



CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 9:

General debate (*continued*)..... 217

Speeches by Mr. Pineau (France), Mr. Shepilov (Union
 of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. Figl (Austria)
 and Mr. Lodge (United States of America)

President: Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON
 (Thailand).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

SPEECHES BY MR. PINEAU (FRANCE), MR. SHEPILOV
(UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS), MR. FIGL
(AUSTRIA) AND MR. LODGE (UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA)

1. Mr. PINEAU (France) (*translated from French*):
 This eleventh session of the United Nations General Assembly is of special importance not only because of the gravity of the issues before it but also because we are conscious of the fact that we face the question of the effectiveness, and even the very existence, of our Organization.
2. This is not the first time the United Nations has faced difficulties, but experience in recent years shows that an effort has been necessary to try to surmount them, in all too many cases without success. The point to remember, in order to understand the history of the past eleven years, is that the respective roles of the General Assembly and Security Council were clearly defined in the Charter. The General Assembly is empowered only to make recommendations; the Security Council, where a small number of delegations are represented and each of the five great Powers possess a right of veto, being alone empowered to take decisions which may even involve the application of sanctions and the use of armed force. Whereas none of the Members of the Organization are ever legally bound to accept Assembly recommendations, they are required, in acceding to the Charter, to accept and carry out Council decisions.
3. During the early years of the United Nations, the Security Council acted to some purpose, as in the cases of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Iran and the aid given by the "satellite" countries to the Communist uprising in Greece. Since 1947, however, the Council has been paralysed whenever there has been a conflict of opinion between the Soviet Union and the West.
4. It was to overcome the drawbacks of an unrestrained use of the right of veto by the Soviet Union that the United States delegation, in 1950, put forward a system in the "Uniting for Peace" resolution [377 (V)] whereby the General Assembly could be convened almost immedi-

ately in the event of the paralysis of the Council. It was not until a case arose in which the United Kingdom and France were involved that this system was put into effect. We note this fact without bitterness but not without misgiving.

5. If we look back on the main issues discussed by the United Nations, we find that it has been unable to resolve most of the questions referred to it. For example, the Security Council asked the Military Staff Committee in 1946 to study the possibility of establishing a United Nations armed force but the Committee reported two years later that it had been unable to continue its task because of Soviet opposition.

6. The problem of the independence of Korea was brought before the General Assembly by the United States in 1947 and the Assembly proposed the establishment of a temporary commission, but this proved incapable of functioning because of Soviet obstruction. The only reason why the Council was able to act in 1950 when South Korea was invaded by the North Korean army was that the Soviet Union was not in a position to use its veto, having withdrawn in January 1950 in protest against the presence of the representative of Nationalist China. But when the United Nations Command informed the Council a few months later that its forces were in contact with Chinese Communist units in North Korea, action against Communist China was completely balked by the Soviet Union veto.

7. The question of Kashmir was brought before the Security Council at India's request on 1 January 1948. The Commission set up to investigate the matter succeeded in establishing a cease-fire but later proved incapable of ensuring the progressive demilitarization which was to precede the plebiscite due to be held under United Nations auspices.

8. In March 1948, the Security Council considered a request by the permanent representative of Czechoslovakia concerning the violation of his country's independence by the Soviet Union, and once again United Nations action was as could have been expected paralysed by the veto. Listening the other day to the Czechoslovak representative's reference to Hungary, we were able to gauge what the moral effects of our impotence have been.

9. In September 1948, France, the United States and the United Kingdom called the Council's attention to the action by the Soviet Union in its occupation zone in Eastern Germany and Berlin, but a draft resolution approved by nine Members was rejected as a result of the Soviet veto. Similarly, a commission set up by the General Assembly on 20 December 1951 to investigate the conditions under which free elections could be organized in Germany was unable even to establish contact with the authorities of the Soviet Zone.

10. On 9 September 1951, the Yugoslav Government asked the General Assembly to put an end to the pressure which for three years had been exerted against the independence and integrity of Yugoslav territory by the

Soviet Union's "satellites". On 14 December 1951, the Assembly adopted a resolution [509 (VI)] on the proposal of Yugoslavia but the Soviet Union and the other countries concerned completely ignored the recommendation made. A similar failure was registered [resolution 613 (VII)] on 20 December 1952 in regard to the Austrian Peace Treaty.

11. Nor did the United Nations meet with any greater success when it took up the question of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania.

12. If we consider the question of Palestine, which is today a particularly burning one, we find that the Palestine partition plan adopted by the Assembly on 29 November 1947 [resolution 181 (II)] was rejected by the Arab Higher Committee; that after the Security Council adopted a resolution [S/714, resolution I] urging the Arab and Jewish communities in Palestine to accept a truce the Arab States refused to heed it; that Count Bernadotte, the United Nations Mediator, and his deputy were assassinated near Jerusalem; that hostilities broke out between Israel and the Arab States in October 1948; that on 11 August 1949 a Security Council resolution [S/1376, resolution II] urged the parties to negotiate a peace settlement but this never materialized; and that no success was registered in finding a satisfactory solution for any one of the questions discussed by the Security Council or the Mixed Armistice Commissions.

13. I hope you will bear with me in recalling these difficulties and failures at some length, but my purpose was not to show despondency regarding the role that our Organization could and should play but to draw lessons from shortcomings that have become apparent in practice. The main causes of these failures are undoubtedly the abuse of the right of veto by the Soviet Union; the General Assembly's inability to make a sufficiently objective study of the problems and compel respect for its recommendations; the fact that the effects and not the causes of the political crises which come before us for discussion are considered and the difficulties—and I shall revert to this point in a few moments—of choosing between conciliation and intervention in disputes in progress.

14. This year, two problems have arisen which are so acute that the United Nations has been severely shaken; I refer to the questions of Hungary and Egypt. The French Government does not recognize any basis of comparison between the two questions. It would, of course, be offensive to France and the United Kingdom to compare them with the Soviet Union and it would be even more offensive to Hungary to compare it with Egypt.

15. If we examine Egypt's action during the past few months, we note a stream of threats directed both against Israel and the Western Powers.

16. As far as France is concerned, these threats were all the less justified in that the French Government in face of certain of Colonel Nasser's actions, had consistently shown itself to be long-suffering to a degree which often earned it the censure of French public opinion. In particular, at no time did we reply to the harangues delivered by the Egyptian dictator, the interference of the Cairo radio or even the practice of training large numbers of agitators in Egypt for subsequent despatch to North Africa. Yet the complaints we are making have proved to be more than justified, as the *Athos* incident has established the fact of direct interference by Egypt in French affairs. The loading of a ship by uniformed

Egyptian soldiers with seventy tons of arms to be used for fomenting agitation against France constitutes interference in a country's internal affairs in the most blatant form.

17. But the issue which overshadowed all others and showed the Egyptian problem in its true light is, of course, that of the Suez Canal. I argued the legal aspect of the case against the nationalization of the Canal in the Security Council, and I believe I proved that Colonel Nasser had no right to take the unilateral action he did. In the General Assembly, however, I feel that it is the political aspect that should be mainly stressed. Many nations have actually coupled the nationalization of the Canal with the question of national independence, as if an independent country could in no circumstances be bound by its international obligations. Were that the case, international co-operation would cease to be a practical proposition in the present world, and the only thing left to each of our countries would be to close its frontiers. The wealthy nations would live prosperously within their own borders and the poor ones in poverty within theirs. There would be no further question of international solidarity. This point is of such importance that I shall revert to it later when I take up the question of assistance to under-developed countries, which also features on the General Assembly's agenda.

18. On the Suez question, the first London Conference, held from 16 to 23 August 1956 had led us to hope that a settlement would be reached. But for Soviet Union opposition, we would undoubtedly have succeeded very quickly in arriving at a system for operating the Canal that would have been acceptable to all. The outcome was the Eighteen Nation Plan which Mr. Menzies, the Australian Prime Minister, submitted in Cairo without a favourable reply being forthcoming. I am firmly convinced that it was still possible at that time to avoid any conflict and to settle the affair in the best interests of the Egyptian people, if not of Colonel Nasser. The sequence of events at the second London Conference held from 19 to 21 September 1956 clearly brought out the Canal users' weakness in face of the arbitrary action of which they had been the victims, thus encouraging Colonel Nasser to take an uncompromising stand.

19. The United Kingdom and France then came before the Security Council, where they once again encountered the traditional Soviet Union veto. What I found interesting at those meetings, however, was not so much the adoption of the six principles, on the application of which there will be lengthy discussion, as the organization of closed sessions and the holding of meetings in the Secretary-General's office at which the possibility was afforded of freely discussing a number of problems.

