

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

NINETEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1323rd  
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 26 January 1965,  
at 3 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Item 9 of the provisional agenda:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
<i>Statement by the representative of Mali . . .</i>	1
<i>Statement by the representative of Morocco</i>	2
<i>Statement by the representative of Pakistan</i>	3
<i>Speech by Mr. Pazhwak (Afghanistan). . . . .</i>	6
<i>Tribute to the memory of Mr. Hassan Ali Mansour, Prime Minister of Iran . . . . .</i>	10
<i>Item 9 of the provisional agenda:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued) . . . . .</i>	10
<i>Speech by Mr. Stevenson (United States of America) . . . . .</i>	11
<i>Statement by the representative of Turkey .</i>	16

*President:* Mr. Alex QUAISON-SACKEY  
(Ghana).

ITEM 9 OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA

General debate (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: In exercise of his right of reply, I give the floor to the representative of Mali.
2. Mr. COULIBALY (Mali) (translated from French): Because of the lassitude at present characterizing the general debate at the present session, I have no intention of engaging in any polemics; in any case, such action would be contrary to the practice of my delegation. Nevertheless, I believe it is my duty to set some matters right with regard to the statements which the United States representative made after my speech here on 22 January 1965 [1319th meeting].
3. Speaking of Viet-Nam, the United States representative accused me of having adopted unquestioningly the communist thesis and of holding that it was imperialism only when a Western Government intervened to protect a peaceful Government and its people and help it to defend itself against communist aggression. If I have understood him correctly, the United States representative contended that the object of American intervention in Viet-Nam was to help the people of South Viet-Nam to defend itself against alleged communist aggression; but I believe that the United States Government, which regards itself as a great defender of democracy, knows perfectly well what the basic aspirations of the Viet-Nameese people are. I am therefore not sure whether the United States Government is really convinced that it is genuinely helping the people of Viet-Nam by giving military support to a succession of central authorities at Saigon. Indeed, with regard to the representative nature of the authorities established or imposed at Saigon,

the New York Herald Tribune of 22 April 1964, on the basis of an assessment by Walter Lippman, wrote that the Saigon Government controlled no more than 30 per cent of the population and no more than a quarter of the territory of South Viet-Nam, even in the day-time.

4. The recent violent demonstrations in which the people demanded that the United States Government terminate its military assistance to the Government of Saigon are indicative enough in this regard. It is therefore legitimate to ask whether the United States Government is helping the people of Viet-Nam, as the United States representative claims, or whether the United States Government wishes to prevent the people of Viet-Nam from exercising its right of self-determination, as provided for in the Geneva Agreements of 1954<sup>1/</sup> with regard to the country's unification.

5. The United States representative also said, in connexion with Viet-Nam, that I had referred only to American intervention in that country. Nevertheless, he did not deny the statements made earlier in the debate by certain delegations to the effect that the military Command set up at Saigon by the United States included over 30,000 advisers and soldiers. The Government of Mali knows of no other Power which has troops stationed in Viet-Nam in violation of the Geneva Agreements. In these circumstances, my delegation would naturally not speak of something which did not exist.

6. Concerning the explosion of the Chinese bomb, my delegation is in no doubt as to the correctness of the tenor of my speech of 22 January 1965. My delegation continues to think that, if the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations had been restored, matters would certainly have been different from what they are today.

7. To the assertion of the United States representative that Mali has no right to describe itself as a non-aligned country, I would merely reply that only the non-aligned countries are competent to define the criteria and rules of non-alignment. In any case, the Government of Mali does not need a great Power, a member or leader of one of the two blocs in relation to which the non-alignment policy operates, to issue to it a certificate or attestation of non-alignment.

8. As the President of the Republic of Mali stated at a people's meeting at Bamako on 24 November 1964, we are non-aligned, but our non-alignment does not mean that we are tightrope-walkers. It does not mean that we must be silent when there is imperialist aggression. It does not mean that we must say nothing

<sup>1/</sup> Agreements on the Cessation of Hostilities in Indo-China, signed on 20 July 1954.

when the rights of peoples are violated. It does not mean that we must remain indifferent to peoples' struggle against a colonial régime or against apartheid.

9. In opting for a dynamic form of non-alignment, the people of Mali was fully aware of the sensitivity of certain great Powers, and especially of their superiority complex, which prevents them from accepting criticism, no matter how constructive it may be, from small countries. In making that choice, we were aware that any denunciation of mistakes made by those great Powers would be regarded by them as an intolerable attack, as is shown by the terms which the United States representative used in exercising his right of reply to my statement on 22 January 1965; but we are convinced that our concept of non-alignment reflects a just policy, a policy whereby ties of co-operation can be established between the peoples, on a basis of respect for the dignity and sovereignty of each of them.

10. We have opted for this course, and we are determined to follow it. It does not disturb us to be accused of communism or communist sympathies, for two reasons: first, we have nothing against communism as such; secondly, we know from experience that, in the minds of those who make such accusations, all peoples which are fighting for respect of their dignity and sovereignty are "communist".

11. The PRESIDENT: In exercise of his right of reply, I call on the representative of Morocco.

12. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (translated from French): In his remarkable statement of this morning [1322nd meeting], my eminent friend, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Algeria, referred to some unsolved problems in African relations. He said that certain African countries still had territorial claims which might contain the seed of fratricidal conflict. Anyone can see that, while such a remark might apply to many cases in Africa, it entitles the Moroccan delegation to feel obliged to comment on it. It might have seemed legitimate—as Morocco spoke a few days ago [1318th meeting]—that we should have had the initiative in describing our attitude on this particular problem, which concerns us, not only in our relations with a brother country, Algeria, but as an African State—since an African decision was mentioned this morning as an indication of the framework within which this problem had been considered—and even as a Member of the United Nations. We cannot keep silent on questions likely to lead, as my eminent colleague says, to "fratricidal conflict".

13. Whatever the competence of any regional organization, it is primarily this Assembly which is competent to deal with any problems that, potentially or immediately, might lead to conflicts or even simply to misunderstandings. It is therefore far less in exercise of my right of reply to the Algerian delegation than in the provision of general clarification, valid for both Morocco and other countries, that I propose, in all friendliness and also in all frankness, to dwell upon certain aspects of the truth which may have been overlooked.

14. On the African level, there would seem never to have been, among African States, a consensus of opinion in favour of inserting into the Charter of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) any legal formula stipulating that the immutability of frontiers was a generally accepted principle. Since we attained independence, we have explained why our sovereignty is not yet effective over the whole of our territory. The Assembly knows the historical circumstances in which, when we became independent, certain parts of our territory, because of a *de facto* situation but against our will, remained outside our sovereignty. I will not take up your time by referring back to the various statements made by the Moroccan delegation; they are to be found in the records of the General Assembly and of the Committees which were seized of these matters. I must however say that the principle of the immutability of frontiers existed, on the African level, only as a political idea put forward here or elsewhere by certain African politicians, and that at no juncture could a political declaration of this nature have legal force and supersede previously existing international law, which the Charter of OAU made no sort of claim to abrogate. In this matter, we continue to rely on something far broader in scope than a regional organization—on the strength of international law, which has always governed such problems. These problems, moreover, are not peculiar to Africa; they subsist in times of crisis and in varying degrees of importance or acuteness, in Asia and even in other countries which claim to be linked by bonds of ideology or brotherly love; they persist in Asia among countries which have inherited the same legacy of colonialism.

15. This morning we heard a dialogue between the representatives of two countries which have had the same problems and are still unable to settle them. These problems are still with us in Africa. The birth of many new African States during the past eight years has led to frontier disputes which have been aired in this Assembly. Such disputes exist even in Europe. The history of Central Europe is largely the history of a continual readjustment of frontiers. I know that many countries continue to formulate reservations in different bodies or make unilateral statements whenever, in any part of the world, they feel that their territorial integrity has been prejudiced by statements in the opposite sense. But there are some things that call for unambiguous rectification; and I make my statement, not merely in reply to a colleague whom I esteem, but in acknowledgement of the value which should attach to everything said in this Assembly.

16. It was stated this morning that the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo in October 1964, had unanimously accepted the principle of the immutability of frontiers. Allow me, at the risk of boring the Assembly, to recall certain truths which have certainly not escaped either those who have sought to disregard them, or the members of the Cairo Conference in October, or, *a fortiori*, observers throughout the world. When it was sought to discuss this problem at the Cairo Conference, it became obvious that it was, for every quarter, one of the most embarrassing. At the outset, it gave rise to two or three

days of heated discussion, and the President of the Conference decided that questions on which the Conference had not reached unanimous agreement should form the subject of documents to be published as an annex to the general declaration. This in itself amounted to recognition that the problems were discussed, that the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries did not reach unanimous conclusions regarding them, and that it was formally decided to exclude from the general declaration of intent all the differences of view which had arisen between members of the Conference. These problems were therefore referred to in annexes, not having the same legal or political force as the declaration. It was even stated specifically that the country which was acting as secretariat of the Conference would publish the results of the Conference's work as two separate documents—one a general declaration containing the resolutions or suggestions approved by the Conference, and the other dealing with the problems that had been discussed but emphasizing the legal difference between what had been decided and what was merely the expression of a hope or of a collective or individual view. Let me add that, when it was sought to discuss this problem, only seven countries were in favour of the principle question, and five against; there were nearly forty abstentions. This constitutes mathematical proof that there was no unanimity on the problem at the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries.

17. This leads me to make another correction from this rostrum. On 28 October 1964 the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic, acting as the representative of the country which had provided the secretariat for the Cairo Conference, sent to the Secretary-General of the United Nations a letter [A/5763] requesting him to have the documents of the Conference circulated as official documents of the United Nations—because regional agencies were entitled to such a privilege. But the document addressed to the Secretary-General did not conform with the distinction specifically requested by the Conference: what was communicated to the Secretary-General was a single document comprising not only the resolutions of the Cairo Conference but also the statements which were to have been published merely as an annex. At the time, my country instructed our Embassy in Cairo to communicate officially with the secretariat of the Conference—that is, with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic—and in a note of 18 November 1964 addressed to the secretary of the Conference the Moroccan Government made an express reservation with regard to the United Nations document on the Cairo Conference.

18. I wish to make it quite clear that, while it was said this morning that certain principles had been accepted at the African or non-alignment level, it was my duty, both as an African and as the representative of a country that had participated in the Conference, to provide the Assembly with this rectification, which is not a political gesture but is supported by official documents that the Assembly can obtain from any delegation of the non-aligned countries and from the secretariat of the Cairo Conference. Moreover, the same reservations were made, at the Conference, by the host country in particular and by other Asian and African countries. Our dele-

gation even sent a letter to the President of the Conference requesting that those reservations be recorded.

