



C O N T E N T S

| | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| Agenda item 9: | |
| General debate (<i>continued</i>)..... | 73 |
| Speeches by Mr. Casey (Australia), Mr. Al-Jamali (Iraq), Mr. Rómulo (Philippines) and Mr. Urrutia (Colombia) | |

President: Mr. Eelco N. VAN KLEFFENS
(Netherlands).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

SPEECHES BY MR. CASEY (AUSTRALIA), MR. AL-JAMALI (IRAQ), MR. RÓMULO (PHILIPPINES) AND MR. URRUTIA (COLOMBIA).

1. Mr. CASEY (Australia): First, Sir, let me express the great pleasure of the Australian delegation at your election as President of the United Nations General Assembly. We are particularly glad to see you, the distinguished representative and former Foreign Minister of a country with which Australia has such long associations and such close present relations, presiding over this body. On behalf of my delegation, I offer you our warm congratulations and wish you every success in your task, which we are confident you will fulfil in accordance with the high standards which your predecessors in office have built up.

2. At the same time I take this opportunity to express once again to Mrs. Pandit, the outgoing President, our admiration and respect for the way in which she, the first woman to be elected President of the General Assembly, has carried out her duties. I think that all of us who had the privilege of seeing Mrs. Pandit presiding again this year at the opening meeting of our Assembly were reminded once more of her skill and fairness in the Chair. I should like to express our warm thanks and congratulations to her on this achievement, which has added to her very considerable record as a woman in world affairs, and which is reflected again in her appointment to London.

3. I expect many of us know the song by Gilbert and Sullivan about the policeman's lot not being a happy one. I think most of my colleagues here will agree that a Foreign Minister's lot, particularly during the last twelve months, has not been an enviable one. The past year has been very full. The amount of travelling involved as we have moved from conference to conference has been considerable. But what, it may be asked, has all this travelling and discussion achieved? Has it meant that we are meeting here today in a

world situation which has altered substantially for the better? That is a question which many people are quite legitimately asking. For my part, I feel that the answer is that there are grounds for greater optimism than was the case a year ago and that there has been some definite progress in a number of important international problems.

4. Of course, the great question before us all remains the same—how can we make progress towards the security and prosperity which we all seek? It is a problem of constant adjustment in an equation where no factor of fixed value remains, especially when the international situation is changing as rapidly as it has been in recent times. Since the last session of the General Assembly there have been many shifts and changes in international affairs. In this period there have been three major conferences. These have done much to produce the situation and to create the state of mind in which we meet here in this present session. During 1954, we have seen the Berlin Conference on Germany and Austria, the Geneva Conference on Korea and Indo-China and, finally, a conference of a very different order, although perhaps potentially the most important of the three, the Manila Conference, which a number of us have attended, and at which the treaty designed to create a system of collective security for South-East Asia was signed.

5. As I see it, one of the most significant things about the first two conferences, at Berlin and at Geneva, was what they revealed about attitudes of the Soviet Union and of China on some major international questions. The Berlin Conference showed plainly that the Soviet Union was unwilling to contemplate any solution of the present division of Germany except on terms which ruled out any chance of the Germans having the opportunity to ally themselves with anyone except the Soviet Union. The Geneva Conference showed, first of all, that there could be no agreement by the Soviet Union to the unification of Korea except on the same general lines as the Soviet terms for Germany.

6. The agreements achieved at Geneva on Indo-China did two important things: first, they stopped the fighting, and, second, they led a number of Governments, including that of Australia, to take further immediate steps to maintain and strengthen the integrity of the South-East Asian countries. And so, when I say that perhaps there are grounds for greater optimism today than there were last year, I do not mean that I believe that international communism has been induced to alter either its present practices or its future designs. If there is ground for optimism it is not because of any change in the communist attitude that has become apparent; any change for the better is due mainly to the positive steps that we have taken now in the East as well as in the West to deal with the threat of communist aggression. There should now be reasonable

expectation that the communist leaders will see for themselves just how we will react in the future to what they might do.

7. At this point, let me say that we should not forget the unhappy situation of division and tension in which communist action has left a number of countries such as Germany, Korea and now Viet-Nam. We should not forget the distress which the peoples of these countries are suffering, with one part severed from the other. In these divided lands the suffering from communist action is direct and painful. Indeed, in all our countries, we are all continuing to pay a high price to maintain ourselves against the undiminished communist threat. The burden of armaments must remain while Communist Powers, led by the Soviet Union, refuse to consider any workable system by which tension could be reduced by gradual, internationally-controlled reductions in armaments. We, in Australia, have watched with great disappointment the Soviet Union's performance in the Disarmament Commission, which this year has made strenuous efforts to find some solution. This failure to reach agreement has caused great disappointment to millions of people all over the world. Even President Eisenhower's constructive proposal, made during the eighth session of the General Assembly [470th meeting], aimed at promoting the peaceful uses of atomic energy under international auspices, struck no response from the Government of the Soviet Union. Its attitude on this matter remained as cynically propagandist as ever until, on the eve of this General Assembly, it agreed to consider negotiating again.

8. Regarding Australia's attitude towards President Eisenhower's proposal in respect of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, the Australian delegation welcomed it last year and we followed closely the course of the consultations between the United States Government and the Government of the Soviet Union which took place during the following months. We had hoped that from these discussions some agreement might emerge which would allow these two great Powers to work together in a positive way on the development of nuclear energy for civilian purposes and that, from such co-operation, in due course great benefits, both in scientific progress and in reduced danger of attack by nuclear weapons, might flow to us all. For we in Australia are engaged in the development of what may be a very rich endowment of uranium ore, and so are particularly interested in this new source of power which could greatly assist and expedite our development. Equally, we are concerned to promote any project which could lead to reduced danger of atomic war.

9. For these reasons, therefore, we welcomed President Eisenhower's proposal last year and we now welcome the proposal introduced in this present Assembly on 23 September [475th meeting] by the Secretary of State of the United States. As a country which promises to be an important source of uranium, we hope to play our full part in the proposed agency for developing the constructive uses of atomic energy. As a people well aware of the importance of these resources in the event of war, we hope that from the co-operation between the major countries concerned in the development of atomic energy, and from the increased mutual confidence which this might bring, the threat of atomic war might be progressively less-

ened and finally removed by the establishment of full international controls.

10. I should now like to speak briefly of some of the things which have happened over the past twelve months and particularly about development in the areas in which Australia is more directly concerned. A year ago the fighting was going on in Indo-China. The United Nations had recently achieved an armistice in Korea and we were trying to proceed to the next step, the establishment of a political conference to discuss the future of Korea. In the Middle East, an area which has always had a particular significance for Australia, agreement between the United Kingdom and Egypt on arrangements for the security of the Suez Canal Zone still seemed a long way off, and the Iranian oil dispute was still unresolved.

11. Now, a year later, we find definite progress in these situations. The armistice has been successfully maintained in Korea and the fighting in Indo-China has been brought to an end. The United Kingdom and Egypt have reached agreement on the Canal Zone problem, and Iranian oil is about to flow again.

12. For us in Australia the most important single achievement was the ending of the fighting in Indo-China. The Indo-China settlement, reached at the Geneva Conference, was by no means all that we would have wished, although it was probably the best that could have been reached in all the circumstances. The flaws in the Geneva settlement on Indo-China and the risks that they entail are obvious enough, but perhaps not enough stress has been laid on the good points.

13. I believe that in the present world situation the ending of open hostilities in such an inflammable situation is an important thing in itself. All of us, I think, were concerned—and perhaps not least the Government of the Soviet Union—at the way in which the heat of the fighting in Indo-China appeared to be creeping steadily up towards flash-point. Wars, particularly modern wars, do not stand still. They tend either to expand or to contract. The termination of the fighting stopped what might well have been an expanding risk.

14. Secondly, the Geneva settlement means that Laos and Cambodia will have complete independence. The Soviet Union, Communist China and the Viet-Minh, as well as the representatives of the democratic countries, agreed to respect the integrity and the independence of these States. This is a provision which may be of the first importance in stabilizing the situation in South-East Asia. It is the earnest hope of my country that all the free Asian countries will accord diplomatic recognition to these States. Some, I am glad to say, have already done so.

15. As I have said before at this General Assembly [473rd meeting], the series of military enterprises in which Communist China has been so actively and vigorously concerned in recent times—Korea, Indo-China and, most recently, in the Formosa Strait, each of which has followed closely on the heels of the other—these warlike activities lead us to wonder about the future, about what the next item in Peking's programme might be. It has therefore seemed wise to us to enter into an arrangement which is designed to underwrite the settlement achieved for Indo-China at Geneva and to establish a system of collective security throughout the area of Asia menaced by communist expansionism.