20. The general feeling in mid-October was that there was a great vacuum—a vacuum which very largely justifies the fears Israel may have had as to Colonel Nasser's next moves. It had received credible information indicating that it might be the next victim of aggression. What we have here is an Israel tragedy which we must try to understand: because of our failure to find a settlement of the problems of the Middle East and put an end to certain threats, we have, as it were, condemned Israel to the necessity of waging preventive war.

21. Marshal Bulganin's recent statement of 5 November 1956 raising the question of Israel's continued existence as a State is a political blunder of the first order, for its effect can only be to drive the Government of Israel to acts of desperation. A country in danger of being wiped off the map overnight will scarcely hesitate over methods.

22. If we say this today, it is not because we have chosen between Israel and the Arab countries. We do not agree, in fact, that any such choice has to be made. However, we consider it essential to achieve conditions for peaceful coexistence between the two sides.

23. To return to recent events, the question facing France and the United Kingdom was this: what could and should our two countries do in face of a conflict that had become sooner or later inevitable? Our Governments were guided by the following considerations: the need to take account of the facts of the situation and the impotence of the United Nations in the Middle East; the avoidance of any discrimination in principle between the Arab countries and Israel but without forgetting Colonel Nasser's persistent threats; the desire to try to protect the Canal zone (because of circumstances we were unable to prevent Egypt from blocking the Canal without any military justification and breach of the 1888 Constantinople Convention); the desire to avert Soviet intervention, which for several months had taken the form of large-scale shipments of arms of all kinds and which might ultimately have resulted in the outbreak of a world war.

24. We have been sharply rebuked for taking the initiative in launching military operations without having been directly attacked. While I am prepared to concede the cogency of that criticism from a strictly formal point of view, I would like to suggest an analogy at this point. Speaking one day in a small rural commune in France, I put to my audience the following argument:

"Suppose the French Government had been able to take action against Germany in March 1936, when Hitler's armies invaded the Rhineland. It would have touched off a minor conflict which would probably have soon been over. Nevertheless, some lives would have been lost and the Government would have been held responsible for its action in the eyes of the world. No one would have known that by acting as it did it had averted the loss of twenty million lives in the Second World War. The problem is not always that of putting off settlement day."

25. There is little to be said that you do not already know about the military operations which have taken place in Egypt. Contrary to Colonel Nasser's assertions, the Egyptian army showed little enthusiasm in battle; the fact that Israel lost only 170 men in putting two Egyptian divisions out of action speaks for itself. We also noted the great wisdom of the Arab countries which gave Egypt moral support, as was natural, but refrained from direct intervention in the conflict.

26. The most important feature of this short campaign is the vast amount of military equipment of Soviet origin captured by the Israel army in the Sinai desert. It is impossible to believe that this could have been utilized by the Egyptian army alone, which everyone knew had very few specialists and technicians. Everything warrants the belief, therefore, that this stockpiled equipment was awaiting the volunteers who would at the appointed time have put it to more effective use. I shall leave it to the Government of Israel to supply the exact tally of its war booty, but I cannot refrain at this juncture from expressing some concern at the way in which the Soviet Union claims to organize world peace while criticizing others for jeopardizing it.

27. As far as the Anglo-French action is concerned, the main concern was to destroy the aircraft which had also been abundantly supplied by the Soviet Union. We bombed airfields and destroyed aircraft on the ground,

but we always gave due warning so that personnel could take shelter, which they always very carefully did. The one episode in this campaign in which casualties were unfortunately heavy was at Port Said, but for this the false reports broadcast by the Cairo Radio were partially responsible. Port Said had surrendered and it seemed that all would be quiet when the announcement that London and Paris had been attacked by Soviet atomic rockets and that Russian troops were about to land had the effect of driving the local inhabitants to futile actions which could have been avoided.

28. From the rapid summary I have given, it is at all events clear that the action of Israel on the one hand and that of France and the United Kingdom on the other, although they by-passed the United Nations—for which you may reproach us—had absolutely nothing in common with the Soviet action in Hungary. Hungary was not threatening Russia; it merely wished to gain its independence and freedom. The purpose of the Soviet action was to change the country's internal political life, which was not true of France and the United Kingdom in Egypt. The Soviet action sought not to destroy dangerous military targets, but to break a people's resistance to oppression and poverty. In carrying it out there was no attempt to avoid loss of life as refugees' reports of the atrocities committed all too clearly show. Lastly, we have only to compare the attitudes of Colonel Nasser and of Mr. Imre Nagy to see how unlike the two cases are.

29. If we now look at the part played by the United Nations in the two crises, the comparison reveals a picture quite different from what we might have expected. The French Government and French public opinion regret, first, that the Security Council and the emergency special sessions of the General Assembly regarded the problem of the Suez as more important, more urgent and more serious than that of Hungary; and, secondly, that the effects of the crisis were discussed at length whereas its causes were consistently neglected and nothing was done to prevent their recurrence. We were shocked by certain votes. I am not thinking of the votes of the Soviet Union and the "satellite" countries, which have never shown much respect for the United Nations, but of those cast by friendly countries from which we might have expected a different stand on the Hungarian question. Nevertheless, I wish to give the United Nations credit for the idea of creating an international Force, although I deplore the fact that this Force has an opportunity to act in Egypt but not in Hungary, so that the value of its action is inevitably lessened.

30. The point I believe must be emphasized is the attitude of the various Powers concerned towards the recommendations made to them by the General Assembly.

31. The Government of Israel quickly accepted the cease-fire although it could easily have exploited its victory to protect itself from any future surprise attack. It agreed to withdraw its troops from the Sinai Peninsula just when it was taking stock of the large amount of Soviet material there, to which I referred a moment ago.

32. France and the United Kingdom agreed to a cease-fire at a date which many of our opponents themselves regarded as premature. It would perhaps have been desirable to ensure the protection of the entire Canal and to prevent the scuttling of any more ships there by Egypt. This could have been done without further bloodshed, in view of the virtual absence of resistance on the part of the Egyptian Army.

33. The Soviet Union has shown two different attitudes. In the case of Hungary it airily ignored the General

Assembly's recommendation [*resolution 1004 (ES-II)*] and then, during the recent debate, blamed its victims for its own acts. In the case of the Suez, however, it has tried to prevent any settlement from being reached and to revive the conflict in the Middle East by reports that Soviet volunteers might be sent to Egypt and by increasing its deliveries of arms to Syria.

34. The Egyptian Government itself has agreed to the parts of the recommendations of the United Nations which were favourable to it, but not to those which were not to its liking—for example, the stationing of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Canal zone. Nevertheless, it would be difficult to deny the Force its role in supervising the clearing of the Canal and ensuring the protection of a waterway which is still international. We have good reason to fear that Egypt may make no effort on its own to ensure freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal. I have not forgotten the statement made long ago by an Egyptian statesman that Egypt would not be independent until the Canal was filled in. A moment ago I pointed to the dangers of such a notion of independence, but it is a notion which is still alive, we fear, in some minds in Cairo.

35. Two conclusions, the seriousness of which must be apparent to all, can be drawn from the differences in attitude on the part of Governments and the different attitudes adopted by the United Nations towards the problems raised.

36. The first is that there is a vast difference between the attitude of the democracies and that of the dictatorships towards the recommendations of the United Nations. If the impression should become too strong that only the democracies are bound by the recommendations and decisions of the World Organization, it will not be long before public opinion in the democracies will not accept participation under such conditions. The United Nations must resolve to impose its decisions on all or resign itself to imposing them on none.

37. Moreover, it would appear that the United Nations cannot permit itself to take the same stand with regard to Powers which possess the atomic bomb and threaten to use it as with regard to Powers which do not. We are not prepared to forget Mr. Bulganin's message and its direct allusion to the use of the atomic bomb by the Soviet Union. If such a factor were to continue to influence the application of the decisions of the United Nations, each country, including the smallest, would feel compelled to make atomic bombs itself to ensure that its rights were respected in international crises. In a few years, when atomic energy becomes less expensive, the manufacture of atomic bombs will be easy. We may well ask in all seriousness what will become of peace when each nation possesses the atomic bomb and threatens to use it. The mad will then be the masters of the world. I apologize for painting such a prospect, but the United Nations cannot afford to ignore the fundamental aspects of the problems whose consequences it examines.

38. We have discussed Hungary. We shall no doubt revert a number of times to various aspects of the Suez problem, but if in dealing with these questions we ignore the considerations I have mentioned we shall accomplish nothing. Despite our good will we shall not organize world peace.