19. You will have noticed that I did not take the floor in order to reopen the question of the dispute between Algeria and Morocco. We did not mention it in our statement, and we should not have mentioned it at all if the problem had not, this morning, been referred to incidentally under cover of a reference to general principles. We felt that the interference which might be drawn in regard to this special case on the basis of general considerations might lead to a distortion of the truth. My delegation wished to re-establish the truth and to make it absolutely clear.

20. The PRESIDENT: The last speaker before the general debate continues is the representative of Pakistan, who will speak in exercise of his right of reply.

21. Mr. BHUTTO (Pakistan): This morning, in the statement made by the Indian representative [1322nd meeting], we witnessed a spectacular display of epithets and adjectives. While I was amused at the vein in which he deployed his vocabulary—with such terms as "crude", "absurd" and "mischievous"—I must confess that, in spite of my best efforts to understand him, I could not see anything more in his intervention than one more attempt to obscure the grave issues which have been created by India and which threaten the peace and stability of South and South-East Asia.

22. The Indian representative stated that I had repeated the performances which I have displayed in my own country at mass rallies and in various other political forums. I do not see what is surprising or unnatural about making an exposé of one's own country's case in the country itself and also in an international forum of this nature. It shows the continuity of our principles; it shows the dedication with which we espouse our cause. If our people are supposed to be different from those whom I address from the rostrum of the General Assembly, if my countrymen are supposed to be sub-human and in a different category, so that I must make one address to them and another address here, I can only say that that would be the Indian way of approaching problems. In India, they may say one thing; in Washington, they may say another thing; in Moscow, they may say a third thing; and in Peking, they may say a fourth thing. These are the standards which India has applied to international relations and international morality. They therefore deprecate and decry the continuity and the logic and the devotion to principle with which we espouse our cause, which is the right of self-determination of the people of Kashmir, the decolonization of the world, and the struggle of the world to achieve an international harmonization and equilibrium.

23. The Indian representative also claimed credit for the fact that, when his Foreign Minister addressed the General Assembly in his policy statement [1301st meeting], he made no reference whatsoever to Pakistan or to the issues that divide India and Pakistan and that have created tension between the two countries. He described that as a gesture of good will. I call it a gesture of deception, because it was nothing

short of deception to try to conceal the fraud that India has perpetrated against the people of Jammu and Kashmir, and against the people of Pakistan and its other neighbours. If we were in the same position, we would not like to expose the duplicity of our policies either. We, too, would like to conceal the wrongs that we have done to others. But the General Assembly is meant to right wrongs. This Assembly is meeting here to understand world situations, to understand where the conflicting equities stand and what comes in the way of the settlement of conflicting equities. The Indian representative, then, made no gesture of magnanimity either to the Assembly or to my country in trying to conceal the domination and the colonial fraud that India has perpetrated on Jammu and Kashmir. It serves the purpose of India to conceal such things. But we are the aggrieved party; we are the ones whose right of self-determination has been denied. It is for us to mention these things, to state our cause, to appeal to the conscience of the world community and to inform the world that a fundamental human right is involved in Jammu and Kashmir, and that the right of self-determination is not compoundable and cannot be qualified. It must extend to the whole world. If all the people of Asia and Africa have the privilege of exercising their inherent right of self-determination, then the people of Jammu and Kashmir are no exception to that.

24. The representative of India said that I had repeated my annual ritual, that I had repeated distortions, and that India is a personal obsession with me. I have to repeat the annual ritual, because this is a duty that I owe not only to my own people but to the world community, as I have just stated. As for the alleged distortions, the world itself can examine the issues involved, the modalities of the issues, the justice of the cause and the norms of history, in order to determine whether distortions have been committed by my country or by India, on this fundamental issue. And India is an obsession neither with me nor with the people of Pakistan. India is more than an obsession with us. India has committed aggression against our people—and, in what I say here, I voice the sentiments of the 100 million people of Pakistan whom I represent. The so-called obsession is forced on us by India's refusal to enable the people of Jammu and Kashmir to exercise their right of self-determination. You call it obsession? It is vastly more. It is a bleeding wound, a standing injury, a malignant scar and a cancer.

25. Who introduced tension into the subcontinent? It was not Pakistan that introduced tension while becoming a member of SEATO and CENTO, and it was not Pakistan that was responsible for the arms race in the subcontinent. Pakistan is one third the size of India. India in all respects is greater than Pakistan—in its manpower, in its territory, in its resources, in its industrial might. It is not for a smaller neighbour to try to provoke a larger neighbour; it is not for a smaller country to try to aggravate the tensions. It was in self-defence, in order to protect ourselves against India's machinations and India's pledge to exterminate Pakistan, that we had to determine our policies in the interest of the security and

independence of Pakistan, which is the fundamental aim and objective of any country.

26. Hundreds of thousands of Muslims were killed in India in the aftermath of independence. Junagadh, Mangool and Manavadar were invaded and occupied by India; Hyderabad, a Muslim state which is as large as, if not larger than, France, was invaded and occupied by India; and above all, Jammu and Kashmir were seized by India's marching troops. India's troops were deployed perpetually against both frontiers of Pakistan, and they remain so deployed even at present, in spite of the so-called Sino-Indian conflict and dispute. Who, then, created tension in our region? We are the smaller and the aggrieved country. Why would we want tension? Who sustained this tension by rejecting every offer for a settlement of the Kashmir dispute?

27. The Indian representative has made much of the so-called no-war pact that India has offered to Pakistan. We are Members of the United Nations, and the Charter of the United Nations precludes the use of force in the settlement of international disputes. As Members of the United Nations we negate the concept of the use of force in the settlement of international disputes. As Members of the United Nations it is our duty to abide by peaceful settlement of disputes. If India, on the other hand, has become a Member of the United Nations with serious mental reservations, then that is a different question.

28. In addition to that, I would like to put the question before the Assembly: If negotiations have repeatedly failed and it is impossible for them to bear any fruit, if the Government of India is averse to mediation, if it rejects limited arbitration, if it warns against the Security Council's passing any resolutions, then is it not the position that all avenues of peaceful settlement are barred and closed to Pakistan?

29. This, therefore, brings me to the logic and to the motives of the so-called no-war declaration. We have said again and again that we have already signed a "no-war declaration" when we pledged our adherence to the United Nations Charter. What is needed is not to make another declaration, but to devise specific methods for the settlement of the Kashmir dispute. This would remove the sole cause of conflict between the two countries.

30. We have been trying to impress this point on the Government of India since 1950, when we proposed a "no-war declaration" which would contain provisions for negotiations between India and Pakistan, and, in the case of the failure of negotiations, for recourse to mediation and, in the event of the failure of mediation, for the submission of the points of dispute to either appropriate arbitration or judicial determination. To our regret, and to the misfortune of our two peoples and, above all, the people of Jammu and Kashmir, the Government of India has persistently refused to accept our offer and to recognize that a "no-war declaration" is a mere platitude unless it is accompanied by a simultaneous commitment to the use of methods for a settlement of international disputes.

31. The peace-keeping processes of the United Nations have been spurned by India with regard to Kashmir.

When it came to the question of how the forces of India and Pakistan could be withdrawn from the State of Jammu and Kashmir, and the security of the State preserved, we proposed the stationing of a United Nations force which would be impartial to both India and Pakistan. India rejected the proposal and threatened that any country which would attempt to inject a United Nations force in Indian-occupied Kashmir would be regarded as unfriendly to India. We went further and conveyed our acceptance to the United Nations representative in 1950 of his suggestion that the possibility of stationing a United Nations force on the Pakistan side of the Jammu and Kashmir border be examined to ensure the security of the area after the withdrawal of the Pakistan forces. India said that it would "regret" stationing of such a force in the territory of Pakistan. Thus India made it impossible to have recourse to the peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations for a solution of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. What is more, India obstructs even a resolution of this Council. And yet India proposes a "no-war declaration".

32. Why does not India make a similar "no-war declaration" to the People's Republic of China? Why is this "no-war declaration" made to Pakistan? Because it is Pakistan territory that India occupies, and therefore India can be magnanimous and make an offer of a "no-war declaration" to Pakistan. On the other hand, India claims—rightly or wrongly, I am not going into the merits of the dispute—that China occupies a part of Indian territory, and therefore India is reluctant to offer a "no-war pact declaration" to China.

33. This is the double standard with which India governs its whole policy: one set of standards for one set of countries, another set of standards for another set of countries. That is why India's non-alignment is a double alignment. India's non-alignment is both alignment and non-alignment. It is a policy which only the rope trick of India can perform.

34. The representative of India has quoted the President of Pakistan. He said that our President has praised the armed forces of Pakistan, and that the armed forces of Pakistan are strong and determined to defend their territory. This is a natural urge and a natural expression of every sovereign independent country, to have armed forces for the defence of its territory. And if the armed forces of Pakistan have a glorious record and a martial record and a martial history, why should India deny the Pakistan army and the Pakistan people this valiant tradition and this valiant history?

35. But we have never used our armed forces for aggression. We have never deployed a single Pakistan soldier in the use of aggression, whereas India in seventeen years of independence has committed aggression on no less than five occasions against its neighbours in order to fulfil its chauvinistic and ambitious policies. In seventeen years the use of force by India on no less than five occasions is a record which even a Genghis Khan would envy.

36. It has been said that Kashmir is an integral part of India and that India is opposed to the Balkanization of its country, that India is a pluralistic society

—whatever that means. We do not stand for the splitting up of countries. We believe in the integrity of every sovereign nation State. But the question of Jammu and Kashmir does not fall into this category.

37. There is an international agreement, embodied in the resolution adopted on 5 January 1949 by the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, which states:

"1. The question of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India or Pakistan will be decided through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite."<sup>2/</sup>

This is the operative part of the document to which both India and Pakistan are parties and which has been endorsed here by this very United Nations.

38. The pledge that the future of Kashmir shall be determined in accordance with the will of the people, as freely expressed, was given not only to the United Nations but directly by India to Pakistan. What could be clearer than the following declaration of the Prime Minister of India in his communication of 31 October 1947, addressed to the Prime Minister of Pakistan? He said—and these are the words of the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru:

"Our assurance that we shall withdraw our troops from Kashmir as soon as peace and order are restored and leave the decision regarding the future of this state to the people of the State is not merely a promise to your Government but also to the people of Jammu and Kashmir and to the world."

39. Was any international commitment ever more clearly made, so consistently repeated, and yet more wilfully dishonoured?

40. I quote Mr. Nehru again. On 2 November 1947, he said:

"We have declared that the fate of Jammu and Kashmir is ultimately to be decided by the people of that State. That pledge we have given not only to the people of Kashmir but to the world. We will not and cannot go back on it."

