

**United Nations**  
**GENERAL**  
**ASSEMBLY**  
**TENTH SESSION**  
**Official Records**



**532nd**  
**PLENARY MEETING**

**Monday, 3 October 1955,**  
**at 3 p.m.**

**New York**

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 9:	
General debate ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	215
Speeches by Mr. Eban (Israel) and Mr. Shukairy (Syria)	
Agenda item 8:	
Adoption of the agenda ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	225
Second report of the General Committee	

**President : Mr. José MAZA (Chile).**

**AGENDA ITEM 9**

**General debate (*continued*)**

**SPEECHES BY MR. EBAN (ISRAEL) AND MR. SHUKAIRY (SYRIA)**

1. Mr. EBAN (Israel): Mr. President, the Members of the United Nations have expressed deep confidence in you and your country by electing you to guide their deliberations in the tenth session of the General Assembly. In congratulating you on this distinction, I gratefully recall the constant and generous sympathy with which the peoples of Latin America have sustained Israel's struggle for independence and security.
2. The illness which has beset the President of the United States has evoked our profound concern. Few men in our generation have brought such high qualities of leadership to the defence and preservation of freedom. Multitudes of people in every land will attend President Eisenhower's progress with devout wishes for his swift recuperation.
3. Three months have passed since we assembled in San Francisco to commemorate the signature of our Charter and to review the progress of the United Nations in the first decade of its labours. A strong impulse for peace went forth from that meeting and brought a healing touch to international relations. We are following with satisfaction the progress made towards the establishment in San Francisco of a visible memorial to mark an enduring covenant between the United Nations and the city of its birth.
4. The central theme in the work of the United Nations at the threshold of its second decade is the unity of human destiny, in a world where the alternatives of catastrophe and salvation have been massively enlarged by the new potency of science. Nations are still sharply divided in their judgements and outlooks. But the knowledge that the ultimate dangers and opportunities are the same for us all has now entered the consciousness of our generation, and given a strong impetus to international conciliation.
5. Thus, as the Conference of the Heads of Government of the four great Powers convened in Geneva, three months ago, its participants could already look

back on a period of fruitful diplomacy. In swift succession they had witnessed a settlement of dangerous disputes in Europe and Asia. An armistice had been achieved in Korea. Bloodshed had ceased in Indo-China. The Austrian State Treaty had been signed. The General Assembly had agreed unanimously on a policy for the peaceful use of atomic energy [*resolution 810 (IX)*], and the disarmament question seemed to have moved forward from its previous point of deadlock.

6. This momentum of agreement drew its motive force from the sentiment that war as an instrument of policy was now obsolete, not only in terms of morality and idealism, but also by the simpler test of utility. The uncontrollable effects of modern weapons had begun to reduce to absurdity the concept of a military solution of major international problems. With the military argument removed as the ultimate arbiter of international relations, the art of conciliation had entered on a new era of challenge. The soldier's deadlock is the diplomat's opportunity.

7. The four-Power meeting at Geneva dramatized this central truth. This, indeed, was its main achievement. For that reason alone, a conference which reached no accord on any specific item of its agenda could yet be accounted successful. The parties at Geneva disagreed on disarmament, on Germany, and on the role and character of a European security arrangement. Their differences on Far Eastern problems were not even submitted for discussion. Leaving these basic discords unsolved, the four Powers nevertheless were united in their determination that a solution by war must be ruled out of any sane calculation.

8. While this common ground should not be underestimated, the fact remains that specific discords have not yet been removed. The road towards agreement may be clearer, and a gentler atmosphere pervades part of its course. But in terms of actual movement towards the solution of conflicts, the greater part of the journey still lies ahead. Our task in the General Assembly is not to inherit or enjoy assured triumphs, but rather to utilize an improved international climate to secure agreements on specific issues.

9. The general debate in this session has already confirmed the need for a cautious appraisal of the international situation. Improvement has not been complete in measure or universal in scope. Disarmament is still a prospect, not an achievement. The problems of the Far East have not yet advanced towards a solution. Moreover, across the whole expanse of the eastern and central Mediterranean the weeks since Geneva have registered an unmistakable decline. In this area, old conflicts have been sharpened and new ones have arisen. It would not be honest to deny that the international situation is less promising today than it was on the opening day of our session.

10. The sense that the gains of Geneva are in acute need of consolidation impelled the delegations of small

Powers, a few weeks ago, to consult on a proposal for expressing the General Assembly's interest in the success of the forthcoming Foreign Ministers' Conference. This idea was widely canvassed and supported. It is our hope that the General Assembly will take suitable action at a later stage.

11. It is pleasing to turn to one area of international co-operation in which the months since the Geneva Conference have fulfilled our highest hopes. The International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy has rewarded the unanimous faith of the General Assembly and the skilful direction of the Secretary-General. In speaking of the world's interdependence, the writers and thinkers of our generation have usually referred to the menace of destruction which has united us in a common fear. But international co-operation should be something deeper and more affirmative than a defensive reaction to peril. Men and nations can be united not merely by a common dread but, more deeply, by a common hope. This message, proclaimed with splendid dedication by the world's scientists assembled at Geneva, enriched the technical successes of the Conference, and made it a landmark in the spiritual history of our times.

12. The Israel delegation at Geneva was inspired by its contact with the nuclear scientists of other lands. In the papers containing Israel's contributions to applied nuclear research, our physicists helped to prove that the atomic age is not the monopoly of the great continental or imperial Powers. All countries which develop a sound scientific tradition may have something to contribute to the new abundance which science has bequeathed to our universal potentiality.

13. The tenth session should move to consolidate the progress made within the last year in this field of international co-operation. The Assembly may wish to make provision for convening a second scientific conference at a suitable time, and for establishing an international atomic agency. My delegation will make its proposals on this agency when the discussion reaches the Committee stage.

14. We are especially concerned with the criterion for the agency's composition and with the nature of its link with the United Nations. But the prospects of a stable peace or of a new abundance will not be realized unless the tensions and burdens of armaments are reduced. In our Disarmament Sub-Committee, the attitudes of the great Powers have now been expressed more clearly than ever before. An objective study of these positions would not give the impression that they are irreconcilable. But the key to disarmament lies not so much in technical devices or the reconciliation of verbal formulae, as in an atmosphere of confidence which, in turn, requires agreement on outstanding political disputes. It is true that heavy armaments cause international tensions; but it is even more true that international tensions cause heavy armaments. The pace of disarmament can thus hardly be more rapid than the general progress of international conciliation.

15. In the meantime, countries which manufacture armaments bear a heavy political and moral responsibility. This responsibility cannot be discharged by supplying armaments on purely "commercial" criteria without reference to their political context; or by using them as currency for the purchase of political influence. The sale or gift of armaments is of course a sovereign right of nations; but like all rights, it can be used with moral discretion, or abused by lack of judgement. Is it

not an elementary duty of all Powers to deny armaments to those who proclaim and practice belligerency, and to shun any policy which, on a local level, would defeat the larger purpose of universal disarmament? We must all agree with the passage in the eloquent address by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union in which he declared: "The primary objective in the present circumstances must be recognized as the termination of the armaments race" [520th meeting, para. 131]. It is unfortunate that a few days later an armaments race was stimulated in the Middle East.

16. Little is achieved of permanent benefit if tensions are eliminated in one continent only to be aggravated in another. In the name of our region's threatened security, we are moved to appeal to all peace-loving States to avoid rewarding Arab belligerency with arms; to abstain from disturbing the military balance on which the peace of our region has precariously rested for seven years. It is indeed hard to comprehend how any Government which values its moral position can give or sell arms to Governments whose primary international objective is to harass, besiege, intimidate, and if possible destroy a neighbouring State with which they refuse to establish peace. It certainly cannot be righteous for any Power to do that which is wrong for another Power to do. Can it be assumed that Israel, or indeed any State in like circumstances, would be content to wait passively while a hostile neighbour, asserting or practising a state of war, strengthened itself for the decisive blow?

17. The institutional problems of the United Nations — its membership, its Charter and its procedures — deserve our vigilant care, especially if we believe that this Organization is destined to play an increasing role in the international problems of the next decade.

18. The question of a conference for reviewing the Charter appears on our agenda in accordance with Article 109. But there is need for delicacy of judgement in selecting the circumstances in which a review conference might be held.

19. My delegation agrees that an attempt to revise the Charter might at this stage present more danger than opportunity. However, a review need not necessarily compel the adoption of revisions. It might well emerge, in such a review, that the trouble lies not in the text of the Charter but in its faulty application.

20. There is clearly a growing opinion in favour of expanding our membership. The Charter envisages the admission of States which are able and willing to carry out the obligations of the Charter. These, of course, include the obligations for the pacific settlement of disputes and the duty to respect the territorial integrity and political independence of all other States.

21. All States which honour these Charter obligations, which have not repudiated pacific settlement and which do not profess or exercise a "state of war" against a Member of the United Nations, may rightly claim a sympathetic response to their membership applications.

22. The work of the United Nations in the fields of development and welfare attracts little of the attention which converges upon its political discussions. The technical assistance programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the efforts of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency and of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, the regional economic commissions and the co-ordinating activities of the Secretariat

have all made the name of the United Nations a byword of humane and disinterested endeavour. Yet many fields remain fallow or neglected. It is urgent to find methods of encouraging international capital investment on terms which are economically feasible to the majority of under-developed countries.

23. The Committees of the General Assembly will again be called upon to examine non-political problems which evoke universal human solidarities across the dividing barriers of national frontiers. My delegation will again contribute its best efforts to the work on the Covenant of Human Rights and to the promotion of the aims of the specialized agencies and of the High Commissioner for Refugees.