39. Other problems are going to claim our attention, in the first place, disarmament. The recent Soviet proposals contribute nothing particularly new to the solution of the problem which has been the subject of so much discussion in the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Com-

mission. The truth is that we shall achieve nothing substantial or permanent until world-wide agreement has been reached on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The need for agreement on that issue does not, of course, absolve us of the responsibility of seeking means to reduce the considerable sums still being expended throughout the world for conventional weapons, or the responsibility of seeking an early solution of the fundamental problems which divide the nations—whether they concern the Middle East, the Far East, the reunification of Germany, or the freedom of the "satellite" countries. What we must at all costs avoid is that the debate on disarmament in our Assembly should be made an occasion for mere propaganda. Rather than spectacular proposals, we must seek practical solutions. France is willing to continue to play the role of mediator in the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission which it has played in recent years through its representative, Mr. Jules Moch.

40. We shall also take up the problem of Algeria. It might be asked why France agreed to the inclusion of this question in the agenda this year when it opposed it last year. Let there be no misunderstanding on that point; we have not changed our view that this is a French domestic problem which is outside the competence of the United Nations, and is in no way comparable to the problems presented by Morocco and Tunisia. In the case of those two countries, whose presence I welcome with great pleasure and good will, we did everything possible to find the liberal solution which was called for, and it is our desire to continue to conduct our relations with them in a spirit of co-operation and friendship, despite the difficulties inherent in such a swift and far-reaching change in our relations.

41. On the other hand, we intend—certainly with every justification, after the seizure of the *Athos*—to raise the question of interference by other countries in the Algerian affair, which is a violation of the United Nations Charter and which, by fostering terrorism and stirring up unrest has helped to delay the peaceful and liberal solution we all desire. The world must understand how difficult the Algerian problem is, ethnically, geographically and politically, and must realize that there can be no question of a theoretical solution which everyone would recognize from the start as unfeasible.

42. Another problem which will be taken up in the General Assembly is that of assistance to the under-developed countries. I am particularly interested in this since I am credited with the authorship of a plan which provides for the organization of assistance under the auspices of the United Nations. I sincerely hope that this plan will be discussed and adopted, but I must confess that I am more pessimistic regarding that prospect now than I was last spring, despite the support the plan has received from a number of countries.

43. For any plan of assistance to the under-developed countries to be effective, three conditions must be fulfilled.

44. The first is acceptance of the principle of the interdependence of nations—a principle which is very different from that of an independence tinged with racism, autarchy or imperialism. In this connexion, I am ready to acknowledge the mistakes made by the Western Powers in the nineteenth century, but these would hardly seem to justify other Powers in making the same mistakes in the middle of the twentieth century.

45. The second is scrupulous observance of undertakings given. There is a current tendency which we find

alarming—the readiness with which certain countries raise the cry of colonialism or imperialism whenever they wish to break international commitments unilaterally. It is difficult to see what treaties and what agreements will be possible in future if they are to be denounced almost immediately in the name of independence or colonialism.

46. The third is the maintenance of order in the beneficiary countries. In addition to financial problems, there are practical problems, which require the presence in the territories concerned of technical experts and a considerable amount of equipment and the uninterrupted execution of large-scale projects. No one can be expected to embark on a programme of technical co-operation without an assurance that it will be possible to work in peace and security.

47. We must study this problem together in a spirit of co-operation. Certainly France is willing to do so, regardless of political and military considerations. It is surely significant, that after bitter conflicts French economic and cultural influence is being revived in Indo-China. This proves that independence is not incompatible with collaboration in the common interest of the parties concerned.

48. In my opinion, it would be unthinkable for the General Assembly to disperse without considering the question of the reorganization of the United Nations. As I have said before, we must choose between two methods. Either the decisions of the United Nations must be enforceable, in which case they must be enforceable in respect of everyone, and no one must be able to use independence as an excuse to evade their application or deny to the international Force the means of performing its functions. Or, lacking the power to enforce its decisions, the United Nations will be purely an organ of mediation.

49. The United Nations must, then, make every effort to examine problems more objectively and seek realistic solutions rather than utter academic condemnations. Along this line of thought, I believe we could instil new life into the Security Council by making use of closed sessions—that is, sessions in which statements are not made for propaganda purposes. We could also develop the role of mediator which the Secretary-General has played so well and which can still be of great service to world peace.

50. We must also avoid the existence or the formation of groups within our Organization whose sole purpose is to oppose other groups. We are a world Organization and not merely the arithmetical sum of regional organizations. We have, of course, the right to organize regional systems of co-operation outside the United Nations but in so doing our primary concern should not be to oppose other similar organizations.

51. Lastly, we must not forget that our role, as it was defined in 1945, is not merely to preserve immediate peace whenever the occasion arises while allowing the seeds of war to remain, but to base our action on the notion of international justice. We cannot abolish war unless we abolish its causes.

52. I believe that we are in duty bound, before this eleventh session comes to an end, to examine among ourselves, in a spirit of co-operation different from that which has hitherto brought us together, the means of attaining our common aim: peaceful and friendly co-existence among all the nations of the world.

53. Mr. SHEPILOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The eleventh session of the General Assembly has met in an international situ-

ation of great complexity. During the past few weeks the forces of aggression and dark reaction in various peaceful parts of the world have been girding themselves for an attempt to plunge humanity into an abyss of new calamities and world conflicts.

54. Not so long ago the most striking development on the international scene was the relaxation of tension. Moving forward step by step, the peace-loving countries were settling international controversies by negotiation and stamping out the smouldering embers of war. We in the Soviet Union are proud of the active part which our country played in that great endeavour. I do not wish to take up the Assembly's time by enumerating all the constructive steps taken by the Soviet Government in the past few years in its struggle to bring about an easing of tension in international affairs. They are generally known. They embraced the full range of international problems, from the effort to bring about a cease-fire in Korea and Indo-China to the normalization of economic and cultural relations with most countries of the world.

55. The real reduction in international tension which was achieved, made the Geneva Conference of the Heads of Government of the four great Powers possible in the summer of 1955, marking an important step in the development of post-war international relations. The "spirit of Geneva" gave new hope to the peoples who rejected the "cold-war" policy with all its baleful implications.

56. But the "spirit of Geneva" was not welcomed by certain influential circles whose interests were bound up with the armaments race. Their aim was, and is, to aggravate international tensions through a policy of reckless adventure and provocation.

57. The exalted position of the United Nations obliges all of us who participate in its activities to make a sober and realistic appraisal of each new development in international affairs. Today we cannot fail to recognize that the imperialistic forces of reaction and aggression have succeeded in dealing a serious blow to the cause of peace and have markedly increased international tension.

58. Fighting has recently broken out in the Near East as the result of a conspiracy against the freedom and independence of the peoples of the Arab world. In times like these any local armed conflict can easily touch off a worldwide conflagration. In regions like the Near and Middle East, which are of paramount political, economic and strategic importance, such a conflict, if not resolved at the very outset, might well plunge the world into another bloodbath. And indeed the armed attack by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt has created a situation which threatens the cause of peace and confronts the peoples of the world with all the implications of the danger of a third world war.

59. In Eastern Europe the Hungarian fascist conspirators, supported from abroad by international reaction, have attempted to overthrow the people's democratic régime, to deprive the Hungarian masses of the democratic freedoms which they had won, and to reduce Hungary once more to the status of a helpless vassal of the imperialist Powers. That attempt has failed.

60. The aggression against Egypt and the fascist *putsch* in Hungary are links in the same chain. They clearly reveal the far-reaching and dangerous intentions of those international forces which are seeking to hold back the forward march of humanity along the road of freedom and national self-determination, to restore colonial rule in areas where it has been overthrown, and to return to power antipopular régimes in countries where they have collapsed.

61. In such circumstances the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace and security becomes especially apparent. The prestige and the future of the United Nations hang in the balance, for it has taken upon itself the solemn obligation "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind".

62. In recent weeks the entire world has fixed its anxious attention on the threatening events unfolding in Egypt. The unprovoked aggression by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt has profoundly aroused world public opinion. The treacherous, unjust and colonialist character of the armed attack by Israel, the United Kingdom and France on the Egyptian people is clearly evident to peace-loving forces everywhere. At the same time, it is perfectly obvious that Israel in attacking Egypt was playing the role of *provocateur* in instigating the execution of a vast carefully planned operation whose chief participants were the United Kingdom and France. Various reasons and explanations for the aggressors' surprise attack against Egypt have been given in official documents of the United Kingdom and French Governments. These explanations do not stand up under criticism.

63. The absurd argument that the United Kingdom and France launched an aggressive war against Egypt in order to "bring hostilities to an end" between Israel and Egypt, and to "separate the belligerents" as the United Kingdom Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden declared in his speech of 30 October 1956 [S/3711] does not hold water. Are we to believe that the naval and aerial bombardments of Port Said, the brutal destruction of such thickly populated Arab quarters of Port Said as El-Tamil, El-Manakh, Abbas Street and others, served to "separate the belligerents"? Can anyone tell us that the inhuman slaughter of thousands of peaceful citizens of Port Said, primarily women and children, the shooting down by aircraft of residents of Heliopolis who were peacefully waiting for a tram, the bombing and destruction of the Coptic church in Cairo, the destruction of the Post Office and of the Roman Catholic church in Alexandria, were carried out for the purpose of "separating the belligerents"? Everyone knows that at these points there was no contact between the "belligerents" (Egypt and Israel), hence these acts could not have served to "separate" them.