16. Together with others of us here, I have just come from the Manila Conference where this important link in the chain of defence against aggression was forged. The South-East Asia Collective Defence Treaty which we negotiated at Manila is an open agreement for all to see. It is an undertaking in complete harmony with the Charter of the United Nations and throughout emphasizes the duties and obligations which all the parties have assumed as Members of the United Nations.

17. The Manila Treaty is merely the application to a particular danger area of the principles of the United Nations Charter. It is directed solely against aggression. It is an instrument of defence and cannot be invoked for aggressive purposes. Those who do not contemplate aggression or interference in the affairs of independent States will find nothing to object to in this organized grouping for defence in South-East Asia and the South-West Pacific. By the Manila Treaty we are not putting ourselves into a warlike posture. We are only warning any would-be aggressor that "this animal is dangerous. It defends itself if it is attacked".

18. There are those who would have us believe that the Communists have no aggressive intentions and that regional defensive arrangements are provocative to the Communists and might induce them to embark on the very sort of aggressive actions which we are trying to prevent. Those who say that the Manila Treaty is provocative seem to forget the military might of the Communist world and the fact that Communist power has actually been used, not once or twice, but constantly for years past to destroy the independence of the weak.

19. Indeed, it is obvious that those countries of South-East Asia which have not so far joined the Manila Treaty cannot help but receive an added measure of security because the rest of us have joined together for the defence of the area. I myself believe that the initiative which the United States of America has shown by taking the lead in the establishment of this new regional arrangement for collective security is a far-sighted and statesmanlike move in the same high tradition as the Marshall Plan and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

20. I have heard it said that some Asian countries which have joined with us in the Manila Treaty are in some way subordinating themselves to the United States. To those who say this, I would say: put yourself in the place of a small Asian country, cheek by jowl with Communist China and so under potential threat; and in that situation if you would not accept the hand of friendship of the greatest single Power in the world today, then I say that you are a braver man than I am. The policy of some Asian countries is to be very severe on communism within their own borders, but to take a neutral position with regard to international communism. This seems to me rather like the village situation in some tropical countries, where the villagers' homes are spotlessly clean but the surroundings of the village have accumulations of refuse which attract flies which undermine the health of the villagers.

21. It can be assumed that there would be no great difficulty in determining whether an outright act of aggression has taken place. Outright aggression can be coped with because it is clear-cut and obvious. For that reason, outright aggression may not be the prin-

cipal danger with which we are faced in South-East Asia. Perhaps the more real danger in South-East Asia today is what I might call aggression by proxy and by stealth. Communism fomented and feeds on the discontents of under-developed peoples. The Communists have a vested interest in discontent. It is this danger that we and the free peoples of Asia must guard against.

22. Many of us have said that communist aggression will not be defeated by military means alone. We cannot exclude the psychological and economic aspects of the problem. Countries under stress and under threat need more than the pledge of military aid if and when their integrity is threatened. This applies to countries as it does to individuals. They need encouragement and moral support. And so, provision is made to this end in the Manila Treaty. The economic side of the treaty will be developed through agencies already at work in the area, such as those set up under the Colombo Plan.

23. An added reason for the Manila Treaty is the need for some co-ordinating factor in South-East Asia where, for one cause or another, the individual countries do not have much to do with each other. They tend to reside in water-tight compartments, and they do this to a considerably greater degree than is usual for contiguous countries throughout the rest of the world. Their economies are very similar, and so there is but little trade between them to provide even this form of contact and interdependence. If the Manila Treaty turns out, as time goes on, to be unnecessary, no one will be more pleased than its members—and not the least of them my own country, Australia.

24. With regard to Laos and Cambodia, the Australian delegation has submitted a proposal for the admission to membership of the United Nations of the independent States of Laos and Cambodia [A/2709 and Add.1] which we commend to our fellow representatives.

25. There are one or two points in particular in this connexion that I would ask delegations to bear in mind: First of all, in 1952 resolutions [620 D (VII) and 620 E (VII)] were passed by the General Assembly which declared Laos and Cambodia as qualified for admission to the United Nations. Secondly, the Geneva Conference—to which the Soviet Union was a party—in effect endorsed these resolutions, and it is appropriate that, at the first General Assembly following the Geneva Conference, we should proceed to admit Laos and Cambodia.

26. Each of the countries represented at the Geneva Conference has committed itself to respect the integrity and independence of these two States. Let us now translate this expression of intention into reality.

27. In proposing the admission of Laos and Cambodia we do not, of course, mean to imply that our support for the admission of other States has in any way diminished. Many countries including Ceylon, Italy, Japan and many others have, of course, been waiting all too long as it is. But we believe that there is a special and urgent case for the admission of Laos and Cambodia. These States are free and independent but their position could be precarious. They need the moral support of the United Nations. Membership in the United Nations would bring with it the opportunity for contact with the outside world which the Governments of these two countries so greatly need,

and it would also facilitate the extension to them of the material assistance of the various United Nations programmes. Viet-Nam presents a rather different and more difficult problem, which we would hope will be tackled later.

28. I have already spoken of the pattern of communist Chinese activity over recent years and of the recent events in the Formosa Strait. A potentially dangerous situation may be shaping up in this part of the Far East, and there is a risk that what began as a minor incident might develop into a wider conflict. Whatever the motives dictating the action of the Chinese Communist Government in this matter, the danger of the situation, I think, clearly affects us all. I hope that the Central People's Government of China and, in their turn, the Chinese Nationalist Government may find it possible to do something to relax the tension. The alternative, and its potential effect on world peace, is obvious.

29. The Indonesian Government has seen fit to bring before this General Assembly the question of Netherlands New Guinea. The Australian Government learnt of this decision with great regret. We in Australia want the most friendly relations with our neighbours. One of our nearest neighbours is Indonesia, and we have over the years succeeded in strengthening the ties of friendship and mutual respect with Indonesia. The issue of Dutch New Guinea has, however, been a real point of difference between us. For our part we have tried to stop this issue from becoming an emotional one. We thought that the less it was shouted from the housetops the better it would be, and our policy has been directed towards this end. However, we are now faced with the fact that the issue has unfortunately been brought before this world forum.

30. It has been said that Dutch sovereignty over Netherlands New Guinea will continue to be a latent threat to the peace and security of that part of the world. I submit with all respect that there is no substance in this contention. Situations are sometimes said to be threats to the peace simply because people wish to regard them as such. The United Nations has already had sufficient experience of the fact that it is only a short move from this attitude of mind to the actual stimulation of disorder and tension. I say, in all sincerity, that the world situation is dangerous enough without raising new and emotional issues such as this which tend to inflame public opinion and exacerbate tensions between friends.

31. I may say that I can see no force in the Indonesian contention that the Netherlands Government has been unwilling to negotiate about Dutch New Guinea. On the contrary, the Netherlands negotiated and discussed the question long and patiently with Indonesia. One of the most important aspects of this question is the social, educational and economic advancement of the inhabitants of this part of New Guinea. Is it seriously contended that if sovereignty over this Territory were transferred to the Indonesian Government the peoples of the Territory would be likely to make more rapid progress? It is not in a spirit of criticism that I say that the Republic of Indonesia, confronted in its present very extensive territories with its own massive problems, is not in a position to promote the social and economic well-being of these primitive people. Most of the inhabitants of Netherlands New Guinea, like most of the inhabitants

of Australian New Guinea, are still in the most primitive stage. Some of them, in the remoter valleys of that vast island, are still head-hunters and cannibals.

32. The United Nations will be aware of these conditions from the annual reports of the Netherlands under Article 73 e of the Charter. I would refer in particular to the very comprehensive and expert report for the current year [*ST/TRI/SER.A/7/Add. 1.*]. In this connexion I may say that if the Netherlands had transferred sovereignty over West New Guinea to Indonesia in 1949, Indonesia would not have reported on its administration, so that the General Assembly of the United Nations would no longer have been in a position to exercise any influence upon the development of this Non-Self-Governing Territory.

33. The fact is that the inhabitants of New Guinea are far removed in ethnic origin, in language, in culture, in history and in religion from the peoples of the Republic of Indonesia. The population of Netherlands New Guinea is Papuan, not Indo-Malayan; they are a people of the Pacific, not of the Indian Ocean. This fact has been recognized internationally by the inclusion in the South Pacific Commission of the Netherlands as the Power administering West New Guinea. This South Pacific Commission is concerned with promoting the welfare of the peoples of the Islands of the South Pacific; these peoples are Micronesians, Polynesians and Melanesians. The Papuans are Melanesians and so are properly associated with the South-West Pacific and not with the Malaysian region and peoples.