41. Again, I quote Mr. Nehru:

"Kashmir has been wrongly looked upon as a prize for India or Pakistan. People seem to forget that Kashmir is not a commodity for sale or to be bartered. It has an individual existence and its people must be the final arbiters of their future. It is here today that a struggle is being fought, not in the battlefield but in the minds of men."

That is a statement by Mr. Nehru on 9 July 1951.

42. Pandit Nehru said on 12 January 1951:

"Another thing that I pointed out—at the Commonwealth Prime Minister's Conference—was that Kashmir was not just a piece of territory to be bartered. It contained millions of human beings and they could not be treated as chattel. We are bound to keep our pledge given to them. But we have no right to impose anything upon them against their wishes."

<sup>2/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 7, document S/1430, p. 25.

43. The Prime Minister of India stated on 2 January 1952:

"Kashmir is not the property of either India or Pakistan. It belongs to the Kashmiri people. When Kashmir acceded to India, we made it clear to the leaders of the Kashmiri people that we would ultimately abide by the verdict of their plebiscite. If they tell us to walk out, I would have no hesitation in quitting Kashmir.

"We have taken the issue to the United Nations and given our word of honour for a peaceful solution. As a great nation, we cannot go back on it. We have left the question for final solution to the people of Kashmir and we are determined to abide by their decision."

44. So the question of Balkanization or the "pluralistic" nature of India is irrelevant. It is not germane to the issue. Here the right of self-determination is clearly involved, and it is baptized and sanctified by an international agreement, by a pacta sunt servanda agreement in the United Nations, to which the whole of the United Nations is a party. If today we lay down different categories of self-determination, we go against the whole current and the whole process of African-Asian solidarity, of the emancipation of people and of decolonization. What is good for Angola and Mozambique, and what was good for Algeria and other parts of Africa and Asia, stands as good for the people of Kashmir. If this problem and this principle become compoundable, then we go against the spirit of the twentieth century, we go against the very basis of the struggle of the common man for emancipation, we go against the very current of the forces of inspiration that unite the world into a good world against an evil world of domination built upon force—crude and barbaric force.

45. The problem of Jammu and Kashmir is a simple one. It is the problem of the exercise of the right of self-determination by the people of that State—five million of them. No less than five million people of Jammu and Kashmir are involved. And they are not chattel, as Pandit Nehru himself stated. They are human beings. They have their history, their aspirations, their culture, and they have the right to be free as any other people have the right to be free. No sophistry by India or any proxy of India can refuse the people of Jammu and Kashmir the right of self-determination. This is an article of faith with the people of Pakistan, and the 100 million people of Pakistan will struggle, and struggle single-handedly, if necessary, for the emancipation of that right. And I can assure you, Mr. President, that that right will be achieved. If it is achieved with the help and the assistance of the United Nations, it will be the endorsement of progress and of the road to civilization. But if it is to be done without that help, then it will have to be done without it, because in the last analysis justice must be done.

46. I wish to add that in my earlier statement [1319th meeting] I referred to Senator Senanayake of Ceylon. For the record I want to clarify that Mr. Senanayake is an independent Member of the House of Representatives of Ceylon.

47. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now continue the general debate.

48. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan): I should like to begin my statement by saying that one of the founders of the United Nations has departed from a world in which, in so many ways, he played a role achieved by only few men in this century of the greatest achievements and events in the history of mankind. The death of Sir Winston Churchill is a grave event indeed. On this solemn occasion my Government has already offered its deep condolences to the Government of the United Kingdom and its people, with whom Afghanistan maintains a most cordial relationship. On behalf of the delegation of Afghanistan, I wish to convey through you, Mr. President, our most sincere condolences to the delegation of the United Kingdom here in the General Assembly, and to give expression to our profound sorrow, which we share not only with the delegation of the United Kingdom, but also with all Members of the General Assembly.

49. Mr. President, I should like to congratulate you most sincerely on your election to the Presidency of this session of the General Assembly. I have known you personally for a long time, and I have full confidence that the nineteenth session of the General Assembly will make a constructive contribution to the achievement of the ultimate ends of the United Nations under your Presidency.

50. It is also with great and heartfelt pleasure that the Afghan delegation welcomes Malawi, Malta and Zambia as new Members of the United Nations. The attainment of independence by these countries is not only a great victory for their own people but for all Members of the United Nations which have respected their rightful aspirations. Their membership in the Organization has strengthened the United Nations by new constructive forces in pursuit of peace and progress for all mankind.

51. Since we last met in this Assembly and spoke about Afghanistan, I can now tell you of the continuation of satisfactory achievements in my country in the implementation of economic and social plans for the general development of Afghanistan.

52. At the eighteenth session [1224th meeting], I referred to one point bearing upon our political and social reforms, and I reported that a new constitution was being drafted based on principles of democracy derived from the spirit of our people and their deep conviction in the venerated principles of equality, human dignity, freedom of the individual and social justice.

53. At the current session, I am happy to inform you that this Constitution was adopted. The new constitution recognizes the national life of the Afghans according to the requirements of the time and as the right of all human societies. It enshrines justice and equality for all and establishes political, economic and social democracy. It ensures the liberty and welfare of the individual, and aims ultimately at forming a prosperous and progressive society based on the preservation of human dignity. It is based solely on democratic principles. It conforms with the principles and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations and the respect for the rights of the human person

as enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

54. In the international sphere during the period between the last session and this session of the General Assembly, Afghanistan has followed its traditional policy of friendly relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence and co-operation with nations regardless of differences in political, economic and social systems. We have not only succeeded in maintaining our relations of friendship and co-operation with the countries of our own continent, of Africa and of the Americas, but, to our great satisfaction, we have expanded such relations in all these continents. We have greatly benefited particularly by establishing and strengthening our co-operation in economic and cultural areas.

55. In achieving these goals we feel grateful to all those friendly countries from whom we have received co-operation and assistance. By this they have shown their full understanding of our problems and our policies, with an appreciation of our sincerity.

56. I also wish to give expression to our appreciation of the co-operation and assistance we have received from the various organs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. We feel confident that in the light of more knowledge of our needs and problems, and particularly a clear understanding of our co-operation and the hard work we have undertaken by ourselves for the betterment of conditions, this assistance and co-operation will be enhanced.

57. In this general debate I should like briefly to refer only to the major problems and activities which my delegation thinks the Assembly should be reminded of. One of these is the result of the work of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, held last year in Geneva,<sup>3/</sup> as one of the most important and promising achievements of the United Nations. Afghanistan has noted the deliberations of this Conference with satisfaction. The Conference had the merit of defining for the first time the tremendous economic and trade problems with which developing countries are confronted and must contend. It was able to consider the global pattern of trade and its relationship with the economic development of the developing countries in a new perspective which once again, and more clearly, emphasizes the fact that the international community cannot live in harmony and peace as long as the prevailing urgent economic problems are not solved by international co-operation and understanding among all nations, regardless of their level of development.

58. Afghanistan particularly notes the work undertaken at the Conference regarding the transit trade of the land-locked countries. We hope that the conference of plenipotentiaries recommended to be convened in 1965 will be held in an atmosphere of more understanding of the difficulties with which these countries are confronted, and that it will adopt a convention which will contribute to the normalization and promotion of trade for the countries which have no access to the sea. Afghanistan believes that such a legal instrument should come into existence, and

that essentially it is only by legally binding international agreements suited to the conditions of our time that we can seek a realistic and reliable understanding among nations.

59. We wish to express our satisfaction that the nineteenth session of the General Assembly, in spite of its having met with unusual difficulties, was able to carry out the measures necessary for the establishment of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, with the Trade and Development Board as a permanent organ of this body of the General Assembly. The co-operation of the entire membership of the Organization on this matter, particularly in unusual circumstances, should be noted as a hopeful measure for understanding and co-operation.

60. The solidarity of the Group of Seventy-seven is of great historic importance as a realization of the significance of international co-operation for creating conditions in which peace can be realized and maintained, but it is in no way less important to note the general political understanding of the entire membership based on the recognition of the principles of mutual benefit in world affairs which, if continued, will result in a peaceful and prosperous life for all.

61. The urgency of the convening of the session of the Board at the earliest possible time should not be ignored in any circumstances, to enable the new institutions to take practical measures to fulfil the aspirations of the Geneva gathering—which succeeded only in preparing the groundwork.

62. During the period between Assembly sessions, Afghanistan also participated in the Conference of the Non-Aligned Nations held in Cairo.<sup>4/</sup> This was a conference dealing with matters of peace and progress and therefore in conformity with the desire of all those countries which believe that their efforts for strengthening the United Nations by international co-operation leading to peace, freedom, and equality should not be confined only to their efforts in one place or on one occasion.

63. The Prime Minister of Afghanistan stated at the Cairo Conference that Afghanistan, as a devoted Member of the United Nations, supports any measures for the strengthening of the Organization within the Organization and elsewhere.

64. The Cairo Conference was a gathering of the forces of construction seeking a positive answer to the demands of humanity for a peaceful and better life. At this Conference, Afghanistan expressed its appreciation for the progress made in the direction of the elimination of colonialism, but at the same time it stressed that colonialism had not been eliminated in all its forms and manifestations and it condemned the domination of any people by any alien Power in any part of the world.

65. While the importance of the limited test ban was emphasized, it was accompanied by our great concern that tests were not banned in all environments and that the destruction of existing nuclear weapons is still an urgent job to be done. The continuation of

<sup>3/</sup> From 23 March to 16 June 1964.

<sup>4/</sup> Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in Cairo from 5 to 10 October 1964.

the nuclear and non-nuclear armaments race as well as the tension between opposing military camps were a further source of concern.

66. The most important issue of our time, that is to say, the achievement of agreements which would lead to general and complete disarmament under strict international control, is in great need of decisive and immediate steps. Afghanistan would join with those countries which would collectively pursue their interest in bringing about real progress in this field by practical and positive measures.

67. Afghanistan holds the opinion that disarmament can be achieved only if peaceful coexistence provides the world with the confidence required. If suggested, Afghanistan will support the idea of seeking the agreement of all concerned for the purpose of convening an international conference on disarmament.

68. While we support the establishment of atom-free zones which, if continually extended, would lead us to an atom-free world, we shall give our support to agreements between all nuclear Powers for a fresh and universal approach to the problem of nuclear test bans in all environments.

69. The role played by the non-aligned nations was in conformity with Afghanistan's basic international policy of an impartial evaluation of the world situation, based on independent judgement, in the interest only of peace with full realization of our responsibilities as objective members of the international community.