64. The United Kingdom, French and Israel aggressors have resorted to the threadbare lie that some terrible Communist plot was being hatched in Egypt to seize the whole Near and Middle East with its vast oil resources, and that this left them no alternative but to face the danger squarely. This is another argument which does not hold up under criticism. Such an argument, which incidentally was brought up again today in Mr. Pineau's speech, might serve as a plot for some Hollywood film, but it has no place in an analysis of the reasons for such a crime as the armed attack by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against the Egyptian people. When the aggressors can think of nothing else to say in justification of their crimes, they habitually drag in the bogey of communism. That is by now an old story.

65. The argument that the aggression by the United Kingdom and France against Egypt was prompted by their desire to guarantee freedom of passage through the Suez Canal likewise fails to withstand criticism.

66. In the first place, everybody knows that the Egyptian State has in practice ensured freedom of passage through the Canal; after nationalization the Canal op-

erated without interruption, and freedom of passage was in no way endangered. Despite what the aggressors had just been saying, they themselves, far from doing anything to ensure freedom of passage through the Suez Canal, acted so as to put this vital international waterway out of operation for a long time to come. The United Kingdom and France are directly responsible before all the users of the Canal for this flagrant violation of the Constantinople Convention of 1888 on freedom of navigation.

67. Secondly, what are the legal grounds on which the United Kingdom and France have been, and are still trying to monopolize the solution of the Suez Canal problem, which concerns the vital interests of many Governments, including those of the Soviet Union, while they trample on the sovereign rights of Egypt?

68. Thirdly, what justification have the United Kingdom and France for resorting to armed force to settle a question on which the Security Council had so recently adopted a decision? It will be recalled that the Security Council affirmed the well-known six principles, agreed upon in a resolution [S/3675] which, had they been put into effect, would have brought about the complete settlement of the Suez problem by peaceful means. The Security Council's decision was widely acclaimed as a notable achievement of the forces of peace. The United Kingdom and France voted for those principles and agreed to negotiate with Egypt. It is now clear that this gesture was false, its purpose being to lull the vigilance of the peace-loving nations and prepare the ground for the sudden attack on Egypt.

69. The attack by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt was, of course, not motivated by the foregoing considerations, which the aggressors are now alleging in order to conceal their real aims. Irrefutable facts show the attack on Egypt was only the first step in the execution of a large-scale strategic plan conceived by the imperialists. It was the intention of the colonial Powers to take advantage of the existing situation in order to foil the Egyptian Government's decision to nationalize the Suez Canal, and to take it back into their own hands. They intended to crush Egypt for daring to assert its sovereign rights; unseat its government for refusing to go along with their imperialistic aims and bring the Egyptian people to their knees. They wanted to deprive several States in the Near and Middle East of their national independence and sovereignty by taking direct military action against the Arab peoples to restore the oppressive colonial régime which the peoples of these countries had thrown off, and to regain the position, privileges and sources of wealth which the imperialists had lost in these countries. The armed attack against Egypt launched by Israel and joined in by the United Kingdom and France was, I repeat, only the first step in the realization of the over-all colonialist plan of the imperialist aggressors.

70. The first emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution [997 (ES-I)] urging the United Kingdom, France and Israel to agree to an immediate cease-fire and to withdraw all forces from Egyptian territory. However, this resolution did not at first produce the desired effect.

71. A tragic situation resulted. Egypt, which was shedding its lifeblood and upon whose peaceful population United Kingdom and French bombs were raining down, appealed for help. Any delay might have spelt disaster for Egypt and caused the war to spread. In these circumstances the Soviet Union considered it imperative to take decisive steps. In a draft resolution [S/3736] sub-

mitted on 5 November 1956, it called upon the Security Council to propose to the Governments of the United Kingdom, France and Israel, that they should immediately cease all military action against Egypt and withdraw within three days the forces that had invaded Egypt. At the same time the Soviet Union recommended that the Security Council consider it essential that all Member States of the United Nations, especially the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as permanent members of the Security Council having powerful air and naval forces at their disposal, should give military and other assistance to the republic of Egypt, which had been the victim of aggression, by sending naval and air forces, military units, volunteers, military instructors and other forms of assistance, if the United Kingdom, France and Israel failed to carry out within the stated time-limits the recommendations specified by the draft resolution.

72. At the same time, the Soviet Government proposed to the United States Government that the two make a joint effort within the United Nations, together with other Governments, to halt the aggression and prevent further bloodshed. The Government of the United States unfortunately did not support this initiative which the Soviet Union, prompted by the gravity of the situation and by its sense of responsibility for the maintenance of peace in the Near East, had undertaken.

73. Finally, the Soviet Union appealed to the United Kingdom, France and Israel to consider the dangers inherent in the situation created as a result of their attack upon Egypt, and to put an immediate end to their aggression. The Soviet Government declared, moreover, that its armed forces were ready to co-operate actively with those of other Governments in putting down aggression in the Near East should the United Nations so decide.

74. Vicious anti-Soviet propaganda has tried and is still trying to make it appear that these resolute steps taken by the Soviet Government against aggression in Egypt are proof of some special selfish motives on the part of the Soviet Union in that area. Slanderers have been, and are still, declaring that the Soviet Union is pursuing its own selfish aims, directed against the aims of the Western Powers and the peoples of the East.

75. Such assertions are utterly without foundation. The Soviet socialist State does not have, and does not want, concessions, military bases or privileges of any sort in the Near East, whether political, economic or military. Any expansionist aims are totally alien to the thinking of the Soviet Government, and would be incompatible with our principles. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union, like many other Governments, is concerned that freedom of passage through the Suez Canal should be assured.

76. The delegation of the Soviet Union notes with great satisfaction that military operations in Egypt have ceased. The brave resistance of the heroic Egyptian people, whose just cause has won the moral support of freedom-loving peoples everywhere, has caused the aggressors to retreat. This triumph is all the more remarkable because two great Powers armed with the finest military equipment, proved unable to crush the resistance of the young Republic of Egypt, far weaker militarily than they, but strong in its indomitable spirit. That example is an inspiration to all peoples who are fighting for their freedom and independence.

77. Thus the conflagration which flared up briefly in the Near East, is dying down, but beneath the fresh ash the embers are still smouldering, and if we do not take care, they may flare up again. The Soviet Union is

seriously concerned over the fact that although a formal cease-fire prevails in Egypt, the withdrawal of United Kingdom, French and Israel forces from Egyptian territory is being held up. In fact, it is reported that the interventionists are reinforcing their troops in the area. An *aide-mémoire* [A/3370] of the Egyptian Government transmitted to the Secretary-General on 18 November states that the United Kingdom and France, instead of withdrawing their forces from Egypt, are "consolidating their positions in Egyptian territory". The *aide-mémoire* goes on to say:

"... these armed forces are at the same time launching upon extremely provocative acts in Port Said and the Suez Canal area, which acts include indiscriminate shooting of the population resulting in many victims...

To this are added the searching and looting of houses and stores, and forcing [Egyptian] labourers, under all kinds of threats, to work with the invading forces".

This situation is fraught with grave danger.

78. As long as the troops of the aggressors remain in Egyptian territory, there can be no assurance that hostilities will not break out anew. The Soviet delegation is of the opinion that the General Assembly should again categorically demand the immediate withdrawal of United Kingdom, French and Israel troops from Egypt. This is the more necessary because the Government of Israel, for example, does not wish to withdraw its troops from the Gaza Strip, having declared it "an integral part of its territory".

79. The Government of the State of Israel has openly proclaimed its annexationist aims with regard to Egypt, including the incorporation into Israel of the Gaza Strip, the Sinai Peninsula, and the islands of Tiran and Sinafir in the Gulf of Aqaba. The Soviet delegation considers it imperative that measures be taken to prevent Israel from further provoking its neighbours and to ensure peace and tranquillity in the Near East.

80. Surely the voice of reason must convince the United Kingdom, France and Israel that their forces must be withdrawn from Egypt without further delay, lest the situation be aggravated anew. It must be borne in mind that the sympathies of peace-loving peoples the world over are on the side of Egypt.

81. The decision taken by the first emergency special session of the General Assembly to establish a United Nations international police Force raises the following considerations. First, it must not be forgotten that the establishment and command of an international armed police Force, under the terms of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, are the prerogative of the Security Council. In the present instance, this provision of the Charter has clearly been violated. Secondly, once the United Kingdom, France and Israel withdraw their armed forces from Egyptian territory there will be no need for a United Nations international police Force.