34. I am convinced that the United Nations will be making a mistake of far-reaching consequences if it encourages Indonesia to continue agitation for the transfer of these alien people to Indonesian control. The separate and distinct character of the Residency of New Guinea has always been recognized by the Netherlands East Indies Administration. The Netherlands has administered its territory in New Guinea for a century and a half. Where such primitive people are concerned, the importance of continuity of administration cannot be overlooked.

35. Despite what the Indonesian delegation might say to the contrary, there has never been any independence movement among the Papuans. The only voices heard in favour of union with Indonesia are echoes from Djakarta. Agitation from outside, such as that now in train, can only have a disturbing and detrimental effect upon the indigenous population of Netherlands New Guinea who, like the population of Australian New Guinea, are untroubled by political conflicts of any kind.

36. The Australian delegation intends to contest this issue vigorously all along the line when the matter comes before the First Committee. Australia will require a detailed examination by the First Committee of the legal basis on which the whole Indonesian case rests. We believe that it will be proved beyond doubt to any unbiased person that the Indonesian claim to the Western half of the island of New Guinea has no justification whatsoever either in law or in common sense.

37. With regard to the subject of trusteeship, our Australian concern is with the Trust Territories of New Guinea and Nauru on which we report to the Trusteeship Council under the Trusteeship Agreements into which the Australian Government entered in 1946.

Let me say a few words on our conception of these obligations.

38. Australia has been accused of being remiss in the fulfilment of its duties towards the indigenous inhabitants of New Guinea and Nauru. Such charges have been made in the Trusteeship Council and in the Fourth Committee and have persisted despite numerous detailed explanations on the part of the Australian representatives. Even the explanations so often given by the special representatives of the Australian Government, sent to the Trusteeship Council from the Australian Trust Territories themselves, appear to have had but little effect on some of our critics. Nor do we feel that proper attention has been given to the reports of the visiting missions which the United Nations itself has sent to our Trust Territories. These missions on the spot have not found anything there inconsistent with our obligations to the United Nations under our agreements, when proper account is taken of the actual conditions in the territories concerned.

39. We in Australia have no objection to constructive criticism but we resent the sort of criticism and insinuations to which we have been subjected and which we regard as unfounded and captious. Please let me say, with respect to our critics, that the United Nations Trusteeship System does not mean that the United Nations is in charge of our Trust Territories. We are in charge of them and we are footing the bill and we are meeting our obligations towards the Trust Territories with all the energy and sympathy and expert experience that we can bring to it.

40. If I may say so, we in Australia are proud of the way we are carrying out the obligations we have undertaken; we are particularly proud of the administrative services that we have built up in our Trust Territories. We make no complaint about there being a proper scrutiny of the way in which our obligations as an Administering Power are carried out, but we cannot accept that there exists in the United Nations the power to direct the speed of development, the rate of expenditure or the basic policies which we consider appropriate in the particular circumstances of our Territories. It is in the hope that such unwarranted criticisms will not be brought forward during the present session that I put this attitude of the Australian Government firmly before you.

41. With regard to the economic and social field, Australia is a member of the Economic and Social Council and has taken a full part in its activities. In the last year the Council has devoted a great deal of time to two problems in which we take considerable interest, problems affecting the economic development and stability of under-developed countries. The Australian Government views sympathetically plans to promote greater stability and a higher rate of economic development in under-developed countries, and I think I may say that our record and our substantial contributions—through the Colombo Plan and to the United Nations programme of technical assistance—are an earnest of our desire to help in this work, consistent with our means and with our other obligations.

42. Having said this, I would like to say a word about the present economic situation of Australia. There is a tendency for countries to be divided into two rigid categories: the so-called "developed" and the so-called "under-developed" countries. For broad descriptive purposes, I suppose these two categories serve a use-

ful purpose, although they are oversimplified and need further description and qualification in some cases. Some countries can clearly be described as "developed" and others as "under-developed" without any further qualification. Australia is one of the countries which cannot be simply described as "developed" or "under-developed". It would be wrong to describe Australia simply as a "developed" country without qualification. Australia is a country which falls into an intermediate category, that is, a country essentially in the "developmental" stage. As with all young countries in the developmental stage, we are unable to finance the rate of development that we wish solely from the proceeds of our own savings. In other words, we are a "capital hungry" country; we constantly need capital from abroad.

43. I say this in order to explain that the resources available to the Australian Government for assisting the development of other countries are unfortunately, but necessarily limited. We do what we can to help others and we believe that for our population our contributions have not been small. However, the approach of the Australian Government to projects such as the special United Nations fund for economic development and the international finance corporation, must of necessity be more cautious than we would like it to be if our own development were further advanced.

44. One of the more encouraging developments during the past year has been the success of United Nations enterprise in the field of technical assistance and in the relief of human suffering. Through the United Nations Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance valuable aid has been given to economically under-developed countries in their efforts to strengthen their economies and improve the material lot of their peoples. At the same time the programmes of long-range and emergency relief to children, implemented during 1954 by the United Nations International Children's Fund (UNICEF), have brought relief in a direct and practical way to no fewer than 31 million mothers and children. The success of these two essentially humanitarian enterprises provides a good example of what can be achieved by co-operation between Governments through the machinery provided by the United Nations. The Australian Government has contributed substantially to these programmes in the past and will continue to support them to the extent that our other commitments allow.

45. I would remind the General Assembly that the problem of European refugees—largely from behind the Iron Curtain—is a continuing one and I hope that sympathetic and humane action will soon bring substantial relief to these unfortunate fellow human beings. I am glad to be able to say that the Australian Government, subject to ratification by the Australian Parliament—I hope within the next few weeks—will be making a contribution of £25,000 to the United Nations Refugee Emergency Fund, for the current financial year ending June 1955.

46. Regarding other Australian contributions, my Government also expects early Parliamentary approval for a contribution of £50,000 to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, and for a contribution of over half a million pounds to Korean relief, both these to be available during the financial year ending June, 1955. Regarding our contribution to UNICEF for the Fund's

current financial year ending December, 1954, Australia expects to provide £201,000.

47. I have tried, in what I have ventured to say to the Assembly today, to express the views of my country on a number of matters in the international field that are of concern to us. The opportunity that this annual General Assembly offers of making each other aware of the reactions of our respective countries is one of the useful attributes of the United Nations. We all know only too well that the organization of the world for peace and survival is very far from being perfect. Nationalism and what is called "enlightened self-interest" and the varying circumstances and environment of each one of our countries, all these things militate against unanimity and even make compromise a difficult matter. In addition, there is the vast and overriding problem of the division of the world between the free democracies and international communism, and the possession by each side of the means of almost totally destroying the other.

48. These things do not make for optimism, and yet it would be unwise to succumb to pessimism as regards the future of mankind. One can only hope and work in the belief that mankind is not destined for national—and international—suicide. The only real hope for continuing peace in the world lies in the possibility that the Communists will come to realize that there is room enough for them to live with the democracies in the same world without interfering with each other.

49. The question of nations living together peacefully is basic to the very conception of the United Nations. It is here, at meetings such as this, that important first steps can be taken in the process of breaking down the barrier of mutual distrust and suspicion at present dividing the democracies and the countries under Communist control. The United Nations provides a common meeting ground where the leaders on each side can come together in personal contact and, as many of us have so often pointed out in the past, these personal contacts are of considerable importance in bringing about a better understanding of differing points of view. Every opportunity, however small, which may arise and which gives promise of breaking down the present barriers between nations must therefore be taken. This is not a position of weakness, I suggest, but of sanity. We must, of course, be on our guard against being deluded by false hopes. However, whatever apparent evidence there may be to the contrary, I am enough of an optimist to say that we should not shut our minds to the possibility that the present tensions may be merely a temporary and not a permanent feature of international relations. Indeed, I am coming to believe that the opportunity that this annual General Assembly provides for continuing and progressive personal contacts between Foreign Ministers and representatives of most of the countries of the world, is one of the most important and valuable functions of the United Nations.

50. We come here as members of delegations representing our respective countries, and to watch and promote the interests of our countries. But let us remember that the survival of our individual countries depends on the survival of the whole free world. The pursuit of our individual ambitions will not avail us if thereby the security of the whole is imperilled. Let us not forget that the whole is greater than the component parts.

51. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq): The country which my delegation has the honour to represent is a firm believer in the United Nations. It bases its foreign policy on the spirit and the letter of the Charter. In the spirit of the Charter we want peace based upon truth and justice. We want peace because we believe that peace means life and war means death for mankind. Peace is especially essential for a young and relatively small country like Iraq that wishes to develop its resources and to make its contribution to humanity and civilization, as it has often done in the past.

52. My country is launching a vast programme of development. We are putting most of our oil revenue into reconstruction and building. In this endeavour we are setting a fine example of international co-operation. Foreign experts, foreign companies and contractors, including British, American, French, Canadian, Dutch, German, Pakistani, Indian, Belgian, Swiss, Scandinavian, as well as representatives of other nations and neighbouring countries, all join in the work of development and construction in a spirit of co-operation and fair dealing. It is a true expression of the spirit and ideals of the United Nations in the realm of reconstruction. We would like to see this peaceful co-operative effort continue and flourish, but we are not as carefree as we would like to be because of the tensions in the international situation.

53. Hardly a day passes without an outrage committed by Israelis against defenceless Arabs on the borders. Hardly a day passes without the shooting and the arrest of Tunisians and Moroccans fighting for the liberty of their homeland. We are most perturbed by communist infiltration and subversive activities both inside Iraq as well as in our neighbouring countries. Communist domination and warfare in China, Korea and Indo-China give us serious warning that we cannot remain carefree while engaged in the progressive development of our country. We must think and prepare for our own security.

54. These worries, which I am sure we share with the rest of the free world, are due to at least two basic causes. The first is that reactionary forces in the world, not appreciating the change in the spirit of the times, have clung to old, outworn policies based on greed, aggression, domination and exploitation of peoples, internally and externally. Internal reaction is exemplified by the wide gap in wealth between the rich and the poor, between the rich who waste or hoard their riches and the poor who do not even enjoy a decent standard of living. External reaction is exemplified by the colonizing Powers that do not recognize the rights of weaker peoples to their own country, to their own homes and property, to freedom and self-determination and to a prosperous and decent standard of living. There is no doubt that the prevalence of the forces of reaction in the world gave birth to forces of destruction, especially of those leading to the destruction of social, moral and religious values. These forces of destruction, as we witness them in Iraq, are led by the so-called Communist elements.

55. We need to face the basic issues that disturb humanity today and agree on a diagnosis and remedy. We usually engage here in specific situations and try to treat them individually, as if they were unrelated to the rest of the world, as if they were isolated and disconnected events. This never-ending treatment of

the basic issues involved will never lead the world to peace and stability so that human talent and energy might be directed towards constructive endeavours.

56. Most of the problems facing us in the United Nations arise either from the forces of reaction as represented by the declining old colonialism, or from the new form of subversion and domination represented by international communism, which is deadlier than the old form of colonialism for it aims at enslaving people by dominating them spiritually and mentally, as well as physically. It turns man into an automatic machine to be enslaved and exploited by the State, or it turns the masses into obedient servants of the State to be directed and exploited by a ruling few.

57. These are certainly not what the United Nations Charter stands for. The Charter stands neither for reaction nor for destruction. It stands for the third way, the way of steady evolutionary progress. The United Nations stands for the dignity of man, for the freedom of the individual, spiritually and mentally as well as physically. It stands for the brotherhood of man where there shall be no discrimination on grounds of race, religion, or class. It stands for settling disputes by mediation and negotiation. It stands for international co-operation in the realm of reconstruction and development, as well as in the liberation of the under-developed and dependent peoples. It is this third way, the way of the United Nations, which must be made effective and which should be universalized.

58. Looking back on the nine years of the existence of the United Nations, one cannot fail to recognize its many and varied achievements in terms of liberating peoples, in averting bloodshed, localizing wars, and in terms of human relief and technical assistance. We certainly acknowledge with appreciation the contributions of the United Nations to the liberation of Lebanon, Syria, Indonesia and Libya. We certainly appreciate the United Nations intervention in Korea to check aggression. We appreciate the United Nations contribution in the field of helping under-developed countries and dependent peoples to attain higher social and economic levels. The specialized agencies of the United Nations are making considerable contributions to that effect.

59. In this connexion, I wish to register my country's thanks and gratitude to the high and noble spirit expressed by the United Nations and its several Member States, as well as its agencies, for the material help, relief and sympathy which contributed much to the saving of the city of Baghdad from the disastrous flood of last spring and which helped many flood refugees.

60. Acting in the spirit of the United Nations Charter, the leaders of the United States and the United Kingdom, and those of the Philippines, India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon presented the world with a new method for attaining the independence and liberation of dependent peoples, the way of negotiation and agreement, not that of strife and bloodshed. More recently, the Anglo-Egyptian settlement of the long-standing Suez Canal problem was a proof of the patience, wisdom and statesmanship of all the parties concerned. We are especially gratified to see our sister Arab State, Egypt, fulfil its national aspirations, while at the same time recognizing its responsibility towards the future defence of the Arab States. We are also gratified that our neighbour and friend, Iran, has at

last settled its oil problem, preserving its national interests. We regret that at Geneva no final settlement of the Korean question could be achieved. We are relieved, however, that a cease-fire both in Korea and Indo-China put an end to bloodshed in those afflicted countries, and we hope that their unity will soon be achieved.

61. We could go on enumerating bright achievements either directly by the United Nations or indirectly by nations motivated by the spirit of the Charter. The problems, however, which today await settlement by the United Nations and which require courageous and responsible statesmanship by Member States are just as significant and numerous, if not more numerous. These problems represent sources of tension and endanger peace and harmony in the world today.

62. From our point of view, the first of these problems is that of Palestine, for it has disturbed peace and harmony in an area which is most vital to the world on account of its strategic importance as well as its material riches, particularly oil. The United Nations, influenced by power politics and Zionist propaganda, partitioned Palestine between the Arabs and the Jews, thus creating a situation which led to the homelessness and destitution of nearly one million Arabs, Moslems and Christians alike, a great injustice to the peace-loving Arabs, the rightful inhabitants of Palestine. Thus Israel came into existence.

63. But Israel was not satisfied with the United Nations resolutions to which it owes its own existence. Israel has already violated United Nations resolutions by usurping by sheer force territory that was not allotted to it by the United Nations. Its terrorists butchered old men, women and children, exterminated the whole population of villages like Deir Yassin, thus intimidating the defenceless Arab population of Palestine and forcing them to leave their homes. The result is territorial conquest, the homelessness of nearly one million Arabs and the turning of Palestine, the Holy Land, the land of peace, into an arena of war and political strife. Israel transferred its capital to Jerusalem in defiance of the several United Nations resolutions calling for its internationalization. War and shootings from the Israel side even endanger the Holy Places in Jerusalem. Israel shootings and aggression, mainly on the Jordanian borders and sometimes on the Egyptian, Syrian and Lebanese borders, continue to occur with no restraint or retribution. The dastardly attacks on the villages of Qibya and Nahhalin this year, which destroyed homes and killed scores of human beings, including old men, women and children, are eloquent examples of Israeli conduct in the Middle East. The Security Council censured Israel for its lawless massacre of people in Qibya [642nd meeting], but that did not restrain Israel from committing the massacres of Nahhalin and a long series of other attacks. The culprits were never called to account and no indemnity was imposed on Israel.

64. The natural consequence of this state of affairs in Palestine is quite a multiple one. To begin with, it is an insult to humanity and shows disrespect for life, property and law. In the second place, it is a defiance of and an act of disrespect towards the United Nations, and we rightly believe that nothing injured the prestige of the United Nations more than the weak, unjust and ineffective way in which it handled the problem of Palestine. In the third place, it disturbed peace, stability and harmony within the Middle

East. In the fourth place, it embittered the relations between the Arab peoples and those nations which were responsible for the creation of Israel and for its continued existence without at least guaranteeing that it abide by the law and by United Nations resolutions. In the fifth place, it wounded the religious sentiments of millions of faithful people in the world who wished to see Palestine as a haven of peace for Moslems, Christians and Jews alike and not a place of religious conflict and desecration and destruction of some of the Holy Sites and Places. The pitiful condition into which the Moslem and Christian refugees of Palestine have fallen cannot fail to embitter the feelings of their co-religionists throughout the world. In the sixth place, it uprooted Jewish people—such as the Jews of Iraq—from the homes in which they had lived for thousands of years, and created a problem of double loyalty for the Jews of the world at large.