70. In this connexion I would refer to what was stated by the Prime Minister of Afghanistan:

"It is by proving to the world that our mission is one of good will, that our actions are directed by reason, that our determination is our goal, that we can hope for full understanding of our purposes and aims."

71. Afghanistan reaffirmed its belief in the principles of coexistence and asked for a clearer understanding of these principles through their codification and declaration to the world as principles which would include mutual respect for all; support of the right of all nations to choose their own political, economic, and social systems; respect for the undeniable and inherent right of all peoples to self-determination; restraint from any policy of political, military, or economic pressure in any form; and solutions of all disputes by peaceful means without using force or the threat of force.

72. We reaffirmed our belief that most thoughtful consideration was imperative in dealing with disputes between nations, and solutions must be sought only by peaceful negotiations; that these disputes have more significance when they exist between neighbouring countries, but the most despicable are the ones where alien Powers continue attempts to suppress the right of peoples to self-determination; that alien domination in any form and by anyone anywhere should be equally as unacceptable as is the classic form of Western colonialism, and, therefore, should be equally doomed to condemnation and abolition; that in all cases, and with no exceptions, the will of the people and their right to decide their own destiny should be considered the just method for the establishment

of peace and better relations between peoples and nations.

73. Afghanistan stressed the importance of this work in the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, as it has always done in the United Nations, and wishes to do now.

74. The principle of peaceful settlement of the problems of the divided nations and the differences between countries concerning border disputes needs urgent attention. This was reaffirmed by the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries. From the general debate in the United Nations it is clear that other Members of the United Nations share this view. I personally welcome the emphasis put on this point by the distinguished Minister for External Affairs of Pakistan in his statement of general policy the other day [1319th meeting] and also today in his speech exercising the right of reply. We earnestly hope that this principle of the peaceful settlement of border and other disputes between countries will be universally accepted and supported.

75. When the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries was in session in Cairo, many messages of good will were sent from all parts of the world, including the ones sent by the Heads of State and Government of countries that did not belong to the non-aligned part of the world. Afghanistan gave a full expression of appreciation to these messages and interpreted them as a good sign of better understanding of the policies of non-alignment. The Prime Minister of Afghanistan called upon the non-aligned nations to interpret them as such and suggested that they "should try to strengthen this understanding by an objective evaluation of the major-world problems". We emphasize this suggestion here in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

76. We expressed the hope that these countries, particularly the major Powers, would co-operate with each other on matters of peace, particularly through the United Nations.

77. We have pledged positive support for the hopes cherished by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, as expressed in his message to the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries. The Prime Minister of Afghanistan stated: "The United Nations is the only place of hope for saving mankind from destruction. This Conference is only a part of the United Nations. The solidarity of the non-aligned nations is already a great contribution to the work of the United Nations. Its unity on matters of peace and war will, in fact, further this contribution. Afghanistan, with other non-aligned nations, pledges itself fully to respect and support the United Nations Charter, once again and for all time."

78. Mr. President, as you see, the aspiration of my Government and my people in relation to the United Nations is explicitly one of deep and unshaken conviction, and this session of the General Assembly was meant to be attended by the Afghan delegation with greater expectations, particularly because it was a session preceding the International Co-operation Year.

79. For our part, we intended to join Members of the Assembly in looking back to the seconds, minutes,

and hours of the nineteen years of the life of the Organization and, after so doing, endeavour to join them in paving the way for our entry into the twentieth year with steady and firm steps in the direction of achieving our ultimate goals as held in the aspirations and demands of the peoples of the United Nations. We still cherish this hope.

80. However, most unfortunately, the beginning of the session was marked by certain disagreements so that the normal functions of the Assembly were threatened by differences of views on some basic principles. Perhaps this in itself was enough to make us feel deeply concerned over the situation. But when the efforts to overcome the situation were not successful in bringing our anxieties to an end, it became more unfortunate to the extent that the world was given the impression that the urgency of the major international problems may be almost overshadowed by what is referred to as the "financial crisis".

81. Even at this rather late hour when the general debate is coming to an end, no agreement on how to overcome the immediate crisis has been reached. The fact that the crisis is not merely a financial one, simply increases our anxiety, and this factor has to some extent changed, in the minds of many of us, the meaning and the sense of what is recognized as patience and hope for the solution to the problem.

82. However, at no time has the Afghan delegation been discouraged. We have watched the developments with great concern, sharing at all times the conviction expressed by the Secretary-General "that it is not beyond the capacity of reasonable men to reach reasonable accommodations, if there is a will to reach them" [1315th meeting, para. 15], and we join him in the appeal he made to the Members of this Organization, as a matter of urgency, to co-operate in devising ways and means to rectify the situation.

83. Mr. President, you also have made similar appeals.

84. The Afghan delegation would like to have the opportunity to be a part of a unanimous, collective, positive response to any constructive measures in the interest of the Organization to enable this session of the General Assembly to function normally and to give the Members of the United Nations an opportunity to take in hand a comprehensive review of the entire matter as soon as possible.

85. In the consideration of such matters it is not difficult for any one of us to understand that no individual Member can afford a departure from the basic political and legal position it holds, but it should be equally easy to understand that co-operative effort by all Members, with the aim of strengthening the United Nations and of creating an atmosphere in which the future may be harmoniously planned, should not be an impossibility.

86. Rightly or wrongly, it has been mentioned frequently during the past weeks that the prestige of a number of countries might be threatened if they were to reconsider their positions. It is difficult to understand how this could be, particularly when the appeals made to them by a majority of the Members of the United Nations have been accompanied by suggestions

only of general principles for them and for the rest of the Assembly to consider as a basis for negotiations, in order that an agreement for the normalization of the work of the Assembly may be reached by all Members at this session without any prejudice to any basic political and legal positions.

87. What could eliminate the fear of losing a point of position or face more than an appeal by this world Organization, where everyone can state his position and reserve his right, after co-operating to make it possible, to work in a normal atmosphere?

88. Everyone is cognizant of the complexity of the problem; but we also know that it can be solved only with time, in a normal atmosphere, and by a comprehensive review of the total problem. If a confrontation is allowed, it will not be an act of wisdom by an Assembly which acted with wisdom and goodwill successfully on much more complex problems. The complexity is indeed in the political nature of the problem. The solution can be sought only through a political agreement. No procedural attempt will lead to a solution.

89. The decision of the African-Asian group to request the Secretary-General to try to bring about an agreement by negotiation was a wise one, and, in the opinion of the Afghan delegation, should be the only course to be followed. My delegation thinks that with the well-considered absence of any definite proposal imposed on the Assembly or on some Members of the Assembly, and with the existence of certain concrete practical ideas based on general principles, only as a basis for negotiation, there is a good opportunity for all to reach an agreement. This requires an agreement to put aside the differences in the interest of the Organization and relieve it of the present situation without prejudice to any positions hitherto taken.

90. In the general debate last year [1224th meeting] the Afghan delegation, in connexion with the annual report of the Secretary-General, stated that the strengthening of the United Nations at that stage in international affairs was of more significance than it had ever been. This year an emphasis on this point seems to be more relevant. We have to keep reminding ourselves of the achievements of the Organization and the increasing responsibilities it has undertaken. It will be an unpleasant reading of history when it determines the real causes of such disagreements, particularly for those of us who would deny their utmost co-operation for solutions to the present problems. In the meantime, none of us who has the opportunity to stand here and speak his mind can afford to leave this rostrum without emphasizing the importance of the fact that an organization should be strong financially, but at the same time realizing that it cannot be an effective organization if it is weak politically.

91. In this grave situation each one of us can weaken the Organization and only all of us can strengthen it. It is our conviction that the United Nations will emerge stronger from the present crisis, in the same way it has managed through past crises. Even the last-moment statements of inflexible positions should not discourage the Members of this great assembly of nations, individually or collectively. Such discouragement

ment is more dangerous than any delay in reaching agreement. On the contrary, the final explanations of different points of view should be objectively understood, which understanding should serve the purpose of finding a desirable solution. We strongly hope that we shall not be proven wrong.

92. All of us are acquainted with the items on the provisional agenda of this session, about most of which I have deliberately not made any observations. This omission on the part of my delegation at this stage is only to put more emphasis, by brevity, on the importance of enabling the Assembly to function in an effective way, with the hope that at the end of this general debate we shall have an opportunity to continue our efforts to make a contribution to the work of the Assembly by expressing our views during its consideration of the items on its agenda.

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Hassan Ali Mansour,  
Prime Minister of Iran

93. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: We have just learned with the greatest sorrow that His Excellency Mr. Hassan Ali Mansour, Prime Minister of Iran, has passed away. It will be recalled that an assassin fired some shots at him last Thursday. The first reports were to the effect that the Prime Minister's condition was satisfactory, and we all hoped that he would make a very quick recovery. This morning we received with great anxiety the news that he had suffered a setback, and we have just learned that he has passed away.

94. For many years the late Prime Minister was closely associated with the work of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, in which he took a very great interest. It was at his invitation that ECAFE held its last session, in March 1964, in Teheran.

95. In mourning his death, we mourn the loss of a great friend of the United Nations.

96. I am sure, Mr. President, that the Assembly would wish the condolences of all delegations to be transmitted to His Imperial Majesty the Shah of Iran, to the Government and people of Iran, and to the members of the bereaved family, including the Permanent Representative of Iran to the United Nations, Ambassador Vakil, and Mrs. Vakil.

97. The PRESIDENT: I am sure that all delegations are shocked at the news of the passing away of the Prime Minister of Iran, and that they would like me to convey the Assembly's condolences to His Imperial Majesty the Shah of Iran, to the Government and people of Iran, and to the members of the bereaved family, including Ambassador Vakil and Mrs. Vakil.

98. May I ask the General Assembly to stand for a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of the Prime Minister of Iran.

*The representatives stood in silence.*

99. Mr. BHUTTO (Pakistan): On behalf of the delegation of Pakistan, I join with you, Mr. President, and the Secretary-General in the words you have expressed on the demise of an energetic, dedicated and forceful leader of his people, Hassan Ali Mansour, the Prime

Minister of Iran, who was devoted whole-heartedly and entirely to the cause of the United Nations and to the betterment of the peoples of the world. He was himself actively involved in this challenge of facing the revolution of rising expectations. I know that he was looking forward anxiously to the second Asian-African conference and not only to the greater solidarity of the continents of Asia and Africa, but also to finding a bridge between all peoples.

100. His country and my country are neighbours. We share many common and imperishable affinities. In Ali Mansour we had a youthful leader who worked ceaselessly for the realization of the goals that would bring about progress and a better understanding among all peoples. His efforts have been brought to a tragic end by an assassin's bullet, but such is the way of life. I am sure that the work that he has done will remain immortal for his people, for those who worked closely with him and for the countries that knew of his tireless efforts for the promotion of international peace and goodwill.

101. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) (translated from French): It was with a great sense of shock and a feeling of deep grief that we learnt of the tragic death of Prime Minister Hassan Ali Mansour, at the age of 41, just a few hours ago at Teheran as the result of a vile crime. Having long been a personal friend of his, may I say that we have lost not only an Iranian statesman of great intellectual and personal quality, but also, as the Secretary-General has just indicated, a whole-hearted believer in the United Nations and in the cause of international co-operation. Apart from his many different services to Iran, and apart from his brilliant career as a diplomat and a statesman in the service of the Iranian Government, Mr. Mansour had twice represented Iran in the United Nations, and had made many friends here; and on more than four occasions he led the Iranian delegations at sessions of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. I may say that he was the personification of the oldest Iranian traditions of tolerance and courtesy; and it is a tragic and terrible irony that this man of peace, who had never ceased to believe in the value of persuasion and peaceful progress in constructive work, should have met his end as the result of an assassin's attack, an act of violence as criminal as it was absurd.

102. Amid the grief which we all feel, allow me, Mr. President, in the name of His Majesty and of the Iranian Government, on behalf of my delegation and of Ambassador and Mrs. Vakil who are more directly affected by this tragedy, and on my own behalf, to thank you, the Secretary-General and the Minister for External Affairs of Pakistan, from the bottom of our hearts, for the generous and noble words just spoken in tribute to the illustrious memory of Mr. Mansour. May I also express my thanks to the Members of this Assembly for the tribute which they have just paid to him.

ITEM 9 OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA

General debate (continued)

103. The PRESIDENT: We shall now continue the general debate. The last speaker is the representative of the United States.

104. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America): Like all here present, we have heard the news of the death by violence of the Prime Minister, Hassan Ali Mansour, of Iran with shock and with grief. On behalf of my delegation and my Government, I extend our heartfelt sympathy to the people of Iran, His Majesty the Shah and the Government of Iran, and the delegation of Iran to the United Nations, and most especially to our beloved and respected colleague, Mr. Vakil, who has today lost a brother-in-law as well as a distinguished leader of his people.

105. Mr. President, this is my first opportunity to express publicly, on behalf of the delegation of the United States, our congratulations to you on your election as President of the General Assembly, and our admiration—I shall now add—for the manner in which you have conducted that office in most difficult circumstances.

106. I have asked to speak at this date so that I can share with all delegations, in a spirit of openness, with candour and with simplicity, my Government's views on the state of affairs at the United Nations as our annual general debate comes to its conclusion. Certain things which I shall say here today have to do with law, with procedures, with technical and administrative matters. So I want to emphasize in advance that these are but manifestations of much deeper concerns about peace and world order, about the welfare of human society and the prospects of our peoples for rewarding lives.

107. There can be little doubt that we have reached one of those watersheds in human affairs. It is not the first, of course, and surely not the last. But this is clearly a critical point in the long, wearisome, erratic, quarrelsome but relentless journey towards that lighter and brighter community which is the central thread of the human story.

108. Twenty years ago we took a giant stride on that historic journey. We negotiated and signed and ratified the Charter of the United Nations. The first purpose of the United Nations was to create a new system of world order. Those who drafted the Charter were acutely conscious of earlier efforts to find collective security against war and were determined to do better this time.

109. I speak to you as one who participated in the formulation of the Charter of this Organization, both in the Preparatory Commission in London and in the Charter Conference in San Francisco, under circumstances so eloquently recalled by Dr. Lleras Camargo in his memorable address on the International Cooperation Year in this hall last evening. I too recall vividly the fears and hopes of those days as the World War ended in the twilight of an old era and the fresh dawn of a new one—fears and hopes which brought us together determined to ensure that such a world catastrophe would never again occur. At those conferences we laboured long and diligently; we tried to take into account the interests of all States; we attempted to subordinate narrow national interests to the broad common good.

110. This time we would create something better than static conference machinery, something solid enough to withstand the winds of controversy blowing

outside and inside its halls. This time we would create workable machinery for keeping the peace and for settling disputes by non-violent means, and we would endow it with a capacity to act. This time we would create working organizations to stimulate economic growth and social welfare and human rights—and put resources back of them. And this time we would create a constitutional framework flexible enough to adapt to an inevitably changing environment and to allow for vigorous growth through invention, experiment and improvisation within that framework.

111. Twenty years ago nobody could see, of course, what the post-war years would bring. But there was a widespread feeling, in those bright, cool days on the rim of the Pacific, that the United Nations was our last chance for a peaceful and secure system of world order, that we could not afford another failure. For the character of war had evolved from a clash of armies for strategic ground to the possibility of the destruction of populations and the indiscriminate destruction of wealth and culture; the weapons of war had evolved from field artillery to block-busting bombs, and then to a single warhead that could wipe out a city; and recourse to war had evolved from what was cruel to what could be suicidal insanity.

112. Twenty years ago there was a widespread feeling, too, that it already was late in the day to begin loosening the strait jackets of unbridled sovereignty and unyielding secrecy, to begin systematically to build the institutions of a peaceful, prosperous international community in the vulnerable, fragile, interdependent neighbourhood of our planet. For science and technology were making the nations interdependent willy-nilly, and interconnected whether they liked it or not. Science and technology were making international co-operation and organization a modern imperative in spite of ideology and politics, and were paving the way for a practical assault on world poverty, if the world was up to the challenge.

113. It may well be that twenty years ago people expected too much too soon from this Organization. In the workaday world we quickly discover that social and scientific and institutional inventions—even important and dramatic ones—do not swing wide the doors to Utopia, but only add new tools to work with in the solution of man's problems and the abatement of man's ills. In the workaday world we also discover, over and over again, that man himself is a stubborn animal, and in no way more stubborn than in his reluctance to abandon the iron luggage of the past that encumbers his journey towards human community. In the workaday world we discover, too, that to be effective an international organization must be relevant to contemporary world realities, and that there may be conflicting views as to just what those realities are.

114. So we have learned how real are the limitations upon a single enterprise so bold and so comprehensive in its goals as the United Nations. We have learned how heavy are the chains of inherited tradition that inhibit man's journey towards wider community. We have learned that the United Nations will be no less—and can be no better—than its membership makes it in the context of its times.

115. And yet, we have seen that the Charter of this Organization has made it possible to maintain a hopeful rate of dynamic growth; to adapt to changing realities in world affairs; to begin to create workable international peace-keeping machinery; to begin to grapple with the complex problems of disarmament; to stimulate effective international co-operation; and so to move, however erratically, down the road towards that international community which is both the goal of the Charter and the lesson of history. I am proud to say that not only has the United States given of its heart and mind to this endeavour, but that over the years we have contributed more than \$2,000 million to the support of the United Nations and its activities.

116. The progress which this institution has fostered has been accomplished despite the unprecedented character of the Organization, despite the intractable nature of many of the problems with which we have dealt, despite the so-called cold war which intruded too often in our deliberations, and despite a series of debilitating external and internal crises, from which the Organization has, in fact, emerged each time more mature and better able to face the next one.

117. In the short space of two decades, the United Nations has responded time after time to breaches of the peace and to threats to the peace. A dozen times, it has repaired or helped repair the rent fabric of peace. And who can say that this has not made the difference between a living earth and an uninhabitable wasteland on this planet?

118. During that time, the United Nations has sponsored or endorsed all the efforts to halt the armaments race and to press on toward general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. Its efforts were not fruitless. Agreement was reached on a direct communications link between Washington and Moscow—a step lessening the risk of war through accident or miscalculation. A treaty was signed—long urged by the General Assembly—the Treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water.<sup>5/</sup> The two States presently capable of stationing nuclear weapons in outer space expressed in the United Nations their intent to refrain from doing so, and we adopted a resolution [1884 (XVIII)] here calling upon all other States to do likewise. In short, the efforts of the last twenty years have at last begun to arrest the vicious spiral of uncontrolled nuclear armament.

119. In the short span of twenty years, the United Nations also has created a versatile range of international agencies which are surveying resources, distributing food, improving agriculture, purifying water, caring for children, controlling disease, training technicians—carrying on research, planning, programming, investing, teaching, administering thousands of projects in hundreds of places, so that, to quote the Charter, "we the peoples of the United Nations" may enjoy "social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom". These activities are now being financed at the impressive level of some \$350 million a year.

120. In its brief life the United Nations has also taken major strides toward creating an open community of science—for the peaceful use of atomic energy, for the application of technology to industry, agriculture, transport and communications and health, for a world-wide weather reporting system, for shared research in many fields, and for co-operative regulation of the growing list of tasks—life frequency allocation and aerial navigation—which cannot even be discussed except on the assumption of international co-operation and organization.

121. We have proved in practice that these things can be done within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations whenever enough of the Members want them done and are willing to provide the means to get them done. In the process we have left well behind us the out-dated question of whether there should be a community of international institutions to serve our common interests. The question now is how extensive and effective these organizations should become—how versatile, how dynamic, how efficient—and based on what assumptions about the sharing of support and responsibility.

122. And yet, in spite of this history, we have reached a fork in the road ahead of this Organization, and thus in our search for world order and our journey toward a wider community.

123. Is this to over-draw the picture, to over-dramatize the situation in which we find ourselves? Not, I think, if we recollect the historic character of warfare. I assume that we are all convinced that the revolutionary advance in destructive capability—and the danger that little wars anywhere can lead to bigger wars everywhere—has made war an obsolete means for the settlement of disputes among nations. Yet World War II, I remind you, occurred after it already was clear to intelligent men that war had become an irrational instrument of national policy, that another way must be found to settle international accounts and to effect needed change.

124. The reason is not hard to find: the level of destruction does not obliterate the inherently double character of warfare. In our minds we tend to associate war—and correctly so—with the ancient lust for conquest and dominion; we tend, rightly, to identify war as the instrument of conquerors and tyrants.

125. Yet in every war there is a defender who, however reluctantly, takes up arms in self-defence and calls upon others for aid. And this is the other face of war: war has been the instrument by which lawlessness and rebellion have been suppressed, by which nations have preserved their independence, by which freedom has been defended. War is an instrument of aggression—and also the means by which the aggressors have been turned back and the would-be masters have been struck down.

126. As long ago as 490 B.C., Miltiades and his heroic spearmen saved Greek civilization on the Plain of Marathon. Nearly 2,500 years later, the gallant flyers of the Royal Air Force fought in the skies over Britain until the invading air armadas were turned back, while the indomitable legions of the Soviet Army fought on and on at Stalingrad until at last they broke the back of the Nazi threat to the Russian homeland.

<sup>5/</sup> Signed in Moscow on 5 August 1963.