24. The General Assembly has agreed by unanimous vote to inscribe in its agenda an item proposed by Israel concerning the question of the safety of commercial aircraft flying in the vicinity of, or inadvertently crossing, international frontiers. The submission of this item to the Third Committee reflects my delegation's intention to treat this matter as a humanitarian question and not as a political or legal problem. In days when so many people commit the safety of their lives to the fortunes of the air, it is urgent to improve procedures for avoiding the disasters which have clouded many homes in many countries in recent years. The traditions of chivalry and freedom which have grown up across the ages in maritime relations should have their counterpart in the protection and immunity of aircraft innocently traversing the skies.

25. Many successes in recent diplomatic history have been achieved by procedures outside this Organization. We need not begrudge this fact, for our Charter, in Article 33, requests parties to a dispute to seek remedy first of all by negotiation and other peaceful means of their own choice.

26. Nevertheless, it is legitimate to feel concern for the institutional welfare of the United Nations and its organs. There is sometimes a danger of weakness through neglect. Where any act of international co-operation or discussion could, with equal efficiency, be carried out either inside or outside the United Nations, there is reason, wherever feasible, to make use of the machinery and moral prestige of the United Nations. There are many techniques available to the United Nations in addition to the familiar method of public debate. More use can be made of our Headquarters as a centre for harmonizing the interests of nations and seeking contacts and agreements away from the inhibiting gaze of publicity. Attention should be given to the Secretary-General's function as a supplementary means of diplomacy. The Secretary-General's success in bringing about the release of United Nations troops held captive in China is both a tribute to his personal statesmanship and an example of an enlightened use of international machinery.

27. But the most acute dangers facing the United Nations today are not those which arise from a neglect of its availability. On the contrary, the crisis lies in a tendency to stretch our functions beyond the limits of discretion, and even of law. The powers of the General Assembly are broad, but not unlimited. Indeed, the Charter first restricts them to a capacity of recommendation, and then denies their application entirely to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State.

28. It was never intended by the authors of the Charter that these provisions should be so stringently applied

as to defeat the moral purposes of the United Nations in the broad field of human rights and self-determination. On the other hand, these provisions were certainly meant to be a barrier against headlong encroachments on sovereignty such as that which occurred on Friday last. It is disquieting to assemble today in the absence of a nation whose radiant contributions to the ideals of liberty have left their impress on the best thought and institutions of modern civilization. To repair this crisis and to prevent its recurrence will now demand careful judgement and action. My delegation hopes that the First Committee will move immediately to dispose of that item by deciding to avoid substantive discussion.

29. The concept of a world government over-riding national sovereignty has a certain nobility. It is a vision towards which the international order may well evolve over the years as community attitudes strike root more deeply in international life. But the Charter of the United Nations is something quite different. It specifically defines our powers and functions and there would be nothing valuable or idealistic in infringing its terms, even if the motives for such infringement were in all cases beyond reproach.

30. This acute problem of determining the due limits of United Nations jurisdiction has often arisen in the context of debates initiated by the newly-liberated countries of Asia and Africa.

31. The United Nations has played a proud role in the emancipation of dependent communities. Israel is one of many countries which have been established since the Second World War through the evolution of dependent or mandated territories into sovereign States.

32. The transition by so many communities from dependence to sovereignty has been powerfully aided by international judgement. A process of liberation which, but a short time ago, could have been achieved only by forcible secession or revolt can now be promoted by conciliation and international judgement. This, indeed, is one of the most important developments in the international life of the twentieth century. There is still much to be done in this field. But there is already such a swift and favourable momentum, the tide of liberation is so irresistible, that the bitterness and acrimony which have attended discussions of this problem are surely without cause.

33. The Asian-African Conference of nations held at Bandung early this year, adopted a series of principles, many of which reflect the general ideals of the United Nations. Most nations assembled at that Conference would undoubtedly agree that the test of these principles lies in their honest and unswerving application. Declarations against discrimination lose much of their value when they proceed from an assembly which embodied discrimination in its composition by prejudicially excluding a Member of the United Nations which forms part of the geographical area represented at Bandung. Similarly, appeals to all nations to practise tolerance and live together in peace as good neighbours even in times of conflict and dispute are not consistent with the refusal to allow all the nations of the region to practise that tolerance and live together within the confines of a single Conference.

34. We are confident that the peoples of Asia and Africa with whom Israel's ties of friendship are steadily increasing will not on any future occasion allow themselves to be pressed into any surrender of their own most cherished principles of equality and coexistence.

35. In debates on national independence, and in many others, especially those concerning the Middle East and North Africa, some States have been eloquent in describing the imperfections of others. But it has still not been pointed out with sufficient frequency that those who denounce the shortcomings of others would do well, in all humility, to contemplate their own. Governments which have themselves never provided their peoples with a free election denounce States with free institutions for their alleged lack of democratic zeal. Representatives of countries in which men have few civil rights and in which women have none, appear in our assemblies as the champions of human equality and as defenders of fundamental freedoms. Representatives of countries in which slavery is officially practised, in which mutilation is a penalty for theft and decapitation the punishment for non-capital crimes, in which elaborate systems of discrimination still prevail, in which power is concentrated in absolute monarchies or military dictatorships, in which fearful poverty and squalor are fatalistically endured, in which labour enjoys neither the right of free association nor the protection of elementary social legislation, in which such outrages as child labour are officially condoned, stand here in the white raiment of immaculate virtue to denounce others for falling short in the observance of human rights or in the promotion of national independence.

36. Since the countries which I have in mind happen also to be the inveterate denouncers of Israel in these halls, we have naturally followed their performance with anxiety and with an envious wonderment at their ability to display such a sweeping tolerance of ills within themselves and such a ruthless intolerance of imperfection anywhere else.

37. Now that the atmosphere of discussion between the major world Powers has become more conciliatory and less vehement, has not the time come to exclude the censorious note of rancour which still marks United Nations debates in regional conflicts and in the great discussions on national emancipation?

38. There is no area in which such a change of atmosphere and approach is more urgently needed than in the Middle East. The very first day of our general debate [518th meeting] was marked by an extraordinary tirade on this subject from the representative of Egypt, since echoed by his Arab colleagues. Describing the citizens of a neighbouring State as "a motley horde of invaders", inciting the Arabs neither to live peacefully in Israel nor to tolerate Israel's existence from outside, he has used the highest international forum as a platform for threatening the integrity and independence of a neighbouring State.

39. Israel is at least as able to withstand these verbal assaults as to resist the more tangible violence which has been directed against her for over seven years, and especially from Egypt in recent months. It is here, more than anywhere else, that we see the incongruity of denunciation. For who is the denouncer? A State which seven years ago sent its armies and air force across its frontiers to launch war in an attempt to destroy a neighbouring Government whose establishment was sanctioned by international recommendation; a State which leads the Arab world in its refusal to establish a peace settlement in the Middle East; a State which professes belligerency and exercises a unilateral state of war; a State whose present Foreign Minister once declared that Egypt admits no obligations under the resolutions of

the General Assembly and implied that it is even entitled to resist them by force; a State which, with other Arab States, fought a United Nations resolution by armed force and now requires others to honour the recommendation which she and her associates tried to destroy; a State which has publicly avowed her refusal to be bound by the decisions of the Security Council, which alone amongst United Nations resolutions have a legally binding effect; a State which maintains in Suez and Aqaba a blockade condemned by international judgement and by the unanimous opinion of the maritime world; a State which has published *communiqués* boasting that its armed units have penetrated deep into Israel territory, there to spread murder and violence amongst an innocent civilian population; a State from which an influence of tension spreads to every point of encounter with the neighbouring world, northward to the Israel frontier, southward in an attempt to intimidate the people of Sudan, westward in efforts to incite violence across the shores of Northern Africa; a State which, already maintaining a military budget three times the size of that of Israel, invites the horrors of an arms race in the Middle East and seeks to conduct macabre bargains in weapons of death — is such a State really in any moral condition to denounce its neighbour from the forum of the United Nations?

40. Instead of rebutting in detail accusations of dubious title and content, I prefer to summarize in positive terms the ideals which guide Israel's outlook on the affairs of its region. Representatives are, of course, free to place this vision side by side with the doctrine of belligerency, blockade, rearmament and non-recognition, which Arab representatives have unfortunately espoused, and to decide which version more closely corresponds to the ideals of the United Nations and to the current mood and outlook of peace-loving mankind.

41. In our conception, the Middle East is a region in which the Arab States and Israel have an unconditional duty to live together in peace side by side.

42. In recent decades, the Arab peoples have been awarded independence in eight sovereign States, thirty times greater than Israel in population, three hundred times as great in area, with unlimited resources of natural and mineral wealth. Israel's restoration to freedom in its small but cherished homeland therefore constitutes no grievance to the Arab world. Indeed, it would have been an indelible disgrace to the world conscience if an international community which had rightly liberated the Arab peoples on an almost imperial scale, had not been able, in the aftermath of immeasurable Jewish tragedy, to establish Israel's independence within the smallest margin of territory and resources in which a modern sovereign State can survive.

43. It is our further contention that Israel and the Arab States are bound to respect each other's political independence and territorial integrity. They are bound to maintain armistice agreements which define the precise limits of their jurisdiction and which cannot be changed without mutual consent.

44. The obligation to respect armistice agreements is, of course, mutual and reciprocal and does not require Israel passively to accept the encroachment of its neighbours. The Arabs are not entitled to exercise, nor is Israel obliged to suffer, a policy of belligerency and blockade which has been ruled inconsistent with the existing agreements.