82. However, the Soviet delegation is aware that Egypt has agreed to the introduction of United Nations armed forces, with the understanding that they may be stationed along the demarcation line between Israel and Egypt which was established by the Armistice Agreement of 1948. Naturally the international forces must not stay in Port Said or the general area of the Suez Canal after the withdrawal of United Kingdom and French troops from Port Said. The continued presence of United Nations forces in that area would violate the provisions of the Constantinople Convention of 1888 and would constitute a clear infringement of the sovereign rights of Egypt. It goes without saying that the United Nations

forces must also withdraw from the demarcation line and from Egyptian territory in general as soon as the Republic of Egypt should consider it necessary.

83. We must not overlook the disturbing fact that influential circles in the United Kingdom and France, and certain circles in the United States, have far-reaching and extremely dangerous intentions in connexion with the dispatch of United Nations forces to Egypt. Their aim is to remove the Suez Canal from Egyptian control and establish some form of alien so-called "international" control in its stead. Demands are being made that the United Nations forces should be stationed throughout the Suez Canal zone and should remain there until such time as a settlement of the Suez problem based on the well-known proposals of the Western Powers can be imposed on Egypt.

84. This reasoning indicates that the Powers which were defeated in the colonialist war against Egypt would obviously like to take advantage of the presence of foreign armed forces in the Suez Canal to carry out their old plans for the "internationalization" of the Canal. It is not difficult to see that such an interpretation of the function of the United Nations armed Force could in practice lead only to the violation of Egyptian sovereignty and of the Constantinople Convention of 1888. In this connexion we cannot but associate ourselves with the remarks made on 16 November 1956 by the Prime Minister of the Republic of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, on the Suez Canal problem:

"This United Nations force will not be concerned with the Suez Canal issue as such, which can only be considered separately after peace has been fully established and all foreign forces removed. The main task of the international force is said to be to ensure that Israel remains within the demarcation lines set by the old Armistice Agreement."

85. It is clear that the stationing of an international United Nations Force on Egyptian territory and the duration of its mission are questions which can be decided only by agreement with the Government of Egypt. It is also clear that it is not possible to discuss in substance or resolve the problem of ensuring freedom of passage through the Suez Canal or the problem of Palestine until such time as the forces of the United Kingdom, French and Israel aggressors have been completely withdrawn from Egyptian territory. At this moment the honour of the United Nations, the honour of peace-loving peoples everywhere demands that we take steps to ensure the immediate withdrawal of the invaders from Egyptian soil.

86. The United Nations should also demand that the United Kingdom, France and Israel call an immediate halt to all actions constituting a threat or causing tension along the Israel-Jordan or Israel-Syrian frontiers (troop concentrations on the frontiers, flights of reconnaissance planes and the like), so that genuine pacification of that part of the Arab East may come about. There are a number of indications—as the Syrian representatives said here yesterday [586th meeting]—that certain circles in the United Kingdom, France and Israel harbour further aggressive designs against the Arab Governments. It is the duty of the United Nations to unmask such intentions and nip them in the bud.

87. It is shortsighted to think that aggression against Egypt or punitive actions by the French colonial authorities in Africa can strengthen the position of colonialism. The peoples of North Africa, both those who have already achieved national liberation and those who are

fighting for it, have taken their destiny into their own hands. There is no way of stopping this great process of national resurgence.

88. I shall say only a few words about Hungary, since this question has already been exhaustively discussed in both the second emergency session and the present session of the General Assembly. It will be recalled that the Cuban delegation interrupted our general discussion by submitting for the Assembly's consideration a draft resolution [A/3357/Rev. 2] on the so-called "Hungarian question". As was to be expected, the debate on the provocative Cuban resolution and its approval by a majority of the Assembly not only failed to contribute to the lessening of international tension, but made matters worse and struck a serious blow at the authority of the United Nations.

89. The content of that debate and the nature and tone of the statements by the representatives of the Western Powers made it plain that for all their high-sounding declarations, it was not sympathy for the Hungarian people which prompted them to sponsor the inclusion of the "Hungarian question" on the Assembly's agenda. They needed a pretext to divert the attention of the public from the armed intervention of the colonialists in Egypt and the preparations for aggression against the Governments of the Arab East. They needed an excuse to launch a political campaign here in the United Nations against the socialist governments in order to revive the "cold war" in all its intensity.

90. Why was this necessary? There is only one answer to that question: the forces of aggression in the world arena do not wish to reconcile themselves to the ever-growing desire of the masses for a relaxation of international tensions and the development of peaceful co-operation among Governments having different political systems. It was no mere accident that the voices of reaction all joined in such frenzied opposition to the great principle of peaceful coexistence. This is no abstract theoretical struggle, but one with a definite purpose, and the events in Hungary are a concrete and active manifestation thereof.

91. It is obvious that forces of reaction and aggression, in opposing the principle of peaceful competition between two social and economic systems, are by no means confident that they will succeed in proving the superiority of their own system in that competition. This is why they have been exerting such strenuous efforts to bring about a full-scale revival of the "cold war," which had begun to subside after the Geneva Conference of the Heads of Government of the four great Powers.

92. One of the manifestations of the newly revived "cold war" policy of the reactionaries which most gravely threatens the cause of peace is the subversive activity directed by organs of certain of the Western Powers against the socialist countries. This so-called "activity" has long since assumed the form of unprecedented interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States.

93. Previous discussion has made it abundantly clear that the fascist *putsch* in Hungary was organized with the active participation of influential foreign forces. Facts cited here on this rostrum by the representatives of a number of countries are still fresh in our minds and need hardly be repeated. I should like to stress here only the most important and fundamental aspect of the situation, which is that the fascist underground in Hungary, with outside encouragement, tried to fasten itself on to the healthy national movement aimed at eliminating serious mistakes and distortions in the country's social and eco-

conomic life, to seize control of this movement and to force it to serve purposes inimical to those of the Hungarian people. This, it must be emphatically stated, is the first time since fascism was routed in the Second World War, that we have witnessed a direct and open attempt by the fascist forces which were reconstituted underground, to challenge democracy and take revenge by resorting to arms. It is a situation which calls for the utmost vigilance on the part of those who desire peace.

94. Consider what would have happened if the fascists had prevailed in Hungary. The frightful atrocities committed by the Horthyist followers during the few days when they had the upper hand in the streets of the Hungarian capital are an indication of the fate which awaited the Hungarian people.

95. But Hungary was not the only country concerned. The victory of Hungarian reaction would have meant the emergence of a fascist Government in the very heart of Europe, which would have served as a springboard for the international forces of reaction seeking to revive fascism and re-establish their power all over the continent. Thus, the victory of the counter-revolutionary *putsch* in Hungary would have constituted an extreme threat to peace.

96. We still face many acute international problems, in the solution of which the United Nations has an important role to play. Foremost among them are the problems resulting from the aggressive attack by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt. It is the solution of these really urgent problems that requires the attention of the General Assembly, and in such a time of stress it is the more regrettable that this forum should have been the scene of base "cold-war" manoeuvres such as the attempt to falsify the essence of the "Hungarian question" and use it as a pretext for interfering in the internal affairs of Hungary.

97. I should like now to take up the problem of disarmament. Our primary responsibility consists not only in helping to wipe out the dangerous breeding-ground of war in the Near East, but in establishing conditions which will preclude the possibility of a renewal of such conflicts in the future. Mankind rejects the path of war and does not wish to live a quasi-military life. It calls for a serious effort to re-order international relations in such a way as to ensure a truly lasting and stable peace. It longs to see the day when air-raid sirens will not disturb children in their sleep, when everyone will be able to reap the magnificent fruits of scientific progress and enjoy the blessings of contemporary civilization. We support any practical measures that serve the cause of peace. What we need, however, is no temporary patching up of the edifice of peace, but a fundamental solution of the problems that agitate mankind.

98. The Government of the USSR wholeheartedly seeks to secure a radical improvement in international relations. Today, when, as recent events have shown, aggressive circles in certain countries are prepared to plunge the world into the abyss of a new world war to further their own selfish interests, the Soviet Government repeats its solemn and fervent appeal to all peace-loving nations, all true champions of peace, to intensify their resistance to the intrigues of aggression and reaction and to display resolution and firmness in strengthening international peace and security.

99. The most urgent problem, which is of decisive importance for the strengthening of peace, is disarmament. It is the key to a radical improvement in the whole international situation. We must firmly reject any theory

according to which a lasting peace can result from a balance of power between great nations armed to the teeth. This theory underlies the policies and strategic plans of the Governments of a number of large Western countries. It determines the scale and tempo of the armaments race and dictates some countries' approach to international relations and to the United Nations. It inspires the strategy and tactics of the "cold war" and breeds contempt for the cause of true international co-operation.