127. All through the years we have been taught again and again that most men value some things more than life itself. And no one has reminded us more eloquently and resolutely that it is better to die on your feet than live on your knees than the noble spirit that left us the other day in London—Sir Winston Churchill.

128. As long as there are patriots, aggression will be met with resistance—whatever the cost. And the cost rises ever higher with the revolution in weaponry. At Marathon 200 Athenians lost their lives. At Stalin-grad 300,000 invaders lost their lives.

129. There, precisely, is the difficulty we are in. Now, in our day, the end result of aggression and defence is Armageddon—for man has stolen the Promethean fire. Yet resistance to aggression is no less inevitable in the second half of the twentieth century than it was 2,500 years ago.

130. The powers of the atom unleashed by science are too startling, too intoxicating, and at the same time too useful as human tools for any of us to wish to abandon the astonishing new technology. But if we will not abandon it, we must master it. Unless the United Nations or some other organization develops reliable machinery for dealing with conflicts and violence by peaceful means, Armageddon will continue to haunt the human race; for the nations will—as they must—rely on national armaments until they can confidently rely on international institutions to keep the peace.

131. This, it seems to me, makes the present juncture in our affairs historic and critical. This, it seems to me, is why the Assembly should be able to perform its proper functions in the event of an emergency, and why the issue before us must be resolved.

132. What then is the issue before us? It is, in essence, whether or not we intend to preserve the effective capacity of this Organization to keep the peace. It is whether to continue the difficult but practical and hopeful process of realizing in action the potential of the Charter for growth through collective responsibility, or to turn toward a weaker concept and a different system.

133. This choice has not burst upon us without warning. Some three and a half years ago, the late Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld, in what turned out to be his last report to the General Assembly, foreshadowed this choice quite clearly. There were, he said:

"... different concepts of the United Nations, the character of the Organization, its authority and its structure.

"On the one side, it has in various ways become clear that certain Members conceive of the Organization as a static conference machinery for resolving conflicts of interests and ideologies with a view to peaceful coexistence, within the Charter, to be served by a Secretariat which is to be regarded not as fully internationalized but as representing within its ranks those very interests and ideologies.

"Other Members have made it clear that they conceive of the Organization primarily as a dynamic

instrument of Governments through which they, jointly and for the same purpose, should seek such reconciliation but through which they should also try to develop forms of executive action, undertaken on behalf of all Members, and aiming at forestalling conflicts and resolving them, once they have arisen, by appropriate diplomatic or political means, in a spirit of objectivity and in implementation of the principles and purposes of the Charter."<sup>6/</sup>

134. If that language of Mr. Hammarskjöld's seems mild and diplomatic, the warning was nevertheless clear. If it was relevant then, it is no less relevant now. If we needed an Organization with capacity for executive action then, how much more do we need it now.

135. There have been many challenges to the ability of the United Nations to act, from the abuse of the right of the veto to the effort to impose a "troika" to replace the Secretary-General. Now we are faced with a challenge to the Assembly's right even to engage in peace-keeping functions or to determine how they are to be financed and to adopt assessments to support them.

136. The decision to invest the General Assembly with the power over the United Nations finances, its power of assessment, was made in 1945 when the Charter was adopted. Ever since then, an overwhelming proportion of the Members have been paying their assessments on the assumption and understanding that this was, in fact, the law—and that the law would be applied impartially to one and all.

137. Almost from the outset these assessments have included peace-keeping activities. Starting in 1947, the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, the United Nations military observer in Kashmir, the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon and other similar missions, were financed by mandatory assessments under Article 17. For ten years no Member of the United Nations thought to refuse—as some are now doing—to pay these assessments, or to condemn them as illegal—as they now do.

138. When the assessments for the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East and the Congo operation were passed year after year by large majorities in the General Assembly, the Members clearly understood them also as mandatory obligations.

139. This was the understanding of States when they made voluntary contributions above and beyond their regular scale of assessments to reduce the burden on Members less able to pay.

140. This was the understanding on which the Members approved the United Nations bond issue, and it was the understanding on which the Secretary-General sold—and over sixty Member States bought—some \$170 million of these bonds.

141. As the Secretary-General so aptly put it last Monday, the question is whether the United Nations will, in the days ahead, be in a position "to keep faith with those who have kept faith with it" [1315th meeting, para. 14].

<sup>6/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Supplement No. 1A (A/4800/Add.1), sect. I.

142. When the argument was pressed—in spite of unfailing United Nations practice—that peace-keeping assessments were not mandatory because peace-keeping costs could not be expenses of the Organization within the meaning of Article 17, that question was taken to the International Court of Justice for an opinion.<sup>7/</sup> We all know that the Court confirmed the principle which the Assembly had always followed: peace-keeping costs when assessed by the Assembly—and specifically those for the Congo and the United Nations Emergency Force—are expenses of the Organization within the meaning of Article 17. We also know that the General Assembly, by a resolution adopted at the seventeenth session [resolution 1854 (XVII)], accepted that opinion by an overwhelming vote—thus confirming that the law was also the policy of this Assembly as well.

143. The Assembly's most important prerogative may well be its power of assessment. It is the heart of collective financial responsibility, and as the Secretary-General also said last week:

"... a policy of improvisation, of ad hoc solutions, of reliance on the generosity of a few rather than the collective responsibility of all ... cannot much longer endure if the United Nations itself is to endure as a dynamic and effective instrument of international action." [1315th meeting, para. 15.]

144. It is your power of assessment which is being challenged. It is the power of each Member of the General Assembly—and particularly those smaller nations whose primary reliance for peace and security and welfare must be the United Nations. And, make no mistake about it, it is your power to keep or to abandon.

145. We can live with certain dilemmas and paradoxes; we can paper over certain ambiguities and anomalies; we can ignore certain contradictions of policy and principle in the interests of pursuing the common interest of majorities in this Assembly. And we can, of course, change our procedures and devise new procedures, within the framework of the basic law, for handling our affairs in the future. Or we can indeed change the law. But we cannot have a double standard for applying the present law, under which we have been operating in good faith for the past two decades.

146. We cannot have two rules for paying assessments for the expenses of the Organization: one rule for most of the Members and another rule for a few. If this Assembly should ignore the Charter with respect to some of its Members, it would be in no position to enforce the Charter impartially as to others, with all the consequences which will follow with respect to the mandatory or voluntary character of assessments.

147. This is not to say the procedures under which the Assembly exercises its authority should not conform to changed conditions and to political realities. Indeed, it is all-important that they do.

148. That is why my Government has suggested that a special finance committee, perhaps with a membership similar to the Committee of Twenty-One,<sup>8/</sup> be established by the Assembly to recommend to the General Assembly in the future the ways and means under which it should finance any major peace-keeping operations—and that this committee should consider a number of alternative and flexible financing schemes whenever it is called upon for such recommendations.

149. We are not dogmatic about this proposal and we are prepared to examine patiently variations and alternatives with other Members—we have been for months and months. Certainly it should not be beyond the ingenuity of such a committee, on a case-by-case basis, to devise ways of assuring financing arrangements for the future which are generally acceptable, particularly to the permanent members of the Security Council.

150. But in favouring procedural changes we do not challenge the basic law of the Charter: we seek improved working procedures. We do not seek to undo the past, but to smooth the future.

151. We support the primacy of the Security Council in the maintenance of peace and security and would support an increase in its role; but we seek to maintain the residual right of this Assembly to deal with such questions in the event the Security Council fails to do so.

152. We support the right, under the Charter, of the General Assembly to assess the membership for the expenses of this Organization, so long as it enforces this power equitably and impartially; we will also support steps to assure that the views of all are taken fully into account.

153. We believe, as I have said, that the Assembly should continue, within the scope of its powers, to be able to deal, free of a veto, with problems of peace and security should the need arise. We are prepared to seek ways of accommodating the principle of sovereign equality and the fact of an unequal distribution of responsibility.

154. The question here is whether the United Nations will demonstrate again, as it has in the past, a capacity for flexibility and adaptation, which has permitted it to grow and to prosper in the past and whether we continue to adhere to the prevailing principle of collective financial responsibility for world peace.

155. It will, of course, be up to the Member Governments to decide whether this Organization is going to continue to work under the Charter as it has been accepted by most of us, interpreted by the Court, and endorsed by this Assembly.

156. My Government is quite clear about its own choice, lest that be a secret to any of you. We want to continue to do our full share in designing and supporting—morally, politically and materially—any sound expansion of the peace-keeping machinery of this Organization. We feel that there are possibilities for a more diversified family of weapons of peace in the United Nations arsenal—from conciliation procedures,

<sup>7/</sup> Certain expenses of the United Nations (Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter), Advisory Opinion of 20 July 1962: I.C.J. Reports 1962, p. 151.

<sup>8/</sup> Working Group on the Examination of the Administrative and Budgetary Procedures of the United Nations.

to small teams available for investigation of complaints and for border inspection, to logistical plans for peace-keeping missions.

157. My Government also intends to continue the search for meaningful and verifiable steps to limit and, hopefully—hopefully, I repeat—to halt the arms race. For a peaceful world delivered of the burden of armaments, we will pursue with the urgency it merits the objective of stopping the spread of lethal weapons and of halting the multiplication of nuclear arms. This most urgent objective is in the common interest of all mankind. For if we fail to achieve it soon, all the progress attained thus far would be brought to naught and the goal of general and complete disarmament would become more distant than ever.

158. My Government is prepared to support a further enlargement of the capacity of the international agencies to wage the war against poverty. We would, for example, like to see the combined Special Fund and Technical Assistance Programme raise its budgetary goal well beyond the present \$150 million once the two programmes have been merged satisfactorily. We would like to see a further expansion of capital for the International Development Association. We would like to see a further expansion in the use of food for development. We would like to see some major experiments in bringing to focus the whole family of United Nations agencies.

159. We would like to see, among other things, the Centre for Industrial Development intensify its work and become an effective laboratory for spreading the technology of the industrial revolution to the far corners of the planet. We feel that there are good opportunities for building up the institutions and programmes dealing with the transfer and adaptation of science and technology, and for developing the wise use of the world's most precious resources.

160. And, too, we wish to see the final chapter written in the drama of decolonization, and written peacefully. We, too, wish to explore the desirability of creating some new United Nations machinery in that most neglected area of the Charter called human rights. We, too, want to press on in such fields as weather forecasting, nuclear energy, resource conservation, and the conversion of sea water.

161. My Government is as anxious as any delegation represented in this Assembly to get on with these priority tasks, to press ahead towards the peaceful solution of disputes, towards co-operative development, towards building the law and institutions of a world community in which man can some day turn his full talents to the quality of society and the dignity of the individual.