45. Since these agreements already signed are described in their own text as a "transition to peace", it is surely an offence against their letter and spirit to maintain them indefinitely without an attempt to extend them into a more durable accord, and it is still more illegitimate to regard them as a shelter for regulated siege or belligerency.

46. Subject to their obligations to each other in their agreements, Israel and each Arab State are completely sovereign. Israel is thus fully entitled to maintain its territorial integrity, and to apply the elementary principle that those who enter Israel's gates shall be men and women, the central passion of whose lives shall be devotion to Israel's flag, loyalty to Israel's independence, zeal for Israel's welfare and security, and a readiness to defend it against all assaults from near or far. These are some of the basic concepts which determine the duties of Israel and the Arab States to each other.

47. Much progress must be made before we achieve even this minimum basis of a formal inter-State relationship. But this cannot be our total aspiration. Even in these discouraging days Israel's vision of the Middle East goes far beyond a mere renunciation of hostility. We are convinced that these two peoples whose encounters in history have been so fruitful for mankind, can, by united effort, restore the past glories of their common region.

48. Israel stands at the very heart of the Middle East, in the centre of its pivotal communications. Only if hostility is abandoned will a free commerce of ideas, energies and merchandise flow across a region which has all the resources of natural and mineral wealth, of man-power and cultural tradition with which to sustain a rich civilization at the highest levels of the atomic century. Is this not a vision worthy of tenacious pursuit?

49. There are no problems outstanding between Israel and the Arab States which would for so much as a few weeks survive a mutual decision to solve them by negotiation. The tragedy of the Middle East lies not only in the Arab refusal to envisage peace and mutual recognition, but, even more acutely, in the painful consciousness of the rich potentiality which lies so close to our common door.

50. If we are denied this fair prospect of conciliation, if conflict and controversy are forced upon us, we shall deploy ourselves accordingly. Some might say that our efforts to consolidate our statehood and defend our interests during seven years of relentless siege have not been unsuccessful. But the vision which attends us when we enter this hall of peace, is the vision of regional harmony and co-operation. However vigorously our neighbours now reject this prospect, we are convinced that it must finally prevail.

51. It was in that spirit that my delegation last year proclaimed from this platform its readiness to fortify the armistice agreements by new pledges of non-aggression, and of mutual respect for political independence and territorial integrity. We do not regret that suggestion, we uphold it still.

52. Similarly, Israel's co-operation is assured for any well-founded effort from outside our region to stabilize its security and to advance its progress.

53. In his address to the General Assembly on 23 September [518th meeting], the Secretary of State of the United States announced his Government's readiness to contribute to a stable settlement by suggestions of which the three essential aspects were, as he described

them, irrigation projects, financial assistance in relation to the refugee problem and security. The United States Secretary of State announced his Government's willingness to enter into monetary and security commitments if those directly concerned wish to contribute to a settlement along these lines.

54. These ideas merit our careful and discerning reaction. While we have reservations on some points, and see unresolved obscurities on others, we respect the broad purposes which have inspired this initiative, and are moving in the proper channels towards its further elucidation.

55. Recent developments which portend the introduction of new and disturbing factors into our region have created a situation of urgent gravity. Thus, any plan to redress the balance and to strengthen inter-regional security is now of real value only if it is so conceived and formulated as to be capable of very early application.

56. We cannot discuss our country's fortunes in its region without a glance at the broad vistas of universal history which surround Israel's view of world affairs. The journey of this people across history for 3,000 years, bearing the great message of order and progress in the universal design; its survival by spiritual dedication amidst unexampled violence and hostility; its martyrdom a decade ago, under the most barbarous assault which has ever disfigured human history; its sudden recuperation at the very depths of its agony by its restoration to statehood in its original home; its revival of one of mankind's oldest cultures; its assault upon the primeval desolation of its country; the rescue which it extended to its kinsmen, remnants of massacre and oppression in Europe and Africa; the establishment of its free institutions; its return to the community of nations after an absence of 2,000 years — these are all landmarks in a story which, despite its small physical compass, has a quality of grandeur and exaltation which has deeply impressed men of sensitive historical insight in every land.

57. The General Assembly of the United Nations has a unique eminence in the international life of our age. All nations and cultures, all systems of thought and conduct confront each other here in the overriding solidarity of peace. Science and history have narrowed the margins of safety within which nations used to dwell. In modern diplomacy the price of success and the penalty of failure have become vaster than they ever were before. International relations are now the decisive preoccupation of our age. Those who labour in these fields may rightly approach their task with a heavy sense of responsibility and dedication. Israel then reaffirms its faith in the ideals of the Charter; pledges its labours to the advancement of peace and abundance; invokes both its ancient tradition and its modern revival to inspire its faith in man's capacity to advance through perils and pitfalls, towards the fulfilment of his peaceful destiny.

58. Mr. SHUKAIRY (Syria): We assemble again, but at the dawn of a second decade with a promise of hope and a chance for peace. The past ten years were pregnant with thrilling events. Born in the aftermath of a disastrous war, this Organization has been fighting a battle of life and death. The issue was one of survival, an issue that goes down to the roots, to the very foundations of our existence. Nor are we yet at an end of our troubles, for the battle is still raging. At times this "Parliament of Man" seems to be trembling under its heavy load of tensions. At times, under the onslaught of

the avalanche of insecurity, it seems almost to have reached the brink of collapse. At times this organization seems almost to destroy the Organization.

59. But the rock of salvation was always there. A great power was emerging — greater than all. The ordinary man in every corner of the globe is rising to power. He is becoming our final tribunal. To him we appeal and before him we plead. From this rostrum we often invoke his sense of justice — natural justice that reposes in the human soul. Public opinion is becoming our holy ghost whom we seek to satisfy. In this Assembly, when we take the floor, when we speak, when we vote, when we rise to a point of order, we always have in mind, we always think of public opinion. We feel as though public opinion is speaking to us, even loudly speaking to us. Even when it is silent we hear the voice of public opinion. But some of us lend our minds and conscience, others are indifferent or resistant. We shall not, however, despair; we shall not lose faith. World public opinion is still in the making. It is growing far, wide and deep. People all over the world — the masses, are forcing their control, their grip over international affairs. The Press, the radio and all the media of knowledge and information are daily invading new hearts, invading new lands. It is true, today the Charter may be violated; it is equally true that freedom today may be resisted; liberty may be denied and human rights may be ignored. But soon, much sooner than we expect, much sooner than we calculate, we will be captured by public opinion. We will be captured by the people's love for justice, by the people's love for democracy, for equality; and it is bound finally to capture this Organization. The Charter then will reign supreme, with honour and dignity.

60. At the outset we are duty-bound to make certain confessions of fact. Facts are facts and should not be suppressed or distorted. We must admit that we meet in this session in a favourable atmosphere, not entirely at ease, but not seriously disturbed. International peace and security are not fully at peace and security, but, admittedly, world tension is undoubtedly on the declining graph. In general, the atmosphere is no more saturated with bitterness and recriminations. The Geneva Conference of the Heads of Government of the four great Powers, which has witnessed international talks on the highest level, is an historical event to be recorded with joy. Exchange of visits between leaders of States in America, in Europe, in Asia and Africa — all these visits prepare for a better life and for better understanding. President Eisenhower's proposal [470th meeting] for the peaceful use of atomic energy is gaining ground day by day. The Soviet scheme for military reductions and for the evacuation of foreign bases is a great challenge to those who wish to follow.

61. Germany, a great country with a people of genius, injured by the Nazi régime, injured by Zionist propaganda, the like of which you heard from the statements of the previous speaker — that country must be unified, must take its seat with us, must take its seat in the family of nations. In this state of affairs we should not hesitate to rejoice, for the world has been sick with international tension. The Second World War has ended, only to prepare the battlefield for a global war, this time a war between the Allies themselves, between those who have been comrades in arms.

62. It is no secret. The Allies have been split into two camps. After the Second World War the world found itself torn between two major blocs. The division has embraced every international aspect. Dissension has

dominated everything and spared nothing. Our Organization, the last asylum of hope and faith, has acted invariably — and I say this without fear of contradiction — with the mobilized majority on one side, with the stubborn minority on the other side, and with a deserted Charter. Even in this Assembly, small States — out of need for economic aid, out of hunger for arms and military equipment — have lost the freedom of their countries, in part or in whole. Even in this Assembly and under the cognizance of the world, many small States have waived their rights to think freely in this Assembly, freely to act in this Assembly, and even freely to vote. This is not a sweeping statement. On many occasions, the principles of the Charter were betrayed.

63. Let us take the principle of self-determination, the cornerstone of our Charter. When the issue is between colonial and non-colonial Powers, the principle of self-determination falls into abeyance. Again, when an item belongs to the people of Asia and Africa, self-determination can hardly find room in any resolution — even as a modest paragraph in a modest preamble in a modest resolution. We recollect with deep regret that in the last session the General Assembly voted down a specific paragraph in a specific resolution. By coincidence, that paragraph which was voted down happened to be a section of the Charter itself. So the Assembly has voted against a specific provision of the Charter, and it seemed as though the Assembly on that occasion was ready to vote against the whole Charter, should the Charter be tabled in the fashion and form of a resolution before the Assembly.

64. The question may be asked, why go so far? The answer is too simple to state. In general, with the exception of a handful of independents we come here as blocs, we assemble as blocs, and as blocs we disperse. We vote as blocs, and as blocs we abstain. This is where the danger lies; this is where the mine is laid. We must call for a halt. Our motto must be "no more blocs within the United Nations". It is on merits, not as blocs, that we should think, judge and act. It is on the facts, not as blocs, that we should either vote or abstain.