65. Thus, the United Nations handling of the Palestine problem, influenced by political pressure and the voting power of the Zionists, rendered no service as regards the moral, religious and political aspects of humanity. And is the problem solved? We can say, flatly, no. It can never be solved until justice is done to the Arabs of Palestine. The Arabs are as much attached to Palestine as anyone is attached to his home and, in addition, there is a spiritual connexion which can never be abandoned. What can the United Nations do, now that things have reached this regrettable state? Nothing less than to implement its own resolutions. The United Nations must see to it that Israel abandons its arrogance and its aggressive practices against the Arabs.

66. The Arab States are exercising great self-restraint in not retaliating against the frequent incidents of Israel border attacks. We know that Israel's aim is to provoke the Arabs to an open armed conflict. This we are determined to do our utmost to resist in the interest of world peace. The great Powers which are primarily responsible for the creation of Israel must at least withhold aid to Israel unless it yields to United Nations resolutions and stops shooting innocent Arabs.

67. We wish to express our appreciation of the Truce Supervision Organization, whose unbiased and objective handling of border incidents make it possible for the world to see through neutral eyes Israel aggression and disregard for human rights and law. We regret the termination of the services of General Ben-nike and, at the same time, congratulate him on his safe departure from his post; for, had he continued his neutral and unbiased service, his destiny might well have been similar to that of the late Count Bernadotte. We trust that General Burns will be as fair and unbiased as his predecessor.

68. There are two bubbles of Zionist propaganda which we wish to explode. The first is that Israel wants peace and that the Arabs do not. This is a complete misrepresentation of the truth. Yes, Israel shouts for peace, but by word and not by deed. In fact, responsible Israelis have often repeated that they do not intend to yield Arab territory allotted to the Arabs by United Nations resolutions. They do not intend to agree to the internationalization of Jerusalem. They do not agree to the principle of the return of those refugees who choose to do so to their own homes. They have never paid for the produce of Arab farms

nor for the rental of Arab property under their control. They have usurped and sold the property of individual Arabs to incoming Jews. They have frozen Arab money in British banks operating in Palestine. They continue to shoot at Jordanian villages bordering on Israel. They treat the Arabs who remained in Israel as Class B citizens and restrict their movements, seize their lands, destroy their villages, including churches and mosques, and restrict their access to health, educational and other social amenities. They rule these Arabs by military force and not by civil authority, denying them elementary civil government. They have turned Arabs in Israel into veritable prisoners of war. Are all these deeds conducive to peace with the Arabs, or do the Israelis want a peace which denies to the Arabs their right to home and property in Palestine? This kind of peace can never be attained. A true peace, based on right and justice and recognition of Arab rights, is not desired by Israel.

69. The second propaganda bubble is that Israel is a bulwark of democracy in the Middle East and a signpost to progress and prosperity in the area. This line of propaganda could very well be exploded through inquiry into the kind of democracy enjoyed by the Arabs who live in Israel, whether they be Christian or Moslem. We have proof that discrimination is practised against those Jews who went to Israel from the Arab world, as well as against those who went there from India. The return of hundreds of Indian Jews to India, as a protest against racial discrimination in Israel, was reported by *The New York Times*. This is the kind of democracy imported by Israelis into an Arab world which, before the coming of the Zionists, had known no religious or racial discrimination. As for Israel being a signpost to progress, we submit that, with Western money and know-how, progress and development in any part of the Arab world would be no less than that claimed by Israel.

70. It is high time that the leaders of the world realized what grave injustice has been inflicted on the Arabs and recognized the following facts: In the first place, from a religious point of view, Palestine can never become Jewish alone. The whole of Palestine is sacred to Moslems, Christians and Jews alike. Secondly, the Arabs of Palestine, both Moslems and Christians, will never accept a *diaspora* inflicted upon them in the twentieth century. The United Nations must see to it that at least those territories allotted to the Arabs in the General Assembly's partition plan of 1947, [resolution 181 B (II)] are restored to the Arabs if partial rectification of the injustice is to be made. Israel must observe United Nations resolutions on Palestine. Thirdly, the United Nations must establish sanctions against those found guilty of the aggressions which take place on the borders between Israel and the Arab States. An aggressor must be punished if aggression is not to be repeated. Fourthly, the United Nations must see to it that Arab private property, revenue from farm produce and rentals, are given to their rightful owners. Fifthly, the United Nations must inquire into the treatment of the Arabs who live in Israel. The great Powers must feel morally responsible for the injustice inflicted on innocent Arabs, as well as for the inhuman and aggressive acts committed by Israel.

71. The Palestine problem provides a reliable barometer with which to measure the moral and human

sensitivities of mankind. The condition of the Arab refugees will provide the barometer readings.

72. A second zone of tension which deserves the constant attention of the United Nations is that in Tunisia and Morocco. These two countries, whose peoples have been struggling for freedom and independence, did not receive, at the last session of the Assembly, the attention which they deserved from the United Nations. Their case was not acted upon. We sincerely hope that the people of France and their present Government will see to it that the national aspirations of Tunisia are recognized and that their negotiations with the Tunisian representatives will lead to fruitful results based on co-operation between friends and equals. We regret, however, the continuation of unrest and bloodshed in Morocco as a result of the fact that the French Government has not yet taken any positive steps by way of responding to the national aspirations of Morocco. We sincerely hope that the French Government will see to it that His Majesty Mohammed Ben Youssef, the legitimate Sultan of Morocco, is restored to his throne. His Majesty the Sultan is the spiritual as well as the temporal leader of his people. We were astonished that France, whose tradition of respect for freedom of worship is well known, could interfere with the religious life of the Moslems of Morocco by removing their spiritual leader. We appeal to France to restore the legitimate Sultan and to initiate negotiations with the true representatives of Morocco. The United Nations must give all its support and blessings to such an approach.

73. Perhaps the most serious problem facing the United Nations and the world is the tension between East and West and all that that problem involves in terms of the armaments race, the partition of Germany, the occupation of Austria and the non-admission of some twenty countries which wish to join the United Nations. In our view, these problems and many others like them could be settled on the highest level between the leaders of the great Powers, in accordance with the resolution [377 (V)] of 1950 which was unanimously adopted by the General Assembly and which my delegation, together with that of Syria, had the honour to initiate. In such a meeting, the fears, suspicions and claims of the two camps should be frankly stated, and mutual measures should be provided to dispel those fears and suspicions and to settle those claims. The cold war can come to an end if international communism abandons its dogmatic and totalitarian spirit and stops the work of infiltration and subversion in other lands; that must be done if we are to have peace.

74. We hope that one of the basic functions of the conference which may be called to revise the Charter of the United Nations will be to examine the provisions of the Charter in the light of the ideological conflicts which endanger world peace today and to provide mankind with techniques to implement the ideology already accepted by all the signatories of the Charter—that ideology which is the fruit of the human evolution of the last 5,000 years. The ideology of the Charter recognizes the unity of mankind and admits the truth of the oneness of the world. It does not think in terms of East and West, Europe, Asia and Africa; it is a global ideology. The ideology of the Charter includes respect for the right of the individual to freedom and a decent standard of living, in accordance with the law. The ideology of the Charter recognizes

the right of peoples to freedom and self-determination. The ideology of the Charter recognizes co-operation between nations and the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. All of us have accepted this ideology, but how shall we succeed in its implementation? That, in our view, should be one of the primary topics which the United Nations conference to revise the Charter should take up.

75. It is not enough to revise the Charter, and it is not enough to formulate abstract principles. What is more important is to develop the will to act and to practise what we profess, for in the last resort it is action which will achieve the aims and ideals of the United Nations.

76. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I did not want to interrupt the distinguished representative of Iraq because I do not favour placing undue restrictions on the freedom of representatives to express their feelings. However, the use of such terms as "arrogance" compels me to state my conviction that the General Assembly would wish speakers to impose a degree of moderation upon themselves; and I am confident that they will take that wish into account.

77. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq): I wish to assure the President and members of the General Assembly that the words I used were an objective statement of a real situation. I therefore cannot see how the President could have any objection to those words.

78. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I raised no objection. I felt, however, that the use of the expression I mentioned justified my appealing to all representatives to exercise moderation. I am sure all representatives share my feeling.

79. Mr. ROMULO (Philippines): In his now historic address to the General Assembly on 8 December 1953, President Dwight D. Eisenhower prefaced his proposal for an international pool of atomic energy for peaceful purposes with a heart-warming tribute to the United Nations. He said [470th meeting, paras. 80 and 81]:

"At the same time that I appreciate the distinction of addressing you, I have a sense of exhilaration as I look upon this Assembly. Never before in history has so much hope for so many people been gathered together in a single organization. Your deliberations and decisions during these sombre years have already realized part of those hopes.