162. This is what we have believed in and worked for at the United Nations for two decades now. This is what most of the Members have believed in and worked for as long as they have been Members.

163. What, then, is the alternative? What if the Assembly should falter in the exercise of its own authority? What if the Assembly should repudiate its own history, reject the opinion of the International Court, reverse its own decision with respect to that opinion, and shut

its eyes to the plain meaning of the Charter, and thereby the treaty which gives it being?

164. I have no prophetic vision to bring to the answer to this question—for this would be a step in the dark, down an unfamiliar path. I can only say with certainty that the United Nations would be a different institution than most of the Members joined and a lesser institution than it would otherwise be.

165. I do not have to draw a picture of the uncertainties, the delays, the frustrations and no doubt the failures that would ensue were Members able to decide with impunity which activities they, unilaterally, considered to be legal or illegal and which, unilaterally, they chose to support or not to support from year to year. And so our world would become not a safer but a more dangerous place for us all, and the hopes for a strengthened and expanded and more useful United Nations would have been dimmed.

166. I must say in all earnestness that my delegation would be dismayed if at this stage in history the Members of the Assembly should elect to diminish the authority of this Organization and thereby subtract from the prospects for world order and world peace. If the General Assembly should now detour on the long journey towards an enforceable world order, I fear we will set back the growth of collective responsibility for the maintenance of peace.

167. Wise men drew a lesson from World War I and established the League of Nations. President Woodrow Wilson took the lead in that great experiment, and my countrymen, in hindsight, deeply regret that the United States did not take up its share of the burden in that historic enterprise. But the lesson of World War II was not wasted on this country, as our active leadership in establishing the United Nations and its Charter attests.

168. Who can say whether we shall have another chance to draw a lesson from another global conflict and start again? But this we know full well: we, the human race, are fellow travellers on a tiny space ship spinning through infinite space. We can wreck our ship. We can blow the human experiment into nothingness. And by every analogy of practical life, a quarrelsome ship's company and many hands on the steering gear is a good recipe for disaster.

169. In such a world there can be only one overriding aim—the creation of a decent human order on which we can build a reasonable peace—not simply the precarious peace of balances and alliances, not simply the horrifying peace of mutual terror, but the peace that springs from agreed forms of authority, from accepted systems of justice and arbitration, from an impartial police force.

170. That is why our commitment to an effective working, tenacious United Nations is so deep, and why, in the most literal sense, the United Nations carries with it so much of the hope and future of mankind.

171. This is our position not because we, among the Members, are uniquely dependent upon the United Nations for the security and safety of our citizens.

172. This is our position not because we, among the Members, especially look to the United Nations for guidance and help for our economic development.

173. This is our position not because we found it advantageous to our narrow national interests to treat assessments as mandatory; we found it a price worth paying in recognition that others also shared the principle that all Members bear some measure of responsibility for maintaining the peace.

174. This is our position, rather, because we believe that in the nuclear age the only true national security for all Members lies in a reliable and workable system of dealing with international disputes by non-violent means—because we believe that we shall continue to face crises and problems which, by definition, can only be dealt with internationally—because we believe that workable, effective international institutions are a plain necessity of our day and age—because we believe that in every secure community shared privileges demand shared responsibility—and because we believe it unwise and unsafe and unnecessary to take a side road at this stage of the journey on which we set out together two decades ago.

175. Beneath all the complexities of the issue that now threatens the future capacity of this Organization, there are some very simple, very basic, very plain points to remember.

176. My nation, most nations represented here, have paid their assessments and have kept their accounts in good standing.

177. My Government, most Governments represented here, have accepted the principle of collective financial responsibility and have striven to uphold the prerogatives of this Assembly.

178. My Government, most of the Governments represented here, want to resolve this crisis without violence to the Charter and to get on with our international business.

179. That is why we have all stood available to discuss this issue at all times.

180. What we have sought is not defeat for any Member of this Organization. What we have sought is the success of the United Nations as a living, growing, effective international organization.

181. But the Assembly is now nearing a fork of the road, and I have attempted to put the issue frankly because the Assembly may soon again have to decide which branch of the road it will take.

182. And the very least that we can do is to be absolutely clear just what we are doing when we exercise that option.

183. Finally, I, for one, cannot escape the deep sense that the peoples of the world are looking over our shoulder—waiting to see whether we can overcome our present problem and take up with fresh vigour and with renewed resolution the great unfinished business of peace, which President Johnson has called "the assignment of the century".

184. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Turkey in exercise of his right of reply.

185. Mr. ERALP (Turkey): Before speaking in the exercise of my right of reply, I should like to say a few words to express the deep distress that will be felt in my country at the tragic news which we have just heard. The untimely death of Prime Minister Hassan Ali Mansour of Iran at the hands of an assassin will come as a profound shock not only to the people of Iran, but also to my people and to all the nations of the world which had come to admire his untiring efforts in the service of his country and his invaluable contribution to the cause of progress of the sister nation of Iran. The irreparable loss of Prime Minister Hassan Ali Mansour will grieve my people as though we had lost one of our own sons and statesmen.

186. My delegation associates itself whole-heartedly with the condolences expressed by you, Mr. President, and by the Secretary-General, as well as the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, to the Sovereign and the people of Iran, as well as to our colleague from Iran and his bereaved wife.

187. Foreign Minister Kyprianou of the Greek Cypriot Government has made a long statement this morning [1322nd meeting]. Every single distortion and misrepresentation concerning the question of Cyprus which adorned his statements has already been refuted in anticipation by the speech delivered by the Foreign Minister of Turkey yesterday [1321st meeting]. The same distortions and misrepresentations were the theme of Foreign Minister Kyprianou's lengthy right-of-reply statement yesterday [1321st meeting]. The representative of Greece has also joined the chorus of this Greek tragedy, adding his Government's voice to this misguided and ill-conceived attempt to deceive the General Assembly of the United Nations.

188. I do not propose at this late stage in the general debate to interpose a subsidiary debate on Cyprus. I feel, nevertheless, that as briefly as possible I must set the record straight.

189. In the first place I should like to dispose of the remarks made by the representative of Greece [1321st meeting].

190. Ambassador Bitsios said that Turkey had threatened to invade Cyprus and that Turkey, while calling for a negotiated settlement, had been reluctant to negotiate. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Turkey has never threatened to invade Cyprus nor does it have any territorial aspirations on that unfortunate island. Where Cyprus is concerned, Turkey has but one purpose in mind, namely, the safeguarding of the rights and the security of its kinsmen in Cyprus. Where Cyprus is concerned, its duties arise from that unique consideration.

191. As for our reluctance to negotiate, the many offers and attempts made by my Government at the highest level to discuss the matter with the Greek Government, and the off-handed manner in which they have been turned down by that Government are a matter of common knowledge. On the other hand, Foreign Minister Kyprianou himself knows very well that the Turkish Government has not refused to negotiate with Archbishop Makarios except when faced with an ultimatum or at gunpoint. Archbishop Makarios, as the President of Cyprus, visited Ankara in November 1962.

192. The Assembly might be interested to hear certain passages from the joint communiqué which was issued on that occasion:

"Upon the invitation of His Excellency Cemal Gürsel, President of the Republic of Turkey, His Beatitude Archbishop Makarios, President of the Republic of Cyprus, paid a state visit to Turkey from 2 to 4 November 1962.

"His Beatitude Archbishop Makarios was accompanied by His Excellency Spyros Kyprianou, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Cyprus, as well as other Cypriot officials."

I shall now quote some of the paragraphs.

"These talks took place in a cordial atmosphere of friendship and understanding and have been characterized by a spirit of sincerity and constructiveness.

"Both parties were pleased to note improvement in relations between Greeks and Turks in Cyprus since the signing of the existing agreements. They also expressed their sincere desire that the improvement in their relations should continue to develop so that they may live harmoniously together in fruitful co-operation."

193. I wonder if Foreign Minister Kyprianou will claim that this communiqué, just like the Zurich and London Agreements of 1959, according to his contention, was also imposed upon the reluctant Archbishop and his Foreign Minister.

194. That visit took place just one year before the Greek Cypriots unleashed their unspeakable attacks against the defenceless Turks. During the talks that were held in Ankara on that occasion, Archbishop Makarios complained of certain impediments to the smooth working of the Constitution. His appeal found sympathy in Ankara and he was told that such technical flaws could be repaired through patient and well-meaning efforts. He was asked, however, and he promised, to issue an appeal calling for respect for the Constitution upon his return to Nicosia. He never made that appeal. On the contrary, he speeded up the preparations for the rape of power in Cyprus. It was obvious that his intention was not to amend the flaws of the Constitution but to get rid of it so that he could bring about his cherished aim of "enosis". Now, when a Security Council resolution<sup>9/</sup> calls for a negotiated settlement, it is the same Archbishop Makarios who declares to the correspondent of the Salonika newspaper Macedonia—and I quote from The Christian Science Monitor of 3 August 1964:

"We are not prepared to accept any compromise or make any concession... I do not believe in the possibility of any agreed solution. In spite of hopes voiced by different quarters, an agreed solution entails possible compromise."

That is the attitude of the Greek Cypriot Government toward the resolution of the Security Council. We, on the other hand, are and have always been ready to negotiate for a peaceful solution and an agreed settlement.

195. As for the charges of discrimination against Greeks in Turkey and of mass expulsions of Greek

citizens, these come under the category of vicious propaganda in which the Greek Government has been indulging lately against Turkey. It has been made amply clear that there are no summary expulsions of Greeks from Turkey. Greek citizens living in Turkey enjoy precisely the same rights as the citizens of any other country. As for Turkish citizens of Greek origin, which Greek propaganda insidiously tries to confuse with Greek citizens, they enjoy precisely the same rights and the protection of the law enjoyed by all citizens of Turkey. There has never been any discrimination against anyone in Turkey. That is much more than can be said about the Turkish minority living in Greece under the status of second-class citizens.

196. So much for the allegations of the representative of Greece, who also took exception to my reference to Greek imperialism, but I shall say more about that presently.

197. And now for the charges and allegations hurled at us by Foreign Minister Kyprianou. Yesterday he started his remarks by saying that he also had the right to say something about Cyprus, being the Foreign Minister of that country. I must hasten to qualify that statement. He is the Foreign Minister, not of the constitutional Government of Cyprus but of a régime that has usurped power and exercises unlawful authority over the Greek-controlled part of the island. As such, he may be qualified to speak for the Greeks of Cyprus but not for the entire people of Cyprus, and certainly not for the Turkish community.