100. Consider the prospect offered to mankind by elevating rivalry in the armaments race to the status of a principle. With such rivalry, which by its very nature excludes any limitations, there can be no question of a balance of power. Where the principle of rivalry in the armaments race, and, more particularly, in atomic weapons, operates, the possibility of a stable balance of power is excluded, and is replaced by a balancing on the "brink of war" if I may use an expression popular in the United States.

101. It is quite plain that such balancing requires a particular psychological environment. It is no accident that prominent advocates of a policy "from a position of strength" still include in their arsenal of weapons, every kind of intimidation of other countries, or that they still sow the poisonous seeds of fear and mistrust. In support of the so-called "general, global plan for the struggle against communism" United Kingdom Field Marshal Montgomery declares: "It is not easy to maintain solidarity, if there is no fear." He is echoed by General Gruenther, the former Supreme Commander of the armed forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization who says: "In view of the Soviet policy of co-existence the danger has arisen that the fear that gripped the public in the past, may disappear." As you see, those who advocate a policy "from a position of strength" require the element of fear.

102. Only in the unhealthy atmosphere of an artificially fostered fear can the taxpayers be made to pay out vast sums for armaments, only so can the globe be ringed by a network of military blocks and war bases. During the seven years that NATO has existed, its organizers have spent \$364,000 million on war preparations! \$364,000 million! This means that the policy "from a position of strength" has cost each family in the member countries of NATO an average of \$3,274.

103. Anyone seriously concerned about the future of mankind, and earnestly desiring to create a system of guarantees for a lasting and stable peace, must admit that the pseudo-realistic theory of a balance of power based on rivalry in the armaments race is worthless and cannot give mankind confidence in the morrow. It completely undermines the very idea of creating an effective system of international security based on trust and co-operation.

104. You know that the Government of the Soviet Union has recently [17 November 1956] placed before the whole world a most important statement on disarmament [A/3366] and the lessening of international tension. This statement contains in particular new proposals for disarmament, for the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons including the prohibition of tests with such weapons and the establishment of effective control to ensure compliance with these measures. The new Soviet proposals correspond to the vital interests of all mankind and constitute a great constructive contribution to the true consolidation of peace. I call upon the General Assembly to consider them with all the attention they deserve.

105. The Soviet proposals, in the first place, raise the question of a substantial reduction of armed forces and armaments during the next two years. They provide that within that period the armed forces of the Soviet Union, the United States and China should be reduced to 1 to 1.5 million men each; those of the United Kingdom and France to 650,000 men each; and those of the remaining countries to 150,000 to 200,000 men. Our proposal is that this should be done progressively. As a first step in this direction, the armed forces of the USSR, the United States and China should be reduced to 2.5 million men each, and those of the United Kingdom and France to 750,000 men each, during the first year in which the Soviet Government's proposals are put into effect.

106. The Government of the Soviet Union also proposes that effect should be given to the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons within two years. By this we mean that States should stop producing nuclear weapons and prohibit their use, and at the same time completely destroy their stock-piles of such weapons and remove them from their armaments.

107. I particularly wish to call your attention to the fact that under the Soviet Government's proposals the immediate cessation of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons is the first step on the road to prohibition of these weapons. There is no reason whatever why this proposal should not be carried out, particularly as it is not linked with any system of control, since any kind of explosion on any scale and in any part of the globe is immediately recorded and detected by modern scientific establishments, which have the necessary equipment for this purpose. For this reason, as the Soviet Union has repeatedly emphasized, the proposal can be carried out at once, and this would give all peace-loving peoples the assurance that the cause of disarmament is at last beginning to move forward.

108. The Soviet Government's proposals also deal with the very urgent question of the stationing of armies on foreign soil and military bases outside national frontiers.

109. You are aware that in accordance with certain international obligations the armed forces of the USSR are at present stationed in the territory of four countries: the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Hungary and Romania. You will also be aware that the Soviet Union has already liquidated all its foreign military bases.

110. The United States, on the other hand, has armed forces in Western Germany, France, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Italy, Morocco, Libya, Japan, South Korea, the Philippines and other countries. According to far from complete information published in the Press, there are no less than 100 United States air bases abroad, twenty of them in the United Kingdom, eighteen in Japan, twelve in the Federal Republic of Germany, eight in France, six in Morocco, five in Canada, five in South Korea, and five in that part of Chinese territory occupied by the United States armed forces (the Island of Taiwan). There are also United States air bases in the territories of Spain, Turkey, Greenland, Greece, Philippines, Iceland, the Azores, Libya, Saudi Arabia and so on. There are also United States bases in foreign countries, such as Italy (three bases) Japan (three bases) Philippines, Western Germany, Spain, Greenland, Morocco, Liberia, Canada, Bermuda, Trinidad, South Korea and others. And then we are told that this is done in the interests of defence or self-defence.

111. The United Kingdom, too, maintains a considerable number of armed forces on foreign soil. In particu-

lar, United Kingdom forces are known to be stationed in Western Germany, Libya, Egypt, the Bahrein Islands, Japan, South Korea, and so forth. French forces are stationed in Western Germany, Tunisia, Morocco, Libya, Cyprus, Egypt, and elsewhere.

112. It is self-evident that the existence of armies and military bases on foreign territory is one of the sources of international tension. The Soviet Government proposes that in the course of 1957 the armed forces of the United States, the USSR, the United Kingdom and France on German territory should be reduced by one-third and this reduction should be controlled in appropriate fashion. Simultaneously, the armed forces of the United States, the United Kingdom and France in the territories of the NATO countries and those of the USSR in the territories of the Warsaw Treaty countries should be considerably reduced. In the course of two years, all foreign naval and air bases on the territories of other States should be liquidated.

113. In addition, we assure the leaders of the Western Powers that as soon as they withdraw their armies from Western Germany and liquidate their military, naval and air bases on foreign territory, we shall at once and without delay withdraw all our armies from those countries in which they are now stationed under the Warsaw Treaty. These armies were dispatched to their present stations under reciprocal agreement with the Governments of the socialist countries, and the question of their continued presence will be decided by these Governments in accordance with the principles laid down in the Soviet Government's statement of 30 October 1956. In accordance with the programme I have described, State military expenditure must be appropriately reduced. This will of course have a most beneficial effect on the people's living standards.

114. The Western Powers have always regarded, and still regard, the organization of effective international control to ensure the implementation of appropriate disarmament measures as a stumbling block on the road to disarmament. It is common knowledge that the Soviet Government has more than once made far-reaching proposals to ensure strict and truly international control. To prevent a sudden attack by one State on another, the Soviet Government, in particular, has proposed, and is still proposing, that control posts be established in the various countries on a reciprocal basis, at large ports, railway junctions, motor highways and airfields. These posts would be to ensure that no dangerous concentration of armed forces and armaments occurs.

115. While not rejecting this proposal in principle, the representatives of the Western Powers, and particularly of the United States, have so far usually countered it with the so-called "Open Skies" plan, i.e., the plan for mutual aerial inspection. The Soviet Government has repeatedly pointed out that this proposal is far from solving the problem of disarmament control and is not capable of preventing aggression. Since, however, the Western Powers have made acceptance of their proposal *sine qua non* for any agreement on disarmament, thus creating a dead-lock, the Soviet Union has decided to take an important new step to meet its partners halfway.

116. The Soviet Government has stated that it is prepared to consider the question of employing aerial photography within the area of Europe in which the principal armed forces of the North Atlantic bloc and of the Warsaw Treaty countries are stationed. As you already know from press reports, the Soviet Union proposes that aerial photography should be carried out to a depth of 800 kilo-

metres east and west of the demarcation line between the aforementioned armed forces. The implementation of this plan would of course be subject to the consent of the States concerned.

117. The Soviet Government considers that all these measures, so important in themselves, can and should serve as a point of departure for the complete liquidation of armed forces and armaments of all types so that States would retain only such contingents of militia (police) as are necessary to maintain internal security and protect their frontiers.

118. The USSR, desiring to give peoples the confidence that arms will never be used for the settlement of disputes between States, once more proposes the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the countries of the North Atlantic Alliance and the countries participating in the Warsaw Treaty. Such a pact, considering that the participants would include the Soviet Union and the United States, that is countries which possess the most powerful armed forces, would result in radical changes in the entire international climate and would help to lessen international tension and to create confidence between States. Such is the broad and yet realistic programme of action proposed by the Soviet Union.