"But the great tests and the great accomplishments still lie ahead. And in the confident expectation of those accomplishments, I would use the office which, for the time being, I hold, to assure you that the Government of the United States will remain steadfast in its support of this body. This we shall do in the conviction that you will provide a great share of the wisdom, of the courage and of the faith which can bring to this world lasting peace for all nations, and happiness and well-being for all men."

80. President Eisenhower said that a year ago. To make this speech he flew to New York directly from Bermuda where he had been in conference with Prime Minister Churchill of the United Kingdom and the then Prime Minister of France Mr. Laniel, about the grave issues of war and peace. The event thus possessed all the elements of high drama. First, the Ber-

muda Conference was held within the framework of the old classical diplomacy wherein the heads of the three great Powers of the western world met together in secret in an attempt to maintain peace by strengthening the free-world coalition against a potential enemy. Secondly, President Eisenhower, as head of the most powerful nation in the world, spoke on a matter truly of life and death for all humanity. And thirdly, the General Assembly of the United Nations was deliberately chosen as the platform from which the historic message would be given to the world.

81. What President Eisenhower told the General Assembly has been heard around the world. His bold proposal on atomic energy has become the number one item of world statesmanship. Four days ago, before this Assembly, [475th meeting], the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, proposed an agenda item which will enable the United States to report on its efforts to explore and develop the vast possibilities for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

82. In connexion with this new agenda item, which I consider to be the most important matter before us at this ninth session of the General Assembly, the Philippine delegation notes with gratification that the Soviet Union has offered to reopen the suspended negotiations on President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace plan. But I warn that in these negotiations we should not get caught in any hidden booby-traps, and we must beware of diplomatic "stalling". Let us go ahead and not stop, look and listen every time we hear a siren song from the other side of the Iron Curtain. Reserving our right to discuss this question in more detail when it is taken up in committee, I simply would like at this juncture to express the hope that Secretary Dulles' proposal embracing four steps—(a) an international agency for peaceful development of atomic energy; (b) a scientific conference under the auspices of the United Nations; (c) a reactor training school; (d) participation of foreign experts in cancer work in United States hospitals—is a world plan, not a national plan, and that there is no idea here of by-passing the United Nations. We must bolster the waning prestige of our World Organization by making the proposed international agency a United Nations instrument from the very beginning.

83. But to convince the world that the United States means to carry it out, we should deal less with generalities and more with specific details. In other words, the United States must be ready to tell the General Assembly, among other things, how much nuclear material it is ready to contribute and what funds it is willing to allot to finance the international pool.

84. A fellow human being, an innocent Asian fisherman, died a few days ago as a result of atom tests, and the world welcomes America's determination "to change the emphasis on the atom from war to peace". But that event of December 1953, when President Eisenhower for the first time presented his plan of a world pool for peaceful development of atomic energy, is significant for another reason: it dramatically points up the degree to which the United Nations has been sadly left behind in the furious pace of scientific progress in the modern world. It was appropriate that President Eisenhower should have chosen to submit his fateful proposal on atomic energy to the United Nations. But the United Nations lacks the authority to act promptly and effectively on the Eisenhower

proposal. Suddenly we realize that no political instrument exists today which could cope with so great a need. Somewhat sadly, we realize that the United Nations has become a vessel too frail to be the repository of humanity's hopes and fears in the atomic age.

85. Nine years ago I had the honour to represent the Philippines during the San Francisco Conference which gave birth to the United Nations. As the representative of a country that had suffered grievous loss of life and destruction of property during the war, I gave earnest support to every proposal which was intended to enable the United Nations to cope with the menace of future war. After two months of strenuous effort the Conference completed the Charter of the United Nations, the first words of which proclaim the determination of the peoples of the United Nations "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind".

86. The Charter of the United Nations was completed on 26 June 1945. Twenty days later, on 16 July, the United States set off the world's first atomic explosion. In another twenty days, on 6 August, more than one month after the signing of the Charter, the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. In retrospect, these dates are significant. The final blueprint of the United Nations was completed shortly before the world was aware that atomic power had become a reality. The eloquent words with which the Charter opens, affirming mankind's determination "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", therefore referred to the only kind of warfare which men had known until then. It was murderous and destructive warfare which made no distinction between combatants and non-combatants, but it was nevertheless warfare which was waged with conventional weapons of finite potency. It was total war, and it was right that those who founded the United Nations in San Francisco should have established as the primordial aim of the Organization the prevention of similar wars in the future.

87. Meanwhile, the world has moved from the menace of total war with conventional weapons towards the menace of absolute war with bacterial, atomic and hydrogen weapons. The United Nations probably has the means to intervene effectively and in time to prevent or halt a war fought with conventional weapons. But it has not the means to do so in the case of war fought with absolute weapons. The reason is simple: the United Nations was not built to the scale of the atomic age in which we now live. Another way of putting this idea is to say that, in the short space of nine years, the Charter of the United Nations has become dangerously obsolete to the degree that under its existing provisions the Organization is powerless to act effectively to forestall universal catastrophe.

88. The most convincing proof of this statement is the confirmed impotence of the Security Council. This is the organ, as we all know, which has primary responsibility for maintaining or restoring international peace and security. I shall not take away from this organ the credit which rightly belongs to it for settling or helping to settle disputes between nations and for preventing or stopping a number of threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression. But in the only instance among these, namely the communist aggression in Korea, which involved large-scale

fighting and which had the actual potentiality of leading to a third world war, the Security Council was saved from total impotence only by the narrowest of accidents, that is, by the providential absence of the Soviet Union from the meeting which ordained military sanctions against the communist aggressors. Moreover, Korea happened to be a theatre of war which the Soviet Union did not consider to be important enough to require its actual participation and all-out effort.

89. Under the Charter, the Security Council is responsible for organizing readily available armed forces from Member States for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. In the past eight years nothing concrete has come out of its efforts in this field. It was left to the General Assembly, under the "Uniting for Peace" resolution [377 (V)] to formulate plans in advance for the organization of collective measures against future acts of aggression.

90. Furthermore, the Security Council is primarily responsible for formulating plans for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments. The records dealing with this matter form the most dreary chapters in the history of the United Nations. In eight years of study and discussion nothing has been accomplished. The armaments race has proceeded without interruption and at a faster pace than at any other peacetime period in the history of the world. Today, having wasted eight years in a fruitless search for an acceptable formula for the regulation of armaments including atomic weapons, we have the sinister spectacle, to use the words of President Eisenhower, of two atomic colossi, the United States and the Soviet Union, malevolently eyeing each other across a trembling world.

91. The great weakness of the Security Council, of course, is that while it has all the attributes of authority, it lacks the actual instruments of power necessary to make that authority real. There is another weakness of the Security Council to which I wish to draw the attention of the Assembly. It is the anomaly that Asia is not represented among the non-permanent members of the Security Council and it is an injustice to the people of Asia who have achieved independence since the drafting of our Charter.

92. Article 23 of the Charter provides that the Security Council shall consist of eleven members, five of whom are permanent—and the time has come to eliminate permanent members also from the Security Council. This Article then states:

"The General Assembly shall elect six other Members of the United Nations to be non-permanent members of the Security Council, due regard being specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization, and also to equitable geographic distribution."

93. In San Francisco, the great Powers arrived at an understanding according to which Latin America was awarded two non-permanent seats and Western Europe, Eastern Europe, the Middle East and the British Commonwealth, one seat each. No place was reserved for Asia. Indeed Asia at that time, in the eyes of the representatives in San Francisco, did not exist as a separate geopolitical entity.

94. Times have changed and a new Asia has risen, but this misunderstanding remains unchanged. Today we, the peoples of Asia, are disenfranchised in the Security Council and only those of us who belong to another so-called geographic unit, namely the British Commonwealth, can be elected to the Security Council. Neither Indonesia, nor Burma, nor Thailand, nor my own country have the right to be represented in this organ of the United Nations which, according to the Charter, has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace.

95. Important groups of citizens in Asia, veterans who have helped to create the United Nations and those who have fought under our blue flag in Korea, have called upon the United Nations to revise the understanding or misunderstanding of San Francisco. This call of Asian veterans has been endorsed by 18 million ex-servicemen representing twenty-five countries, including my own, united in the World Veterans Federation. In associating myself with my former comrades-in-arms, I feel that I do not only speak in the name of the people of the Philippines but also in the name of all peoples of Asia. We want the United Nations to give us our rightful place in so important a body as the Security Council.