198. Yesterday [1321st meeting], the Foreign Minister of Turkey read a quotation from Archbishop Makarios in which the Archbishop declared his intention to bring about the complete expulsion of the Turkish community from Cyprus. Foreign Minister Kyprianou dismissed this as a fabrication. Fabrications may be one of the weapons in the armoury of the Greek Cypriot régime, but we do not use them. If Foreign Minister Kyprianou takes the trouble to look up the back numbers of Greek Cypriot newspapers, he will find that the statement in question was made by Archbishop Makarios on 4 September 1962, at the village of Panayia where he was born, on the occasion of the unveiling of a bust of EOKA<sup>10/</sup> leader Takis Sophokleios, who had died in that village.

199. It was said that we had at no time expressed any regrets for the loss of life among Greeks and Turks alike as a result of the tragic events in Cyprus. If Foreign Minister Kyprianou takes the trouble to read the minutes of the Security Council meeting of 17 September 1964,<sup>11/</sup> he will find that not only had I expressed regret for such loss of life but that I had also placed the responsibility for the death of innocents, Greek and Turk alike, at the door of the Greek Cypriot régime, which had miscalculated the consequences of their aggression against innocent victims.

<sup>9/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Nineteenth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1964, document S/5575.

<sup>10/</sup> National Organization of Cypriot Fighters.

<sup>11/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Nineteenth Year, 1153rd meeting.

200. Foreign Minister Kyprianou solemnly declared here that his régime considered the Turks of Cyprus as equal citizens. One cannot help but be reminded of George Orwell's classic book, Animal Farm, where he relates that on that farm all animals were equal, except that some were more equal than others. To illustrate the true feeling of the Greeks towards the Turks in Cyprus, I would like to quote from none other than the EOKA leader, General Grivas, who, in a circular issued to the EOKA gangs on 14 May 1956, declared:

"When water and fire become intimate friends and when hell and paradise unite, then and only then shall we be the sincere friends of the Turks."

This is the spirit of charity which prevailed then and prevails now among the Greek Cypriots towards their fellow citizens. These are the Greek Cypriots who would have the Turks of Cyprus left to their mercy.

201. In support of the utterly ludicrous charge that it was Turkey and the Turks of Cyprus that started the tragic events in Cyprus, Foreign Minister Kyprianou threatened to produce a mysterious document. We have often been threatened with such mysterious documents before, without ever having seen them. I need no such document to prove the contrary. If the international Press is not considered sufficient witness, then may I refer to the writings of a comrade-at-arms of Foreign Minister Kyprianou himself. I am speaking of Nikos Sampson, one of the principal sponsors of the Greek Cypriot aggression against the Turks who has been publishing a series of articles in his own newspaper, the Mahi, published in Nicosia.

202. In those articles, Nikos Sampson reveals to the whole world how the Greek attacks had been planned long in advance, how instructors sent from Greece took an active part in these preparations, how the dwellings of such leaders as Lyssarides and Yiorkadjis, the present Minister of the Interior, had been turned into arsenals and operations headquarters, and how Commander Dzivelekis of the Greek contingent in Cyprus and General Perides, the commander of the three-Power headquarters, directed the operations in which many officers and men from Greece took part. I shall look forward to reading one day the memoirs of Foreign Minister Kyprianou himself if he ever publishes them. They would be very instructive.

203. In a desperate attempt to denigrate Turkey, Foreign Minister Kyprianou took the trouble to go back to certain massacres alleged to have been committed by Turks in the past. I suggest that if we start looking into the old files, the Greeks, whether they be of Greece or Cyprus, will not come out snow-white. Need I go into the horrors of the massacre of the innocent Turkish inhabitants of the island of Crete, who suffered at the hands of Greek imperialism? The story and the figures can be found in the Encyclopaedia Britannica. Or should I tell the story of thousands of innocent civilian Turks of Asia Minor who perished during the imperialistic aggression of Greece against Turkey in the years 1919 to 1922? But perhaps I should quote briefly from a book by the celebrated historian Arnold Toynbee entitled The

Western Question in Greece and Turkey. In the chapter on "The War of Extermination" he writes:

"My wife and I are also witnesses for the Greek atrocities in the Yalova, Gemlik, and Ismid areas. . . . We not only obtained abundant material evidence in the shape of burnt and plundered houses, recent corpses, and terror-stricken survivors. We witnessed robbery by Greek civilians and arson by Greek soldiers in uniform in the act of perpetration. We also obtained convincing evidence that atrocities similar to those which had come under our observation in the neighbourhood of the Marmara during May and June 1921, had been started since the same date in the wide areas all over the remainder of the Greek-occupied territories."<sup>12/</sup>

204. Nor can the Greeks of Cyprus absolve themselves from blame for these atrocities in Asia Minor. Even General Grivas, who is now Commander-in-Chief of the illegal Greek Cypriot armed forces, was a member of that imperialistic expedition against Asia Minor as a young officer.

205. These are mere glimpses from the past. I would not have mentioned them had the ghosts of the past not been revived. We believe in looking to the future, to a peaceful solution and an agreed settlement of our problems.

206. Foreign Minister Kyprianou would have us believe that the Turkish community was not involved in the struggle in the island for independence and that it was artificially introduced into the issue. I am sure that the Assembly will find this hard to swallow. Any community which has been fighting valiantly for its preservation and against the imposition of "enosis" cannot be said to be indifferent to the political future of the island. Foreign Minister Kyprianou, however, artificially introduced into the issue the other minority groups in the island which can in no way be compared to the two major communities whose participation in the Government is clearly defined in the Constitution.

207. Reference was made to the Treaty of Lausanne<sup>13/</sup> yesterday and today, whereby Turkey had renounced title to the territorial possessions of its predecessor. By no stretch of the imagination can this be interpreted in the sense of the Turks of Cyprus having renounced their fundamental right to refuse to live under Greek imperialism.

208. We have listened patiently to the repetition of the false assertions that the Zurich and London Agreements which gave birth to the Republic of Cyprus were imposed against the will of the people of Cyprus. The statement of my Foreign Minister contained incontestable evidence to refute this allegation. These agreements were freely negotiated by the Greek as well as the Turkish leadership and the Treaties based upon them were freely signed by the President of the sovereign Republic of Cyprus in the exercise of his constitutional rights. In fact, Archbishop Makarios went to the polls in the free elections in Cyprus as a champion of those Treaties. The people of Cyprus, by

<sup>12/</sup> Arnold J. Toynbee, The Western Question in Greece and Turkey (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1922), pp. 259-260.

<sup>13/</sup> Signed on 24 July 1923.

electing him to the Presidency by a landslide, have solemnly endorsed those Treaties.

209. At one point [1321st meeting] Foreign Minister Kyprianou used words to the effect that a federation on ethnic lines would be merely "the last step to partition". This I find difficult to understand. If that were the case, it would be hard to explain how federations based on ethnic lines, such as those of Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union, Switzerland and many other countries, continue to thrive as independent countries. Federation can lead to partition only if the Greek part of the federation carries out its avowed intention of union with Greece, leaving its Turkish compatriots high and dry. A federation based on goodwill and on the determination to exist as a nation need never turn into partition. Partition is not our aim, and to keep harping on it is no more than shadow-boxing with a non-existent adversary.

210. Foreign Minister Kyprianou quoted from a speech of Atatürk, who had led Turkey's struggle against Greek imperialism and who, along with that great Greek statesman Venizelos, had laid the foundations of friendship between the two countries—a friendship which is now in jeopardy. Atatürk did indeed speak of dignity and honour in independence. He was not speaking of using independence as a stepping-stone to territorial expansionism, but of true independence as an aim in itself. I ask the Assembly, is it in keeping with the dignity and honour of an independent State:

(1) To allow its territory to be invaded by ten to fifteen thousand troops from the Greek mainland in preparation for annexation?

(2) In a welcoming speech addressed to the new Greek Ambassador to Nicosia, to declare that he is to be the last Greek Ambassador, since very soon Greece and Cyprus will be one and the same country?

(3) On a plate presented to the King of Greece, to inscribe a solemn wish that his domain may soon extend to the island of Cyprus?

211. Does the Greek President of the presently independent Republic of Cyprus think of remaining independent in dignity and honour when he declares to Lord Thomson—and I quote from The Sunday Times of 20 September 1964:

"I want something higher than being a temporary President of Cyprus. My ambition is to connect my name with history as the architect of 'enosis' (union of Cyprus with Greece)... we want to do it through the United Nations."

212. All the trumped-up charges and allegations, both of the Greek Cypriot Government and of the Government of Greece, to which I have referred, will be amply debated and fully refuted in the appropriate Committees and organs of the United Nations once this Assembly is again in a position to adopt its agenda

and proceed with its normal functioning. In the meantime, I must warn this august body against the most colossal hoax which is now being perpetrated in its councils by these two Governments. It is noteworthy, for instance, that Foreign Minister Kyprianou, in the hour-long speech he delivered this morning, not once mentioned the avowed ambition of his Government, namely, annexation by Greece. That is something that can apparently be mentioned only outside the United Nations. The function of the Assembly is to submit to this deception and then be discarded.

213. It was also noteworthy that in his speech this morning [1322nd meeting] Foreign Minister Kyprianou was even reluctant to call the largest Turkish city by its current name of Istanbul. No, he called it Constantinople, by its Greek name, revealing once again the wild expansionist dream of the Greeks to revive the Greek Empire at the expense of their Asian neighbours.

214. My delegation is fully confident that when, through patient debate, this deception is exposed, the General Assembly will see the situation in its true light, namely, as an attempt to widen the shores of Greek imperialism by robbing a new nation of its independence under the guise of what they term unfettered independence.

215. Finally, the Foreign Minister of the Greek Cypriot Government has solemnly declared from this rostrum that the concept of participation or federation can never and shall never, under any circumstances, be accepted. I would like to declare with equal emphasis that the annexation of the island by Greece and the domination and enslavement of the Turks by the Greeks in Cyprus can never and shall never be accepted.

216. The Turks of Cyprus are not rebels; they are the victims of the Greek Cypriot rebellion against the Constitution. The Turks of Cyprus, after having lived under colonial rule for 100 years, have now breathed the air of independence for four years, and they wish to remain independent. They shall never submit to living under Greek imperialism. They have not deserved it. Like all peoples, they are entitled to live in freedom, freedom from the risk of foreign invasion and freedom from the fear of being annihilated by their fellow citizens. And so shall they live.

217. The PRESIDENT: There are still a number of representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply. My fear is that if I allow those who are now inscribed on my list to speak, this will result in other representatives wishing to speak.

218. My intention, therefore, is that we should adjourn now and tomorrow morning the Assembly will meet to hear tributes to Sir Winston Churchill. After that, those who wish to exercise their right of reply can do so. There is a limit to human endurance, and I am sure that the Assembly will bear with me.

*The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.*