65. In the United Nations the small and medium-sized States happen to constitute the majority, and the overwhelming majority, of the Assembly. But, unfortunately, this majority does not command, does not control, does not possess the majority. If, however, we can tear ourselves from the fabric of blocs, from the net of camps, with a will to support the Charter, we can save the peace of the world. Surely we can save our civilization and our very existence. Needless to state, the great Powers cannot wage a war in the planets or in the stars. The battlefield is necessarily on this earth of ours. This earth is mostly ours, mostly belongs to us, small and medium-sized States. Under our feet rest war fuel and war materials. In our lands lie airfields, military bases, lines of communication and all the means serviceable to the industry of war. It is only natural that with us, if we will, rests the decision for war or peace; and the choice is between coexistence or no existence.

66. Let us not forget, however, that the handful of independent States is no longer a handful. A new phenomenon is emerging. A number of States do come to the United Nations with a free mind and independent judgement. Particular mention may be made of the African-Asian States, or, if you wish, many of the Latin American States. We are not a third bloc, nor do we wish to be. We are an expression of independent thinking. We approach international problems on their

merits, and on their merits only. As a matter of fact, in Africa and Asia we differ in creeds, cultures and races. But our common ground has always been peace through freedom. We come to the United Nations with our wounds still fresh. We are awakening — we are rising in moral and material strength. With us we bring our memory of struggle as a ceaseless reminder to preach justice, practice justice and abide by justice.

67. But this is not all. The African-Asian group has not kept idle with arms folded. In the past the message of peace arose from the East, and it is the duty of the East to resume its transmission. This was our source of inspiration in our deliberations at Bandung. That Conference was more than a historic event. It marks a historical era — genuine and innocent. I say "genuine and innocent" with full meaning because we have no ulterior motives. We did not meet as satellites. We met as free and independent states. All manifestations of colonialism were condemned. Imperialism, its technique and its designs, were mercilessly outlawed. The Asian-African Conference at Bandung voiced the wishes of the people; and to the satisfaction of those wishes we are dedicated. At Bandung we met, large and small, weak and strong, of various colours and of various creeds. We used various languages but we all spoke one: the language of freedom.

68. We understood each other readily, and we decided unanimously. The whole Conference was a success. It was a successful experiment in support of peaceful coexistence, an existence born in full legitimacy. And the Bandung Conference lost its Asian-African identity only to become a world force finding its expression, as we all know, as is rightly admitted, in the Geneva Conference.

69. There is scarcely a novel item of international character on our agenda this year. In spite of their gravity, many of the problems are as old as the Organization itself. They figure on our agenda in every session, together with a bundle of reports for our examination, to be remitted again for further examination. We witness again and again the vicious circle of shifting them from one Committee to another Committee and from one session to another session.

70. The question of disarmament, however, is one of deep concern to the civilized community. Various schemes have been suggested, only to add to our files already swollen with reports. The problem, however, is dual in character, involving both disarmament and rearmament, which need to be solved simultaneously to strengthen peace and maintain stability. With a few States the problem is one of highly excessive armaments; with the other States, with the majority, the problem is one of under-armament. It is again the same old story of areas of a highly developed character and areas of an undeveloped character.

71. Human nature being what it is, military strength is one of the determining factors in guarding our independence, sovereignty, liberty, and all the dear treasures of our human existence. Excessive armament is a threat to the peace, but it is equally true that under-armament is an invitation to aggression. Under-armament is not by itself a vice, a peril or a danger. Under-armament is an invitation to aggression inasmuch as it creates weakness and a vacuum which invites, excites and incites aggression.

72. We in the Arab world suffer from what we call an armaments starvation, an armaments hunger, like many other small and middle-sized States. In spite

of the observations made by the representative of Israel from the rostrum of the General Assembly regarding the policies of the Arab world for armaments to defend their sovereignty, their territory and their people in order to avoid an episode, a tragedy of another problem of refugees in their territory, or to aggravate the situation in Palestine as it is, it is the sacred duty of every people, of every nation, to defend their territory and to take whatever means are necessary in order to make that defence satisfactory.

73. Generally speaking, States are either in a category of "haves" or "have-nots". Should we be blamed if by coincidence, if you please, the Arab world falls under the category of the "have-nots"? It is not a shame to admit that we are within the category of the "have-nots" but it is certainly a shame that we should not defend ourselves. It is certainly dishonouring and degrading to our rights, to our duties and to our people that we should continue in that vacuum of insecurity, and that we should continue to fall within the category of the "have-nots". This imbalance of strength creates insecurity, since the people are divided not only into two political camps, but also into two camps, that of the great "haves" armed to the teeth, armed also with the weapon of attack, nuclear energy, ready to explode; and the other camp of the small and middle-sized States, the "have-nots", depending upon others to receive crumbs of armaments and equipment to satisfy partly or wholly their starvation and hunger, their under-armament.

74. Self-defence is not only a right but it is a duty, and a sacred duty too. It is our sovereign right, a right enshrined by the Charter, and as such we accept no intervention, and no observation, either in the General Assembly or outside of the General Assembly. It is our right, and our sacred right too. It is our duty, and we shall always be ready to discharge our duty without any intervention. We accept no observation, from whatever quarter it comes, whether it is from the East, whether it is from the West, or whether it is from the gentleman who preceded me in addressing the Assembly.

75. Our defence is our own. How we should set up our system of defence, how we obtain the necessary means, materials and equipment and what-not for our defence, what agreements we accept, what agreements we reject, with whom we agree, with whom we disagree, is our own business. This is our own affair and we are the masters of our own affairs. I think that it must be made clear, once and for all, that the question of the defence of the Arab world and the Middle East is the concern primarily of the Arab world itself, of the people themselves, and we reject every intervention. We accept no observation. We are the sovereign on the land and we shall always maintain our right of sovereignty regarding our defence.

76. Analysed from another angle, we all know that this question of armaments, however, is leading to undue pressure and often to loss of sovereignty. We should not deny that; it is a fact. To defend its territory and people, a State frequently submits in transactions of arms to terms impeaching, impairing and endangering its sovereignty. Thus the outcome is quite clear. A State loses the very objective which it seeks to defend. It again becomes enslaved. This is where a great danger lies, a danger not restricted to the States concerned, but to international relations at large. The remedy, however, is not far to seek nor difficult to find. Coupled with disarmament, we have to emancipate transactions of



armaments from stipulations or restrictions of any political character. Give it or withhold it.

77. There should be no political restrictions impairing our freedom of action. It is either given or withheld. We cannot have again in this world an arms slavery, a slavery based upon a policy of armaments. Arms slavery must be abolished. There is no sense in declaring the principle of sovereignty in the Charter, when sovereignty itself is the price where with arms starvation is sought to be satisfied. If this emancipation with respect to armaments cannot be effected for one reason or another, we will have to seek an international plan to be carried out under the umbrella of the United Nations. This plan may be based on the same pattern as set for cultural, economic and monetary assistance now administered under international control. An arms fund or bank established in this manner would be fed by the "haves" in favour of the "have-nots". The idea rests on an international pool of arms and military equipment aiming at a just, equitable and balanced redistribution of arms in the world. In brief, the system would be one of an armaments communism, so to speak belonging to the whole community and under the auspices of the international community.

78. At present, we live in a world of unbalanced strength. A few are armed to the teeth; many others are hundreds of years behind. Thus we need to build up a world of balanced strength. Such a balance would, in turn, build up a strong United Nations, balanced and solid as a pyramid.

79. Likewise, nuclear knowledge and technology must be widely disseminated to the four corners of the globe. Here, again, human progress in this field is halted by many vacuums and air pockets. In the family of nations, few and only few are hundreds of years ahead. The range is multiplied without proportion. With ordinary means, through the gentle process of evolution, it is difficult to cover the ground or to bring the range closer. To catch up, under-developed areas must follow a revolutionary course. Happily, this revolution can be accomplished peacefully and without bloodshed through the peaceful development of atomic energy. The United Nations, through an international organ, will be called upon to establish seminars and research institutes on a regional basis to circulate nuclear knowledge and technology throughout the world. This again will help to revolutionize human progress and prosperity without bloodshed and sacrifice.

80. Let me deal for a moment with the problem of United Nations membership. We have strong feelings in favour of universality. We believe that all applications so far filed should be entertained. We cannot claim to be a world organization with a large number of States outside the Organization. The hair-splitting forensic examination about the prerequisites of membership does not further the cause of peace. Let us face the fact with courage and frankness that the States which are out of the Organization are fashioned out of the same fibre as those that are in. In and out, we have merits and demerits. No one can seriously claim that we are the Republic of Plato. Our past record has shown that sometimes we are peace-wishing, sometimes not peace-loving. Faults we have committed, and of faults we complain. The challenge, however, is decisive. He who is without fault, let him stone those sinners waiting at our door.

81. Speaking from a regional angle, we strongly endorse the applications of Jordan and Libya. We

whole-heartedly welcome the two sister States, as well as the remaining applicants. We trust that the time will not be far off when four other Arab countries will join this Organization. Palestine, Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco, after emancipation and independence, will, we trust, join this Organization. It is only a matter of time and freedom will emerge victorious. By that time, twelve Arab States in this Organization will be ready to make an immeasurable contribution to the cause of peace and prosperity in the world and to play their role.