96. It is significant that President Eisenhower chose to speak before the General Assembly. This body, in which all the sixty Member States are represented, has been variously called an international debating society, the forum of humanity, and the town meeting of the world. It is weak where the Security Council is strong, at least on paper. It has none of the outward attributes of authority, but it has power over the hearts and minds of men out of all proportion to the actual authority it wields. Far from being a Parliament of Man, it has authority only to make recommendations without being able to venture upon coercive sanctions.

97. I have said of the United Nations in general that it has become a vessel too frail to serve as the repository of the hopes and fears of humanity in the atomic age. Lacking something better, we have, at least in the General Assembly, a repository of the good sense and good conscience of humanity.

98. It used to be said that while the United Nations has not achieved much success in the political and security field—and disarmament is one of its more awesome failures—it has done much useful work in the economic, social, cultural, humanitarian, trusteeship and legal fields. During the past seven years, this has been largely true. Despite the cold war, the United Nations has accomplished tasks of international co-operation which, against the background of previous history, are nothing short of prodigious. The problems of world economic and social development, particularly the effort to raise standards of living, the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms, the march of the Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories towards eventual freedom, the continued development of international law—all these have been faced and measurable progress has been made in their solution, in the very shadow of the cold war. We have the programme of technical assistance and we have the useful work continually being done by the specialized agencies in the fields of agriculture, industry, science, education, health, finance, trade, transportation, etc.

99. All this is true. But today, there seems to be a general feeling that the possibilities of United Nations action even in these non-political spheres have become pretty nearly exhausted. We have come to a point of diminishing returns. There is growing reluctance on the part of the developed countries to assist the underdeveloped countries in their programmes of economic development. An example is what has happened to Point Four; another, the freezing of the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance; and yet another the virtual pigeon-holing of the project for the establishment of the special United Nations fund for economic development.

100. In another field, there is growing resistance of the more advanced countries to any other action designed to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms throughout the world. The reasons they give are strange indeed: they either say that they do not wish to risk lowering their own standards by signing conventions or covenants concerning these matters with the less developed countries, or they say—as they do on questions like those of Tunisia, Morocco, and of the race conflict in South Africa—that the United Nations is forbidden by the domestic-jurisdiction clause of the Charter from interfering in these matters. In the field of trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories we have come to a point where we are not only at a standstill, but where the Trusteeship System and the principles underlying Chapter XI of the Charter are “withering on the vine”.

101. It is difficult to escape the feeling that on all sides there is a concerted and deliberate campaign to arrest progress in these non-political fields under the auspices of the United Nations.

102. One generous way of explaining this is to say that since so much progress has been achieved in these fields during the past seven years, we ought prudently to settle down and consolidate the gains that have been made. I am afraid, however, that the real reason is two-fold: first, that further progress in these fields must now await the conclusion of the cold war and the establishment of genuine international co-operation among the great Powers; and, secondly, that the United Nations has exhausted the limits of its possibilities of action under the Charter as it exists.

103. We are back to where we started. We realize that there is something naive and unreal in trying to promote higher standards of living, human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law in a world where men are condemned to live in constant fear of universal death. We are compelled to admit that under the present Charter the United Nations is incapable of performing the service that it should perform for the peoples of the world in this atomic age; and it is the most important and urgent single element of that service to save humanity from the menace of atomic destruction.

104. President Eisenhower, in his speech already referred to, justly credited the United Nations with realizing part of those hopes which had been pinned on it by the peoples of the world. But, in his own words, that “the great share of the wisdom, of the courage and of the faith which can bring to this world lasting peace for all nations,” [470th meeting, para. 81] is yet to be provided. In other words, the question remains whether the good sense and good conscience of humanity will be asserted effectively and

in time to forestall a war of annihilation with atomic and hydrogen weapons. Since our margin of safety is so narrow, we must ask ourselves whether we should be content with the United Nations as it is, knowing that it was tailored to the needs and uses of a pre-atomic age, and whether we should accept the terrible risk which attends the widening gap between our on-rushing atomic science and the inertia of our political know-how.

105. The answer is not easy. For, throughout history, men have sought to retain the forms and institutions of their daily life long after these have been outmoded by the ideas and precepts of advancing science. In the past, however, there was always a sufficient margin of safety which afforded men enough time to adjust themselves to the new conditions. Except for sudden revolutionary short-cuts often necessitated by a massive accumulation of intolerable evils, it has nearly always been possible to remodel the old forms and institutions for the more spacious requirements of the new ideas and principles.

106. The question, I repeat, is whether in this atomic age we are permitted the time to do this. It is a serious question, but one which should not lead to panicky solutions.

107. We must reject, to start with, the notion that the United Nations should be scrapped. I think that, faced with the possibility of universal disaster, sensible people everywhere are inclined to feel somewhat more comfortable and secure with the United Nations than without it. If it gave us nothing more than this sense of added comfort and security, the United Nations would be worth having.

108. However, a sense of security is not enough. The danger which mankind faces is both real and immediate, and it must be met simultaneously on two levels. First, we must endeavour to make the United Nations function to the utmost of its possibilities under the Charter, using its undoubted moral influence to help prevent impending disaster. Secondly, we must boldly explore ways of so strengthening the United Nations that it may have, before it is too late, the power to prevent universal catastrophe.

109. In other words, it is not enough to say that the United Nations is better than nothing. We shall find before long that the United Nations is not good enough unless it is the best that human ingenuity can fashion, unless it is able to provide that “great share of the wisdom, of the courage and of the faith which can bring to this world lasting peace for all nations.” To cope with the atomic revolution, we need a political revolution of at least equal imagination and magnitude.

110. In accordance with Article 109 of the United Nations Charter the tenth regular session of the General Assembly, which will be held next year, will discuss a proposal to call a conference to review the Charter. If such a conference is held—and let us all hope that it will be held—it is, however, generally doubted whether any major amendments to the Charter will be approved. Since amendments are subject to the veto of the permanent members of the Security Council, it is naturally assumed that amendments purporting to strengthen the United Nations at the expense of the great-Power veto and of the principle of the sovereignty of states will have little, if any, chance of adoption.

111. Nevertheless, necessity is still the mother of invention. Our need is for peace, no longer as a mere convenience but as the indispensable condition of human survival. This thought will not sink in easily, for men's minds have been inured to situations of measurable and surmountable danger. But the irrevocable finality of the danger we face will inevitably moderate the prevailing pessimism and compel all Member States, especially the great Powers, to be more receptive to proposals for the revision of the Charter of the United Nations, no matter how radical they may seem.

112. In considering amendments, the yardstick should not be what seems to be possible in the context of the present international situation, but rather what is necessary to enable mankind to avoid atomic destruction. Accordingly, any and all proposals should merit careful consideration which would make it possible for the United Nations to cope with this imminent danger. Such proposals would certainly include: the restriction of the scope of domestic jurisdiction and of the concept of the sovereignty of states, the limitation or abolition of the veto, the establishment of a system of weighted representation of Member States, the abolition of permanent seats in the Security Council, and the placing in the hands of the United Nations of the means to enforce decisions involving international peace and security, particularly as regards the regulation of armaments, control of atomic energy and prohibition of atomic weapons.

113. There are those who will say, this is "world government" and dismiss such proposals as utopian and impractical. But in the present context of human affairs, any revision of the United Nations Charter will be less than practical unless it attempts wisely and courageously to bridge the gap between what is possible and what is necessary. This can be done only by a bold new approach, a desperate frontal assault, if you will, upon the problem of international organization, undeterred by the limitations of past or present experience. Do we discount the inertia which induces the human mind to seek the line of least resistance and to devise partial or makeshift remedies for recognized evils? By no means. However, while the force of custom is indeed powerful, it is not more so than the instinct of survival. Therefore, in this matter, we must not only think in terms of the improbable but also attempt the seemingly impossible. For the alternative is to let the world drift willy-nilly towards disaster, borne on the ancient tides of power politics and war.

114. I am aware that there are those who would choose this dread alternative. Their attitude has taken the form of an aggressive attack against the United Nations, not because it needs to be improved and strengthened, but because they would destroy it utterly and let every nation withdraw into the hard shell of its sovereignty like a turtle. The reference to the turtle is a deliberate one. It emphasizes the fact that it is impossible, in this age of the jet plane, to return to the age of turtles. Mr. President, Gentlemen: it is much later than we think.

115. Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): I wish first of all to associate myself with the other representatives who have congratulated you, Mr. President, on your election to the presidency of this General Assembly and to express to you my sin-

cerest wishes for the success of your work. I should also like to take this opportunity of telling Mrs. Pandit how much we appreciate and admire the tact and efficiency with which she conducted the discussions of the last session of the Assembly.