119. I know that the reactionary propaganda machine will once again put forward its usual argument—that this is bolshevik propaganda. Whenever we propose genuine, specific and carefully considered plans, we are told by persons who do not wish to act upon these plans that they are propaganda. Yet what prevents those making such assertions from finding out whether this is in fact propaganda or a firm determination on the part of the peoples of the Soviet Union to really bring disarmament about? Let us make the attempt.

120. The question arises, where and how should this programme be considered and the necessary decisions worked out. The Soviet Government considers that efforts to solve these problems should be continued in United Nations bodies. Yet the present international situation calls for the immediate adoption of measures to prevent war and terminate the armaments race. Bearing this in mind, the Soviet Government supports the proposal made by the President of the Swiss Confederation to convene a conference of the Heads of Government of the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and India. Such a conference could facilitate the reaching of agreement on disarmament questions. Moreover, the success of this conference could pave the way for a broader conference in which the Heads of Government of all States parties to NATO and the Warsaw Treaty could take part. This broader conference should also be attended by the Heads of Government of a number of other countries, and especially the People's Republic of China, India, Yugoslavia, Indonesia and Burma, which are not parties to any military groupings.

121. In the words of the Soviet Government, the world now has a choice between two paths: the path of discontinuing the "cold war", renouncing the policy of "positions of strength", disarmament and the creation of all conditions for the peaceful coexistence of States with differing economic and social systems, or continuation of the armaments race, continuation of the "cold war"—a path leading towards a war unparalleled for its hardship and destructiveness. There is no third course. In the USSR Government statement of 17 November 1956 occurs the following:

"The Soviet Government has always maintained and still maintains that there are no such controversial

problems in the world as could not be settled peacefully, with due regard for the legitimate interests of the countries concerned. As to the existing ideological differences, they cannot serve as a reason for the aggravation of relations between States, for war propaganda, and especially for the use of force by one State against another. Such differences can and must be resolved through a struggle of ideas in which the advantages of this or that ideology or this or that economic system will be demonstrated by the very course of historical development." [A/3366]

From this august rostrum I urge you to support the proposals submitted by the Soviet Government, the implementation of which will radically change the whole international atmosphere, eliminate the threat of another world war and strengthen international peace and security.

122. I am approaching the end of what I have to say. Any analysis of the present tasks of the United Nations would be incomplete without a reference to the grave economic problems which preoccupy the minds of millions of people in all countries of the world. The Soviet Union is in favour of active economic co-operation on a world-wide scale, in the interests of all nations. Differences in the social systems of countries cannot and should not hamper this co-operation. In contrast to the "Let us arm!" slogan of the North Atlantic bloc, we advance the slogan "Let us trade".

123. The grandiose programme for the development of the national economy of the Soviet Union, described in the sixth Five-Year Plan, offers most favourable opportunities for expanding economic relations with other countries. The People's Republic of China and other socialist countries offer enormous opportunities for the expansion of international trade. These relations can, of course, be developed only in strict compliance with the principles of equality and mutual advantage, without any discrimination.

124. It is generally admitted that the United Nations and its economic bodies are not yet giving questions of international trade the attention they deserve. Moreover the illegal decision of 1950 [*resolution 500 (V)*], imposing an embargo on trade with the People's Republic of China has not yet been revoked and certainly hampers the development of sound international economic relations. The Soviet delegation intends to submit to this session a proposal for the establishment of a world trade organization to function within the framework of the United Nations. This new body will be able to draw on the valuable experience acquired by the regional economic commissions, the Economic Commission for Europe, the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, and the Economic Commission for Latin America.

125. There is also an urgent need for a thorough discussion and an agreed solution of the most pressing economic problems connected with the expansion of international economic co-operation. In this connexion the Soviet delegation is submitting a proposal to convene a world economic conference in 1957 to which all countries will be invited, whether they are Members of the United Nations or not. This economic conference could, for example, discuss the following problems: (a) a further expansion of world trade and the establishment of a world trade organization within the framework of the United Nations; (b) international economic co-operation to promote the formation of independent national economies in under-developed countries; (c) international credit and finance problems. A world economic conference would undoubtedly further expand interna-

tional economic relations and strengthen international co-operation.

126. The outstanding event of our time is the great process of liberation and regeneration of the peoples of Africa and Asia. During the past ten years more than 1,250 million people—almost half the world's population—have embarked upon the path of independent national advancement. The Bandung Conference of African and Asian countries [April 1955] has shown the whole world not only that the relative importance of the nations of the East in international affairs has increased immeasurably, but also that they play a very important part as a factor of peace, and as champions of peaceful co-operation among equal nations.

127. Yet colonialism is still far from dead. A number of countries have the status of colonies or semi-colonies. Even States which recently achieved their independence are constantly coming to grips with various forms of colonialism. Surely the war being waged by French armed forces against the people of Algeria, the Netherlands occupation of part of Indonesian territory (West Irian), the *de facto* occupation by United States armed forces of an integral part of the territory of China (the island of Taiwan) or Portugal's refusal to liberate the Indian territory of Goa, are all manifestations of colonialism. There are also other forms of colonialism which adapt themselves to circumstances and make increasing use of camouflage tactics, devising "consortiums", "associations" and other allegedly "non-political" forms of colonial expansion.

128. We cannot but agree with Mr. Sukarno, the President of Indonesia, who recently stated that in this age: "there can be no final peace or security until the last vestiges of colonialism have been swept into the ash can of history along with fascism, feudalism, slavery and other rubbish of the ages". Indeed, colonialism poisons the international atmosphere, breeds antagonism and hostility among nations and sows the seed of hatred and war. The elimination of the outdated system of colonialism has become a pressing historical need.

129. The United Nations cannot disassociate itself from the great process of the liberation of colonial peoples. At this session of the General Assembly we are called upon to consider and solve a number of pressing problems affecting the vital interests of peoples who do not as yet enjoy the right to self-determination and who are struggling to free themselves from the colonial yoke. I should in particular like to refer to the question of prolonged periods of trusteeship over a number of territories. Up to the present time the United Nations has merely stood by and watched how Member States of the United Nations, administering various Trust Territories, violate the obligations they assumed under the United Nations Charter. As is known, organs of self-government have not even been established in some territories and to all intents and purposes the indigenous inhabitants are excluded from the administration of territories. Certain Powers have a very peculiar conception of the right of trusteeship; for example, they carry out tests of atomic weapons in Trust Territories and thereby expose the local inhabitants to serious danger. Moreover some countries are taking measures leading to the annexation of Trust Territories. We can discern an obvious trend towards imposing the colonial yoke more firmly and increasing colonial dependence in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter.

130. The United Nations General Assembly could here and now decide to fix specific time limits, as short as

possible, on the expiry of which the peoples of all Trust Territories would be granted independence. Trust Territories should even now be given the right to send observers, representing the local administration and elected by the people, to the United Nations.

131. One of the important current problems is how the economic development and industrialization of under-developed countries are to be ensured and how the economic gap between these countries and highly-developed industrialized States can be closed as soon as possible. United Nations bodies are discussing the question of setting up a special fund for the economic development of under-developed countries. The Soviet delegation considers that this measure is completely justified and feels that the question should be solved without delay. The Soviet Union is prepared to participate in a fund of this kind.

132. The Soviet Union deems it necessary not only to participate in United Nations efforts to assist the under-developed countries but also to co-operate with them on a bilateral basis. The USSR is in practice already co-operating with a large number of States on the basis of complete equality and mutual benefit. Furthermore, at the present time the Soviet Union is assisting other countries in the construction of several hundred industrial enterprises and has granted them long-term credits amounting to 25,000 million roubles on the most favourable terms. In doing so the USSR does not seek concessions or a share in profits, it does not impose conditions inconsistent with the sovereignty, national interests and dignity of countries, and it does not ask for political or military advantages in return for its assistance.

133. The present international situation makes exceptionally high demands on the United Nations. We should use and exploit the great opportunities offered by the United Nations which are, unfortunately, far from being used to advantage. In this connexion I should point out that the Soviet people, like all peace-loving peoples, once again express their profound indignation that through the fault of a certain group of States the question of the representation in the United Nations of that mighty world Power, the People's Republic of China, has not been settled at this session either. The fact that the Indian proposal [A/3338] to place this question on the Assembly's agenda was rejected indicates that forces are at work within the United Nations trying to prevent it from assuming the role in international affairs which belongs to it under its Charter. It still remains our primary and fundamental duty to rectify the monstrous injustice as a result of which the legitimate representative of China with its 600 million inhabitants is absent from this Assembly. We are not concerned solely with the respect due to the inalienable rights of the People's Republic of China. We are concerned just as much with the respect due to the fundamental principles and prestige of the United Nations. It is time to put an end to this injustice.