82. There remains the question of the revision of the Charter. At this stage, we take no definite attitude. Our mind is open to any valid argument advanced. However, it does seem that the revision of the Charter is unwarranted. The Charter is not to blame. The burden lies upon our shoulders, upon ourselves, and the poor Charter is quite innocent. It is not guilty. If there is any guilt, it must be placed at the door of this Organization. The Charter is not responsible. On the contrary, the Charter is supreme and superb. As an international instrument, it is a masterpiece. And, after all, it is the implementation of the Charter that counts. It is what we practise and not what we preach that ultimately matters. An ounce of honest action is worth a large number of Charters devoid of implementation. After all, the principles of the Charter are as old as Plato, if not older. But it was Socrates alone who drank the hemlock. Our present Charter is not an isolated invention which was miraculously found in the streets of San Francisco. The editing, the style and the language are truly ours; but the ideas and the ideals are the great legacy of the human race, the accumulation of the free thinking of the world throughout all the generations. When we want to consult the Charter, we simply have to look for it in our hearts and not in our pockets. It is there that we can read the Charter and it is there that we can understand it.

83. In dealing with peace and security we cannot overlook the disturbed conditions now prevailing in North Africa. In that region human suffering is mounting beyond every thinkable limit. The situation is most distressing and disturbing. In Algeria a genuine war is being waged. In Morocco bloodshed is becoming the rule of the day. Massacre, decimation and various acts of repression are becoming daily occurrences in the life of the community. The issue, however, is crystal clear. The struggle is between the people and a colonial rule. Allegations have been made that certain States are inciting the people to revolt, or that such and such a broadcasting station is inciting the people to revolt through statements and declarations. This is nothing but ridiculous. The movement is one for liberation, it is a fight to achieve sovereignty and independence. It is a movement endeavouring to realize the principles of the Charter. Many of the States represented here in this Assembly have fought on the same battlefield, and in the wars of independence many were condemned as rebels and bandits. Finally, however, the rebels have captured their seats in this Organization and it is actually true to say that many of those seated here today are, so to speak, the successors to rebels and bandits — they are now the worthy accredited servants of sovereign States, free and independent.

84. Invariably the outcome was ultimate victory, and in the case of North Africa the same destiny is bound to come to pass. France, with all due respect, will walk out of North Africa and the people will be liberated, will become free, independent and sovereign. With this



fate in mind, with this destiny already visible, why pay the high toll which is now being paid in terms of lives, suffering, distress and discomfort? Why this bloodshed and the misery on such a scale and in such a degree? Why not listen to the wisdom coming from the Far East, from Indo-China? In the Far East, France, and only France, can assess the suffering, her loss and her injury.

85. The people of North Africa, however, do not stand alone. Peace-loving nations will not fail to extend their support and sympathy. Maybe, and this is one of the merits of France, maybe many Lafayettes are now on the scene, crossing the Mediterranean to support the cause of freedom as many Frenchmen have done in the past. Maybe history repeats itself.

86. It is with great regret that I speak on this question in the absence of France — it is with great regret and deep concern that France is not among us in this gathering, because we do not want to discuss this problem in the absence of France. This problem must be considered fully. After all, the views of those concerned are being explained and placed before the General Assembly and before the world at large — let the world know whether this is a case of internal or domestic jurisdiction or otherwise. Let the world know whether this is a case of colonialism or otherwise, whether this is a case intended to offend France or to uphold the spirit and the principles of the Charter in favour of freedom and liberty. I appeal to France not to take the vote that was cast on Friday [530th meeting], or the recommendation of this General Assembly, as being offensive to France. There was no intention to offend France. At no moment did we have in our minds the desire to offend France or to decry her. France should not take this vote as a defeat for France, but as a victory for the French Revolution, for it is in that revolution that we see France, in it she gave the world the principles of liberty, freedom and independence, and it is from that angle that we wish to view the question and it is from that angle that we should like freely to discuss it.

87. Last, but first and foremost, comes the question of Palestine. There is no doubt that it is first and foremost, for it discloses a tragedy with no equal or parallel in the annals of history. This is not a frontier dispute that could be settled one way or another. This is not a clash of ideologies or creeds that could be settled one way or the other. This is not a conflict between civilizations or races that could be guided in its peaceful settlement by give and take. The problem is much deeper and much graver.

88. The issue refers to a whole people, not a fraction of a people, but a whole people in their entirety, in their right to liberty, their right to freedom, their right to property, their right to live in their homeland, their right to die in their homeland, the rights which you and I exercise. The question refers to the rights of a whole people and to the whole set of human rights. This is not a violation of a right of election, of worship, of freedom of speech or freedom of conscience, it is a question of the whole of their rights to everything — the right to live, to elect, to worship in their homeland, the very right to have a home. It is this sacred human right to have a home and to live at peace in their homeland, given to them by their fathers and grandfathers since immemorial times. This is not a matter of the demarcation of boundaries or of honest disagreements or of interpretations of the Charter. It is a question of a

whole people uprooted from their homeland and living in exile for eight years with all the distress and conflict entailed. Leaving aside responsibilities and brushing aside the reasons, causes and effects, it is quite clear that here we have a people uprooted from their land and clamouring every year to the General Assembly, through the report of the United Nations observers, for repatriation. The people want to live in their own homeland.

89. What conciliation could be applied to such a problem, what mediation? Either let these people live in their homeland or let them die in exile, and the choice has been taken by Israel to let these people die in exile.

90. We of the Arab world contend, and I believe rightly so, that Palestine is the homeland of its legitimate citizens, whether they be Moslems, Christians or Jews. It is the homeland of each of those people. Those people happen to be by historical making, not by historical coincidence, Moslems, Christians and Jews, who have lived for generations throughout history in amity and friendship. We claim that Palestine is the homeland of those people, without any discrimination and without any distinction in law or in fact between a Jewish citizen, a Moslem citizen and a Christian citizen.

91. As everyone well knows, Palestine is the Holy Land of those three religions of the world, whereby the citizens, Christian, Moslem and Jewish, are the guardians of the holy shrines. They are the guardians of all the Holy Places, places which are holy to those three religions of the world. This is our contention pure and simple.

92. What is the contention of Zionism? That contention is also quite simple. Although Mr. Eban did not give us the definition of Zionism, it is well known. Palestine to Zionism means the homeland of every Jew in the world, whether he is American, British, French, Scots, Canadian, or anything else. He might be one of the representatives here in the General Assembly just for the simple reason that he is a Jew. This is not our contention. We say that Palestine is the homeland of its people; they say that it is the homeland of every Jew. The bulk of citizenship seems to be outside Israel; this is a state established not on its soil and not by the people of the land. It is a State the bulk of whose citizens are living abroad in every corner of the globe — people who must owe their allegiance to the flag of Israel and not to the flag of the United States or to the flag of France. Every Jew, according to Zionism and according to Israel, must believe that Israel's flag is his. This is the difference between what we claim and what Mr. Eban's Israel is.

93. Mr. Eban had the courage to come to the rostrum of the General Assembly to speak about the States of the Arab world, to level criticism against the Arab world and the State of Egypt. I am not here to defend Egypt or any other Arab State. But, Mr. Eban, come here to the rostrum and tell us frankly which State has driven the people from their homeland, which State has seized the property of the people, which State has for eight years been resisting the repatriation of refugees?

94. Has any State been known, even in the barbaric ages, to resist the repatriation of the people? We all know of wars, we all know of aggressions, we all know of invasions, but we have never known of an invasion which uprooted the people of the land or denied to the people their right to live peacefully in their homeland.

95. Mr. Eban spoke about conciliation, about mediation, about peace and what not. It is quite easy for one to speak about peace and still to interfere in our affairs, interfere in our policies of rearmament — to interfere with an evil eye on our oil resources and on our lands. Is all this not evidence of a motive of expansion and aggression against the oil lands and other vast areas of the Arab world?

96. It is quite easy for Mr. Eban to make any kind of statement. He spoke about conciliation and about a conciliatory spirit. You all know that there was a Conciliation Commission appointed by you in order to arrive at a peaceful settlement of the Palestine question. What did the Palestine Conciliation Commission report in its progress reports? In all the reports submitted to the General Assembly it stated that the main obstacle was that Israel did not wish to repatriate the people to their homelands. The Palestine Conciliation Commission was entrusted with settling the territorial question, the question of the status of Jerusalem, and the question of the repatriation of the refugees. All the reports of the Conciliation Commission to the General Assembly have stated that Israel resists repatriation, Israel resists internationalization and Israel resists any discussion of the territorial question. What, Mr. Eban, remains for conciliation?

97. Mr. Eban spoke of mediation. I do not want to embitter the atmosphere of the Assembly, but what were the results in connexion with mediation? What happened to the United Nations mediator? Under whose flag and under whose authority was the United Nations mediator massacred, and mercilessly massacred? How can one have successful mediation when the mediator is massacred on the soil of the other party? Still it is quite easy for one to speak of mediation. I do not want to say that Jewish terrorists massacred the mediator. I do not want to bring that up. But it is quite well known and it is common knowledge that it was not at Arab hands that the mediator was massacred.

98. After frustrating conciliation and after the mediator was murdered, the Israelis still have enough courage to come here before the General Assembly to speak of mediation and conciliation.

99. These facts are alarming and I did not want to mention them. However, I could not sit by idly or silently listening to the bold allegations which were made — I would say, with all due respect, of the preposterous allegations which were put forward by Mr. Eban against the Arab States, and particularly against the great and leading State of the Arab world, Egypt.