116. For the first time in the nine years of the existence of the United Nations, the General Assembly is meeting without having to consider problems of armed hostilities in any part of the world. This apparent calm, however, rather reminds us of a temporary lull before a storm, since it is, unfortunately, true that never has there been such a cleavage of opinion or such a clear-cut assumption of positions in the ideological conflict which divides the peoples of the world.

117. Every day we are drawing nearer to that culminating period of crisis, to that parting of the ways when the inescapable choice must be made between the way of peace and the way of adventure. It is the duty of the United Nations, by discussions like this, to take stock and to reflect whether it has been able to fulfill the primary duty with which it was charged at San Francisco, the duty to maintain peace.

118. I personally share the Secretary-General's anxiety and concern over the fact that in recent months many countries have preferred to seek solutions of their problems outside of the United Nations and I think that we must investigate and remove the causes which have led them to adopt procedures different from those originally provided by the Charter.

119. I also agree with my old and valued friend, General Rómulo, on the points which he has just raised. I think it would be absurd for us to close our eyes to the facts or to harbour illusions. The problem is there and if we are to solve it we must face it openly and seek its causes, so that we may remove them.

120. It is an over-simplification to ascribe the paralysis of the Security Council entirely to the matter of the veto or to delude ourselves that the political inertia of the United Nations is due only to that paralysis. I believe we must now recognize that that is not the only cause of our failures.

121. We may say of the United Nations, what Dr. Alberto Lleras said a few months ago in Caracas when he resigned his office as Secretary of the Organization of American States. The Organization is what its Members wish it to be. They can help to strengthen it or they can undermine its prestige in many ways, either by bringing before it questions which by its very nature it is not fitted to consider and which it is consequently unable to solve, or by not bringing before it problems which can and should be solved in accordance with its Charter. Thus, we cannot lay the success or failure of our Organization at any particular door. We must realize that we are all to a greater or lesser extent responsible for what happens to the United Nations. The Organization reflects our conduct as States.

122. An organization of this kind easily tends to become a new state-like entity, a super-government with powers greater than those conferred by its constitution, and it must not be forgotten that such an arbitrary assumption of power has repercussions which could culminate in the extinction of the international body, with all the consequences attendant on such a failure, nor must we forget that because of this inordinate assumption of powers we have to witness a struggle for control of the organization which, with

its extended powers, might be an effective instrument of intervention or of peaceful penetration.

123. Let us examine more closely how individual States, by their conduct, may wittingly or unwittingly help to undermine the authority of the United Nations.

124. An international organization is but the culmination of the general process of integration of social groups throughout history. If we had a clear understanding of our task, we could hasten the achievement of the fundamental unity of mankind. We could not expect that in ten years nations would organize themselves into a perfect international society, but we all feel that we might perhaps have better directed our efforts.

125. It would be entirely unjust, however, to say that in the process of integrating international organization the United Nations has not helped towards the rapprochement of the various countries. Year by year the bases for an improved international organization are becoming clearer and firmer, although we often come up against the embarrassing fact that some nations, probably because of a laudable striving towards human solidarity, require of our Organization a course of conduct of which it will only be capable when all its constituent parts are firmly co-ordinated.

126. For example, the United Nations has been entrusted with the task of drawing up conventions on such problems as respect for human rights or the right of peoples to self-determination; but until those conventions have been signed the international Organization cannot be asked to intervene in the same way as it would if they had already been ratified. We must not confuse ideals with positive legislation. We cannot ask the United Nations to intervene in problems unless it has previously been given sufficient authority to deal with them. Recourse to the United Nations in such cases is one of the main factors impeding the progressive development of that body towards the ideal international organization to which we all aspire.

127. Another hindrance arises not in the Organization itself but in the Foreign Ministries of Member States. In the present century foreign relations are extended to fields which were not previously held to be within the competence of foreign ministries or state departments. Whether we call them state departments, chancelleries or ministries of foreign affairs, however, it is none the less true that they have not been given the powers which they should have within the framework of the administration of each country if they are to steer their way through the problems for which they bear responsibility.

128. An international body is not the product of a capricious desire on the part of nations to establish communication with one another, but the logical consequence of a more compact and homogeneous world, in the sense that there are very few matters which are still strictly and absolutely of national concern. No country could enact legislation today without taking into account the standards which govern the other nations of the world. Isolation is regarded now only as a sanction to be applied against countries which try to ignore the rules of international co-operation. Present-day civilization cannot tolerate any such obstacle in its path as might be caused by a nation claiming the exclusive use of its air, land and sea territory. Public health, for example, must be administered with

reference not merely to the individual but also to neighbouring States. The United Nations has been unable to deal, as it would have wished, with those and many other problems, not owing to any deficiencies in its Charter but because delegations receive instructions from foreign ministries which lag behind progress and whose own organization has not developed to the same extent as that of international organization. The narrow official channel constituted by the sections formed in many chancelleries or state departments to handle matters connected with international organizations, and through which passes the stream of reports and documents of all kinds, cannot deal with any matter thoroughly and is consequently unable to direct a policy in harmony with the march of progress. Hence, such ministries often instruct their delegations to avoid as far as possible any decision in the international body which they might later have to defend in their national parliaments. While the foreign ministries show paralysing inaction and indecision in the political sphere, the technical experts, without any regard for the views of their ministries, become the only channel through which the foreign relations of nations are conducted: the technical experts meet at international assemblies and endeavour to pledge the policies and resources of States; they speak for their countries and accept obligations for which in most cases the ministries are unable to obtain ratification by national parliaments. Sometimes the reverse is the case. In economic matters, for example, ministries have realized the futility of envisaging any political co-operation not supported by full economic co-operation. Yet, unfortunately, it has been impossible to ensure that the technical ministries, those, for example, concerned with finance, the exchequer or commerce, particularly among the great Powers, would uphold the suggestions or recommendations of those foreign ministries or state departments which have realized that the desire of nations for justice and economic and social security must be achieved as well as their aspiration towards international peace and security.

129. The consequence of all this has been timidity and indecision on the part of delegations to the United Nations regarding the solution of the great economic and social problems which confront the so-called underdeveloped countries. The study of economic development as a means of endowing peoples with worthy living conditions, better adapted to the preservation of ethnic and national interest, has been carried over from one General Assembly to another without our having taken any important decision on a matter of such supreme significance for the destiny of our countries. We can therefore state that the firmness with which our Governments pursue their policy towards this international Organization, in accordance with their position in the far-reaching ideological dispute of the present time, has not always kept pace with the collective feeling of our peoples who believe, and perhaps with reason, that it is of fundamental importance to make an all-out attack on the complex problem of their economic development.

130. Failure to understand the necessity for greater economic co-operation has resulted in an anomalous situation in which governments, chancelleries and state departments have reached an understanding among themselves, but at the price of being obliged to run counter to public opinion in their own countries, while that public opinion, surrounded by evidence of dire

poverty, cannot understand why international diplomacy is powerless to forge an instrument for the solution of its economic problems.

131. To quote one example, the question of a special fund for economic development and an international finance corporation has been included in our agenda for the last three or four years. The Latin American States have felt that bodies of this kind would greatly assist their Governments in carrying out projects of supreme importance for the increased well-being of their peoples. Yet at every session a definite decision on this matter has been postponed and consequently, as Mr. Maza, the Chilean representative, so brilliantly pointed out last Thursday [475th meeting], the Latin American countries have now decided to study the matter on a regional level, that is to say outside of the United Nations.

132. These observations lead me to conclude that our present frustration is due to the fact that Governments have lost confidence in the United Nations, because they have not had the ability or skill to use the Organization for the purposes for which it was founded. They have been unable to use the United Nations because they have not succeeded in granting their foreign ministries sufficient authority.

133. Having heard General Rómulo's excellent speech I ask: what would we gain by a reform of the Charter if in future years foreign ministries still did not understand how to make use of it? Why seek representation for Asia on the Security Council, as General Rómulo suggested, when he himself said that the Security Council is now useless? It is my belief, that the problem does not lie within the United Nations but in our own Governments and our own foreign ministries.

134. All the organs of the United Nations, all its bodies for international co-operation, all the measures for security will fade into the background and become subsidiary and secondary until such time as the authority which the foreign ministry should hold in every country has been re-established. Such authority is essential in order to re-establish the confidence of the nations in the authority of the United Nations; armed with that trust, we can regain the confidence of all the peoples of the world in our Organization.

135. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): There are no other names on the list of speakers for this morning. Two representatives have asked for the floor for this afternoon. The General Assembly would be grateful if other delegations would speak today in order to expedite our work.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.