100. Such threats are full of warning; such a situation is pregnant with danger. We have here a people robbed of their homeland, of their liberty and of their property. We have here a people who have been denied all the human rights in their entirety and who are living on the charity of the international community. These people who have homes, lands, farms, funds, revenues — everything which they possess in their country — and they must live for the eighth year on the charity of the international community. Just imagine the amount of peace which this situation harbours.

101. So far the people of Palestine have not taken the law into their own hands. But who can rest assured that they will continue to be law-abiding? The leading of an underground movement cannot be ruled out by them. The people of Palestine might at any time carry

out a campaign to emancipate their country in order to enjoy their property, to live in their homeland, to return to their homes, to their farms, to the graveyards of their fathers or their grandfathers, to exercise the right which every human being in this world is exercising, whether he comes from a free people or from an enslaved people.

102. Today the people of Palestine may still have faith and patience. They may possess nothing except courage and determination. But no one knows what tomorrow will bring. Tomorrow may bring everything. It may bring all that a people need to defend their national existence, all that they require to repel an aggression on their homeland.

103. In the course of this struggle, the people of Palestine will not be alone nor will they be let down. There is no doubt that all freedom-loving peoples all over the world will rally to their support.

104. Yet the United Nations has a role to play and a duty to discharge. Mr. Eban has referred to the non-participation of Israel in the Bandung Conference. He is entitled to inquire. The point is crystal clear. Israel did not participate because Israel was not invited, and Israel was not invited because Israel does not belong to the soil of Asia and Africa.

105. Zionism by definition, as we know it, is the penetration of the West; it is a symbol of imperialism. As such, there is no room for Israel in Asia or in Africa, or in any conference held by Asia or Africa. Jews, as legitimate citizens of the Arab world, are entitled to live prosperously and freely in their homes in the Arab world. They would be welcome, but Israel has no room as a State with Zionism behind it, with the ideas of expansion and aggression, the events of which are being evidenced every day by the reports of the United Nations observers. Such a State has no place in the Middle East.

106. Yet the United Nations has a role to play and a duty to discharge. I do not propose to deal with the rights and wrongs. I do not wish to weary you with a long list of flagrant violations committed in the area day and night. Likewise, I do not intend to outline the various resolutions passed by the General Assembly on the question of Palestine. I do not wish to enlist those resolutions, and particularly that resolution which gave birth to Israel. We all know that Israel was created on the strength of a resolution, and on the strength of a resolution it was admitted to its seat in the General Assembly. That State, which was created and admitted by a resolution, finds the courage here in the United Nations to rebel against all the resolutions of the General Assembly regarding repatriation or internationalization of Jerusalem and the other items of the Palestine question. I would brush aside for a moment any action that has been taken by the United Nations in connexion with Palestine. I would even assume that no such resolution has been adopted by the Assembly, and that the United Nations has never been seized of the Palestine question. Let us take the problem in that context: the United Nations was never seized of the Palestine question, with no resolutions passed by the General Assembly. Let us see whether the problem admits, by itself, to be examined, even without the Charter.

107. Here is a problem endangering the security of the area. A people has been uprooted from its fatherland. One million refugees are suffering the distress and dis-

comforts of exile. The refugees are determined to go back to their homes — which is their right. Now or in the future, nothing will break their determination. It is their right, their inherent right, their natural right. As much as any nation represented in this Assembly, the people of Palestine are entitled to continue their national life in their homeland. So far conciliation and mediation efforts have failed, and against all the resolutions of the General Assembly Israel has resisted repatriation of the refugees and restoration of their property. No doubt, such a situation is bound to lead to a state of insecurity. The situation is already dominated by outbreaks of events day and night. To avert a threat to the peace, it becomes imperative that the Security Council should take effective measures in order to safeguard the rights of the people of Palestine. We believe that a commission representing the Security Council could effectively discharge this task. The composition and terms of reference with regard to this commission would be as follows:

(a) The commission shall be composed of Iran, the USSR and the United States. The United States and the USSR would be representing the permanent members of the Security Council; Iran would be representing the non-permanent members.

(b) The headquarters of the commission would be at Jerusalem, and the commission would be authorized to establish under its control the necessary offices and committees, and to engage the required experts.

(c) The commission shall ascertain the wishes of the Palestine refugees, to determine who desires to return to his homeland and who wishes not to return.

(d) The commission shall take the necessary measures with a view to facilitating the repatriation of those refugees wishing to return, and the compensation of the refugees who do not wish to return.

(e) The commission shall arrange for the payment of adequate compensation for property lost or destroyed.

(f) The commission shall provide for the necessary guarantees to secure all human rights for the refugees returning to their homelands.

(g) As a preliminary measure the commission shall be empowered to recover the property of the refugees, to receive their revenues, income and their rights.

108. The terms of reference of the commission, the task of the commission is not a biased task. It aims at the determination of the wishes of the refugees themselves, ascertaining those who wish to return, and taking effective measures to make them return and live in their homeland, ascertaining those who do not wish to return and paying compensation to them.

109. Such a line of action does nothing more than give effect to the resolutions already adopted by the General Assembly. Likewise it does nothing more than secure respect for human rights.

110. We have heard and we have read about various suggestions and solutions. We know of no other solution of an international character that could maintain justice and peace at the same time; the choice before us is peace or no peace.

#### AGENDA ITEM 8

#### Adoption of the agenda (*continued*)

#### SECOND REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/2985)

111. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The General Committee's second report [A/2985] con-

tains recommendations concerning the inclusion of two items in the agenda. Paragraph 1 deals with item 5 of the supplementary list [A/2942] "The question of West Irian (West New Guinea)". The General Committee, at its 104th meeting, decided, by 7 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions, to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of that item on the agenda. I would ask the Assembly to take a decision, first, on that recommendation. But before giving the floor to the first speaker, I would like to draw the attention of representatives to the provisions of rule 23 of the rules of procedure. This rule states:

"Debate on the inclusion of an item in the agenda, when that item has been recommended for inclusion by the General Committee, shall be limited to three speakers in favour of and three against the inclusion. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule."

112. It is not my intention to impose a fixed limit to the length of the statements of speakers who may take the floor under this rule, but I should like to take this opportunity of reminding representatives that it has been the custom of the Assembly, on similar questions, to adopt a voluntary limit of approximately ten minutes.

113. Mr. LUNS (Netherlands): The decision taken by the General Committee to recommend to this Assembly the inscription in its agenda of the item concerning Netherlands New Guinea has caused the Netherlands Government grave concern. We deeply regret this recommendation, not primarily on account of the consequences for our own country, but chiefly because of the fateful results which an acceptance of this recommendation might have for the future relationship between the Netherlands and Indonesia.

114. It is well known to all Members of this Assembly that, during the year that lies behind us, a long series of events has taken place in Indonesia which has rendered the continuance of friendly relations between the Netherlands and that country well-nigh impossible. I have no desire to enumerate these sad events, some of which we have seen ourselves compelled to publish in a White Paper.

115. When, six weeks ago, a new government was appointed in Indonesia which gave rise to the hope that it would pursue a different policy, this development was greeted with a feeling of relief and expectation in the Netherlands. Quite recently, the new Indonesian Government has indicated its willingness to remove some of the causes of friction and to create a better climate in which it may be possible to undertake a joint search for a durable and effective improvement of relations. It is obvious that such an improvement cannot come overnight. It requires careful preparation, goodwill and patient effort.

116. It is for this reason that, in the address which I had the honour to make some days [528th meeting] ago to this Assembly, I termed the insistence of the Indonesian delegation on inscription of this item in the agenda a sad error.

117. If this item should indeed be incorporated in the agenda what would be the result? A public debate, in which both sides will be forced to revive old grievances for which the United Nations has no remedy. It has been argued by some representatives in the General Committee that a debate could assist the parties in reaching a solution. I consider it my duty to state on behalf of my Government that, so far as the Netherlands



is concerned, this is definitely not the case. The debate that was held last year did nothing to bring about a *rapprochement* between the parties, nor did it make any contribution towards a solution of the problem itself. One of the reasons why last year's debate only served to worsen relations between the two countries was that the object of the seemingly harmless resolution that was then proposed was in reality to induce the Netherlands Government to transfer to Indonesia, through negotiations, the territory of Netherlands New Guinea. It was very fortunate indeed for all concerned that this proposed resolution was rejected.

118. That the United Nations should endeavour to lend assistance to the efforts of one country to obtain part of the territory of another was unacceptable to us. It remains so today.

119. Discussions between the Netherlands and Indonesia are undoubtedly needed. If certain preliminary conditions are fulfilled, discussions will be held, and they will range over a large number of subjects of vital interest to both countries. As to the sovereignty over Netherlands New Guinea, however, I wish again to remind this Assembly of the oft-stated view of my Government that that is a matter which will ultimately have to be resolved by the inhabitants of that territory themselves.

120. Should this matter be inscribed in the agenda of this session, no debate, however moderate and with whatever good intentions it may be conducted, can possibly alter this fundamental fact. Any debate would, therefore, be an unwarranted interference and must of necessity remain sterile.

121. Some representatives have praised the parties for the moderation of their statements in the General Committee and have drawn from that moderation the inference that a debate on the substance in the General Assembly could do no harm. This is a dangerous illusion. As you will perhaps agree, today again I have striven for moderation, but the harm which could be caused by the inscription of this matter has weighed heavily on my mind.

122. I trust that it will be given serious consideration when Members cast their votes.

123. Mr. ANAK AGUNG GEDE AGUNG (Indonesia): The General Committee has recommended [104th meeting] the inclusion of the item concerning the question of West Irian in the agenda of the General Assembly. This is not a new item for this Assembly. Last year, it was included in the agenda by a great majority of the Member States of the Assembly. The question of West Irian, the dispute over West Irian, still need a negotiated settlement.

124. It is important to note that the General Committee's recommendation for inclusion comes at a time when international tensions have been somewhat relaxed, and when the hope for peaceful negotiations on several international problems gives greater encouragement than last year. It is, indeed, for this very purpose and reason that the Indonesian Government, along with fourteen other Member States of this Organization, has presented this question again to the General Assembly, since my Government is still seeking a negotiated settlement of the dispute; that is, a solution by way of negotiations, as demanded by the relevant agreements of 1949 between the Indonesian and the Netherlands Governments and, indeed, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

125. The final *communiqué* which was unanimously adopted on this question by the Asian-African Conference in Bandung, in April of this year, not only also supported the position of Indonesia in the dispute and seriously recommended to the Netherlands Government to reopen negotiations in order to find a peaceful settlement of the political dispute, but, more than that, it earnestly appealed to the United Nations to assist the parties concerned in finding ways and means for that peaceful negotiated solution.

126. The decision taken by the General Committee to recommend the item for inclusion in the agenda of this session is, indeed, a commendable one. The discussions in the General Committee [104th meeting] last Thursday on this matter also clearly showed already the new encouraging aspect, not only in the international atmosphere in general but also in the relationship between the parties concerned in the dispute. No one, I am sure, doubts that the Indonesian delegation has done its utmost to keep the tone of the debate as moderate as possible, and has added its assurances that subsequent discussion and consideration of this matter will be conducted in the same friendly and moderate spirit.

127. It is, therefore, a cause of deep regret to me that the representative of the Netherlands spoke today in opposition to the recommendation of the General Committee. His arguments for opposing this recommendation are the same that we heard last Thursday in the General Committee. With all respect for the stand taken by his Government on this matter, I do not think, however, that his assumptions are correct. The argument that discussion of this item will not serve any purpose is, of course, an assumption which I do not share, and one which I believe is a grave error.

128. As my delegation stated in the General Committee, Indonesia and the Netherlands are both Members of this Organization. We both have special duties and responsibilities with regard to the function of this Organization, in conformity with its Charter. We have come here, guided by these duties and responsibilities, to promote the effective functioning and usefulness of this Organization for peace. On the other hand, the United Nations too has duties and responsibilities towards its Members who seek this purpose. To say that such a course of action will be harmful means, in our view, a disregard of the real purposes of the United Nations and of the duties of its Members. Let us be reasonable.

129. There is now already an improved atmosphere between the Indonesian and Netherlands Governments. In all our statements, in and outside of this Assembly, we have carefully avoided saying anything which might hamper the further development of our improved relations which, I hope, may lead eventually to the negotiated settlement constantly sought by the Indonesian Government. The solution of the dispute itself may be left up to the respective parties concerned, but it is certainly a grave error for us to turn our backs altogether on the United Nations. This Organization, which we have to uphold in all sincerity, is, by virtue of its Charter, a "centre for harmonizing the actions of nations", and certainly of those of its own Members. This is a matter of principle. For my Government, it is at the moment also a matter of the greatest importance. It is a matter of principal importance.

130. As I have said again and again—and I believe the Netherlands Government fully understands this point—there is no reason to believe that the mere

placing of this item on the agenda will in any way harm the present improved atmosphere between my Government and the Netherlands Government. No one can be more interested than I am myself in seeing further improvements to this atmosphere. And I am sure that my friend, the Netherlands representative, Mr. Luns, is aware of this.

131. It is for this reason that on behalf of my Government, I sincerely appeal to representatives to adopt the recommendation of the General Committee to include this item in the agenda of the tenth session of the General Assembly. To do otherwise, to reject or postpone the inclusion—and I stress this in all sincerity—will undoubtedly be detrimental to further efforts to improve the relations between the Indonesian and the Netherlands Governments; and these efforts are so important to both of us and, indeed, so important to the promotion and preservation of peace in general.

132. Moreover, when viewing this question as a source of friction, as a source of antagonism between Asia and the West, let us remember what the Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjöld, said in his annual report on the work of the Organization:

"The peoples of Asia today, of Africa tomorrow, are moving towards a new relationship with what history calls the West. The world organization is the place where this emerging new relationship in world affairs can most creatively be forged" [A/2911, page xi].

133. My Government has the greatest confidence in this possibility, and it will be the constant endeavour of my delegation to promote this new relationship of mutual understanding and co-operation in this august body. Let me assure you that my Government is only too eager to treat the question of West Irian in this very same way.

134. Let us have faith in each other's goodwill. Let us have faith in the United Nations. In this spirit, I sincerely appeal to all of you to vote now, without delay, for the recommendation of the General Committee to include the question of West Irian in the agenda.

135. Mr. QUIROGA GALDO (Bolivia) (*translated from Spanish*): The United Nations is again confronted with the vexed question of West Irian. The Indonesian people are once again turning to the representatives of sixty sovereign States to express, first and foremost, their faith in the spirit of justice which inspires those States—a splendid gesture of confidence on the part of the Government and people of a country which might have addressed our Organization with words of bitter reproach.

136. Last year, at the 509th plenary meeting, the draft resolution, submitted by the First Committee in its report [A/2831] failed to obtain the two-thirds majority necessary for its final adoption. Strange defections at the last moment and unaccountable changes of opinion within the course of a very few days led to the loss of just the votes necessary to form the requisite majority. Thus the fair and moderate draft resolution approved by the First Committee after laborious, and at times dramatic, discussions proved abortive.

137. We may now wonder what the Assembly's attitude should be to this renewed expression of confidence in its wisdom and justice on the part of the Indonesian people. The question is of unusual importance at this time if we consider, before replying, the

place of the State of Indonesia in the present world political picture.

138. During the interval between the ninth and tenth sessions of the General Assembly, there has been the Bandung Conference, whose efforts and achievements have been described from this very platform, by representatives of the great Powers of both East and West, as highly important and auspicious for the maintenance of world peace.

139. What happened at Bandung with regard to the question of West Irian? What happened was, simply, that the representatives of 1,400 million human beings unanimously agreed that Indonesia was absolutely right in asking for the resumption of negotiations with the Netherlands in order that the political fate of an unredeemed part of the fatherland might be settled by the peaceful and normal means offered by diplomacy.

140. I should like to ask the Assembly whether or not the Bandung Conference was sufficiently important for its results to have any influence on the decisions of the representatives of sixty nations who are present here on behalf of some 800 million human beings. From that last figure we must, of course, subtract the total number of the populations of the Member States of the United Nations which took part in the Bandung Conference, if we are to make an accurate comparison of the two figures.

141. If the reply were in the affirmative, we should have nothing more to say, but if it is in the negative, a new and more urgent question arises. Have the representatives of less than 800 million human beings the right to consider inopportune and undesirable the very thing that the representatives of 1,400 million people deemed opportune and urgently desirable?

142. Only a criterion based on racial discrimination could lead us to make so grave a mistake; if this should be the result of our deliberations, we shall have divided the human race into two groups, of which the one represented here would be distinctly the smaller. If such a thing should happen, we shall have denied the infeasible concept of the fundamental unity of mankind, which is the very *raison d'être* of the United Nations.

143. The West Irian question is a dispute of an essentially political nature; admittedly it has certain legal aspects, but these, if looked at objectively, are seen to be purely secondary. There are agreements, solemnly subscribed to, whereby the Netherlands and Indonesia have undertaken to settle the political future of West Irian by means of diplomatic negotiation. Unfortunately, one of the parties refuses to keep its word, and so Indonesia has requested the United Nations to urge the Netherlands to comply with the agreements it signed and to keep its word.

144. Why, then, should the proposal for the resumption of negotiations between the two parties be considered inopportune? It has been said that it would be advisable to postpone consideration of the case because there has been a marked improvement in the world political climate since the Geneva Conference of the Heads of Government of the four Powers. It is indeed a paradox that the lessening of international tension should be used as an excuse for stifling the aspirations of the peoples towards freedom and for leaving unburied the huge corpse of colonialism which, unburied as it is, is poisoning the international atmosphere.

145. On the calmness and the cool judgement with which the Assembly considers paragraph 1 of the second

report in which the General Committee so wisely recommends the inclusion of the question of West Irian in the agenda of the tenth session will depend, to a large extent, the maintenance of the prestige of the United Nations, not only in the eyes of the Afro-Asian peoples but also throughout Latin America, whose citizens echo the lofty saying of Bolívar, that people who love freedom will in the end be eternally free.

146. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand): The General Committee has very wisely recommended the inclusion of the West Irian question in the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly. In regard to this question at any rate there can be no doubt as to the competence of the General Assembly. This item has already been placed on the agenda of the ninth session of the Assembly. Indeed, in no way can Article 2 paragraph 7, be invoked in this case because it is admittedly a case of a dispute between two Member States concerning a situation which might lead to international friction, and thus deserves the attention of the General Assembly under Articles 34 and 35 of the Charter. Under the two Articles of the Charter, such a situation need not be one which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security but only one which involves consideration as to whether its continuance is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

147. What is the situation in question? In compliance with rule 40 of the rules of procedure, I shall not discuss the substance of the question but will only state that under article 2 of the Charter of the Transfer of Sovereignty, by which the Netherlands transferred complete sovereignty over Indonesia, it had been agreed:

"That the *status quo* of the residency of New Guinea" — or West Irian — "shall be maintained with the stipulation that within a year from the date of transfer of sovereignty... the question of the political status of New Guinea" — or West Irian — "be determined through negotiations between the Republic of the United States of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands" [S/1417, Add.1, appendix VII].

Negotiations took place but agreement has not yet been reached.

148. Further negotiations should therefore take place in order that a peaceful solution, in the form of a mutually satisfactory agreement, may be reached. In fact, a draft resolution was prepared at the ninth session expressing the hope that Indonesia and the Netherlands would pursue their endeavours to find a solution to the dispute in conformity with the principles of the Charter. Although that draft resolution was supported by a majority of Members, it failed of adoption because of the absence of the requisite two-thirds majority.

149. In the meantime, however, there has been a new and welcome development in that there has been an improvement in the relations between the Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands. Although such an improvement has not yet resulted in mutual readiness to negotiate, it brings with it hopeful possibilities of negotiation. In conjunction with the conciliatory efforts of the United Nations, it should be possible to bring the parties together in friendly negotiations with a view to reaching a peaceful solution.

150. The United Nations is "a center for harmonizing the actions of nations" and for developing friendly relations, and the General Assembly is a forum for calm

and friendly discussions with a view to a peaceful settlement of disputes. It exists not in order to set Member States apart or to set them against each other but to bring them together into harmony and concord, inspiring them with a spirit of co-operation and goodwill. The discussion of this item in the General Committee was calm and friendly, and I am confident that the adoption of the West Irian question as an item of the agenda of the present session will not prejudice, but rather will promote, the search for a peaceful solution of the question. My delegation therefore whole-heartedly supports the recommendation of the General Committee for the inclusion of the item.

151. Sir Percy SPENDER (Australia): Last week the General Committee decided, in a very close vote, to recommend the inclusion of this item concerning West New Guinea in our agenda. Before this narrow majority in favour of recommending inscription was obtained the General Committee had shown itself equally divided on the question of giving priority in voting to a recommendation for the postponement of the consideration of inscription which had been put forward by the representative of New Zealand.

152. Before I outline to you briefly the arguments which my Government feels are conclusive in requiring, both in logic and in political wisdom, the rejection of this item from our agenda, I would like to say how deeply the Australian delegation regrets that New Zealand's wise motion was not passed on to this Assembly with the endorsement of the General Committee. The New Zealand motion was to the effect that we should postpone for the time being consideration of the inscription of this item. Australia welcomed this New Zealand move because its adoption would have meant the avoidance of the need to enter once more at this time into argument about the essentials of this matter — whether strictly procedural in nature, or touching upon the substance of the question of the Indonesian claim — and would thus have fostered the new spirit which we in Australia believed might be emerging, in relations between Indonesia and the Netherlands.

153. For these reasons the Australian delegation was most deeply disappointed that the Indonesian delegation, in the General Committee, felt itself unable to give the slightest indication that its attitude on this matter, so far as the United Nations is concerned, had changed in any way whatever. We had expected the desire of the new Indonesian Government for better relations, expressed by its responsible spokesmen, to bear some fruit here publicly in relation to Dutch New Guinea. The New Zealand motion for postponement, which would not have involved Indonesia in any public abandonment of its claims, was such an opportunity which most regrettably has been allowed to slip past. In these circumstances, the Australian delegation is left with no alternative but to put forward, with the full force of our convictions but dispassionately, arguments touching the basis of the Indonesian claim to West New Guinea.

154. With these considerations in mind, I shall try to be as brief as possible. Permit me at the outset to observe that it is not sufficient merely, as the representative of Indonesia has done, to refer to a dispute which, it is urged, should be settled peaceably. As a general proposition that might seem to be quite reasonable. It is, I believe, and I put it to representatives, important to consider what the dispute is. It is a dispute in which Indonesia claims sovereignty over the territory and population of Dutch New Guinea. It seems



difficult to me to understand references to this dispute being the subject of a mutually satisfactory solution; it is a question of whether sovereignty is or is not to be transferred to the Republic of Indonesia. To talk in these circumstances of a mutually satisfactory solution surely is somewhat unreal, to say the least. Having this in mind, I should like to remind the General Assembly in the first place that this matter was exhaustively debated last year but that the requisite majority required to bring into effect any Assembly recommendation on a matter of this sort was not forthcoming. Since that failure to obtain the requisite majority, almost a year has passed during which the territory of Netherlands New Guinea has continued to make undisturbed progress. It is thus now even clearer than it was last year that West New Guinea represents no threat to the peace or security of the area of any kind. But on the other hand the debates heard here last year made it painfully clear to us that United Nations consideration of this matter in itself promoted a certain unnecessary degree of tension and a most regrettable if highly artificial atmosphere of friction between close associates and friends.

155. Secondly, and quite apart from any technical or constitutional consideration — in view of the debate here last Friday, I do not think that any useful purpose could be served by dwelling on this again — it is quite clear, I think, to all of us who care to face the problem, that this Assembly can make no practical contribution, and should indeed not make any contribution, towards the satisfaction of Indonesia's desire to gain possession of Netherlands New Guinea. The intentions of the Netherlands Government were mostly clearly stated by its representatives here last year, and have been repeated this year both in the General Committee and in this inscription debate. There is, and there can be, no alteration in their resolve to maintain their rights and fulfil their obligations in relation to their territory of Netherlands New Guinea, in respect of which the Netherlands has undertaken, and is fulfilling, obligations under the United Nations Charter, and has promised, a promise which was repeated here again today, that the inhabitants of the territory themselves shall in due course be able freely to determine their own future.

156. If last year's debates proved anything, they proved that the General Assembly was not willing to make itself a party to any campaign of pressure aimed at territorial change. Under the Charter, the General Assembly is not a body which can properly be used to this end. After last year's experience, and after the intentions of the parties had been made so manifestly clear, it would not only be a waste of the Assembly's time to inscribe the matter again this year, but also, by virtue of the Assembly's recognition last year that it cannot support the Indonesian claim, would tend to bring this great gathering of ours into disrepute by attempting to make it the instrument of pressure in support of one individual Member's claims against another's. The Assembly, as I have said, plainly cannot make a practical contribution in this matter. It can only contribute to spreading discord and unnecessary friction.

157. Thirdly, to admit that a territorial claim by one Member against another constituted in itself a *prima facie* case for United Nations consideration, would be to open the door to unlimited misuse of United Nations machinery. I ask all Members of the Assembly to consider most carefully whether, if this matter is inscribed and the process of attempted political pressure

is continued here, this action would not provide a most unhappy precedent for the prosecution here of territorial claims by one Member against another.

158. Fourthly and finally, there is the legal aspect of this matter with which the representative of the Netherlands dealt so fully last year when the matter was discussed in the First Committee. I do not wish to rehearse again now the facts he brought forward and the arguments he adduced on this matter. I only wish to say that if the legal issue in relation to Netherlands New Guinea is in doubt, then it should be clear to every one of us in the General Assembly that this is not the place where anything approaching a judgement of legal issues which could have any force in law whatever could be obtained. I said last year, and I repeat again now, the General Assembly is not the place, and has not the competence, to interpret international agreements or treaties or to examine territorial claims. I believe that the recognition of this fact, apart from anything else, weighed most heavily with delegations last year when the General Assembly decided not to give its endorsement in any way to the furtherance of Indonesia's pretensions in this matter.

159. I have tried to be brief and have been, I hope, moderate in my choice of language. It was not our wish to have to take part this year in a debate even on the inscription of this matter. It is extremely painful for my delegation to have to take issue with Indonesia, with which we have the most friendly relations, on such a matter as this, and particularly here in this most public of forums.

160. However, since the Indonesian delegation has decided to press for inscription, with, I can only assume, the intention of pressing the Assembly to endorse this year what last year the Assembly was wise enough to leave well alone, it will be my duty once again to state Australia's position frankly and positively. But I must say that I feel that it would be most regrettable if Australia is obliged — as it will be if the item is inscribed, to do so. For I cannot conceive that the Assembly will, in the absence of new arguments and in the state of calm progress existing in Netherlands New Guinea, be swayed in the end by extraneous consideration to alter the verdict it gave last year.

161. I therefore appeal most earnestly to the General Assembly to take now the wise decision which can obviate these unfortunate consequences, both for the parties concerned and for this Organization, by refusing to inscribe this item on our agenda.

162. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): In accordance with rule 23 of the rules of procedure, the Assembly will now proceed to vote on the recommendation of the General Committee contained in paragraph 1 of its second report [A/2985] that item 5 of the supplementary list [A/2942] "The question of West Irian (West New Guinea)" be included in the agenda. The representatives of Iraq and of the Netherlands have asked for a roll-call vote.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Honduras, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Costa

Rica, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti.

*Against:* Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic.

*Abstaining:* Paraguay, Peru, Turkey, United States of America, Venezuela, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Greece.

*The recommendation was adopted by 31 votes to 18, with 10 abstentions.*

163. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): As the General Assembly has decided to include this item in its agenda, I draw your attention to the General Committee's second recommendation on this item contained in paragraph 1 of its second report, namely, that it should be referred to the First Committee. If

there are no objections, this item will be referred to the First Committee.

*It was so decided.*

164. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Paragraph 2 of the General Committee's report [A/2985] deals with the item proposed by the Soviet Union: "Measures for the further relaxation of international tension and development of international co-operation". The General Committee decided, without objection, to recommend the inclusion of the item in the agenda. I would ask the General Assembly whether it too approves, without objection, the General Committee's recommendation regarding the inclusion of this item. If there are no objections, the item will be included.

*It was so decided.*

165. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): If the Assembly so agrees, this item, too, will be referred to the First Committee.

*It was so agreed.*

*The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.*