134. Statesmen of different political beliefs, faiths and philosophies are assembled here in this hall. In this respect the composition of the United Nations is a real cross-section of the world. Yet notwithstanding all the differences between these States and peoples, whose representatives are assembled here, they have all recognized the principles of the United Nations Charter. This means that while certain factors divide these States and peoples, other more important ones must unite them. We all live on one and the same planet which cannot be divided into isolated parts. In other words we must live in harmony with each other and persevere in our search for the path of peaceful and fruitful co-operation in the interests of

mankind as a whole. The solution of this problem naturally requires great efforts. Yet since we have such a lofty goal to attain, nothing should deter us.

135. What do the peoples want and expect from us? What mandate have the representatives assembled here received from the hundreds of millions of people inhabiting Europe and America, Asia, Africa and Oceania? These peoples, speaking in different languages, have submitted to us a single imperative demand—give us a stable peace, do away with the spirit of hostility and mutual distrust in international relations, and make sure that mankind can work in undisturbed peace. Let us therefore eliminate every obstacle that stands in the way of an improvement in the international situation and hampers the United Nations in the proper fulfilment of its high mission.

136. Mr. FIGL (Austria):¹ Permit me first of all to express to Prince Wan Waithayakon in the name of the Austrian delegation cordial congratulations on his election to the Presidency of the eleventh session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

137. It is now almost ten years since Austria applied for admission to the United Nations. There can be no doubt that this long period of waiting was caused by the tensions between East and West, by the cold war whose fronts were spread across our country. A favourable constellation of the world political situation and the efforts of Austrian diplomacy to turn this to account finally made possible, after about 360 meetings had taken place in vain, the conclusion of the Austrian State Treaty and the re-establishment of a free and independent Austria. This event, so significant for our country, had also been taken as a symptom of relaxation of tension between the two great Power blocs, a relaxation which was, in the last analysis, the determining factor in the admission of Austria and other States to the United Nations. After almost twenty years of isolation, it is now again possible for the country on the Danube to make its voice heard in the forum of world opinion and to co-operate in the realization of the goals of this community of peoples.

138. The long occupation to which our country had to submit prompted us to reorient our foreign policy and to formulate it with the utmost precision. During that period, it became clear to us that the removal of foreign occupation troops from Austria would be achieved only in the wake of a general international softening of antagonisms. The recognition of this fundamental truth made it clear to us that two maxims would constitute the bases of the new Austrian foreign policy: first, our neutrality, which will keep us out of any sort of military alliance; second, intensive co-operation within the framework of the international community of States, with all the means at our disposal, for the maintenance of peace. In practical application, these principles mean permanent neutrality, and at the same time dedication to active international co-operation on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations. The Austrian Parliament laid down these two principles in a solemn declaration last year and, in its session of 26 October 1955, established the basic policy for our future relations with the rest of the world in a law in the Federal Constitution concerning Austria's neutrality.

139. Permit me to examine these two fundamental principles of our foreign policy more closely. Austria's neutrality consists in the obligation never in the future to enter into any military alliances and not to permit the

establishment of military bases by foreign Powers on its territory. The concept of Austrian neutrality does not include ideological ties. Neutrality binds the State only, and not the citizen. The right to free expression of opinion and freedom of the Press are guaranteed in the Austrian Constitution. The Austrian people has given clear proof during the past ten years that the principles contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are to them not merely words, but a binding obligation.

140. Our permanent neutrality is not an international statute dictated to us from outside. It is a foreign policy chosen by the Austrian people in a free and self-reliant decision. Our neutrality is also not an end in itself, but a means to an end. This end, which was expressly adhered to in the Federal Constitutional law referred to, is the maintenance of our independence and the inviolability of our territory. The corollary of neutrality is the will to maintain it and to defend it with all available means. Our neutrality is therefore an armed neutrality. Should our freedom be attacked, we shall know how to defend Austria's borders. Neutrality for us is dedication to law and justice, and rejection of force and violence.

141. Participation and co-operation within the frame of the international community of States forms the second basic principle of our foreign policy. The highest goal of the United Nations is the assurance and maintenance of world peace, and the elimination of disputes likely to lead to a breach of the peace. The United Nations has done valuable work in this field. It has achieved the localization of incidents in such a way that they have not kindled a world conflagration. The stronger the authority of the United Nations becomes, the better it will be possible to preserve the peace of the world. In the political field, it is difficult to find a common denominator, to eliminate resentments held over from the past and, in spite of manifold common interests, to achieve concerted action. For this reason, the activity of the United Nations must be judged not only in the light of results obtained but in a larger perspective, and from the standpoint of what the world situation might be today if this forum had not been in existence.

142. This year's General Assembly of the United Nations takes place in a time significant to world history. Anxiety and fear of the demon of war have once again possessed the human race, and today the world looks to this community of nations, in which all its hopes are placed. Will it justify the confidence of the peoples of the earth and assure and preserve peace and order, bread and work? Time presses and we must have effective actions instead of ineffective words.

143. Austria, situated as it is in the heart of Europe, has throughout its long history regarded mediation and conciliation as its mission. We have done this again only recently. The events in Hungary led the Austrian Federal Government to appeal to the Government of the Soviet Union as early as 28 October 1956 to co-operate in ending hostilities and bloodshed. We have done this under strictest adherence to our neutrality. I should like to give special emphasis to this fact in view of allegations regarding arms shipments to Hungary. The Austrian Government has not found a single case of such shipments having crossed the Austrian border into Hungary. These and similar allegations, from whichever side they may come, must therefore be rejected as unfounded.

144. From the very beginning we have tried to render aid to Hungary and to fulfil our humanitarian neighbourly duties. It was for this reason that the Austrian delegation submitted on 9 November 1956 a draft resolution [A/3324] under Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter,

¹ Mr. Figl spoke in German. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

which was adopted by the General Assembly, to carry out through the United Nations a large scale relief programme of providing medicine, food and clothing for the Hungarian people.

145. The readiness to help shown by the Austrian people, the readiness to help manifested by the whole world, may serve as a reminder to the conscience of statesmen that human beings are of good will, and that it is the task of those responsible to put this will into action. Nearly 50,000 refugees from Hungary have already sought asylum in Austria, and more are arriving daily. The forced migrations of peoples during the twentieth century, which are to be ascribed to the suppression of the freedom of the individual and of whole peoples, certainly do not contribute to the honour and the good name of this so-called century of progress.

146. Since the end of the Second World War, 800,000 refugees have crossed the Austrian borders; 130,000 of these refugees are still being cared for by the Austrian Federal Government in accordance with the Geneva Convention. For us Europeans, the tragedies of these poorest of the poor, who have lost their homes, are still very much alive in our memories. The suffering and want of these homeless people who, despairing of humanity, have wandered along the highways still weigh heavily upon us. And now thousands of human beings are again in flight into Austria.

147. There is much eagerness to help, and I should like to thank the United Nations for its effective support. I also appeal to the members of this community of peoples to give shelter to these refugees suffering from want and hunger, to admit them without bureaucratic formalities and without first examining them for their various qualifications, and to heed no other law than that of humanity, thereby assisting Austria in discharging its heavy burden. The cost of giving adequate care to the refugees is formidable. I therefore appeal to all representatives here to urge their Governments to assist Austria in discharging this task.

148. Austria is also devoting great attention to events in other continents and hopes that all those responsible will translate into reality the good intentions of this world forum, will follow its advice, and will subordinate their own interests to the interests of all. All the questions disturbing the world today can be solved if the principles of the Charter of the United Nations are transformed into action, if human rights are respected, and if the right of self-determination is truly granted to the peoples. Problems of a local character between individual States should be settled by agreements in the spirit of the United Nations. Such agreements, if they are observed in letter and in spirit, will contribute to peace and will promote good relations among neighbours. By no means the least of the problems which are relevant in this context is that of the minorities.

149. The present age has been called the age of atomic energy. There can be no doubt that the release of the power of the atom contains dangers. Fortunately, in recent months it has been possible to implement measures, within the framework of the United Nations, guaranteeing the peaceful use of this tremendous energy. I assure the Assembly that Austria will participate actively in these efforts and that Austria is prepared, in the spirit of the decision taken by the Conference on the Statute

of the International Atomic Energy Agency held in October 1956, to facilitate in every way the establishment of the headquarters of the future International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna.

150. On Human Rights Day, the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra—one of the oldest orchestras in the world—will give a concert in this very hall. Through that concert, Austria will give expression to its solidarity with the United Nations. We consider ourselves fortunate to be able to give that expression of solidarity in our own special language in this hall of peace. Music binds people together. May the harmony of the orchestra serve as a symbol and a guiding rule of action for the representatives of peoples, who here represent the world. It is not by one instrument, but by all the instruments together, that unity and harmony are produced.

151. May the representatives of peoples in the United Nations also speak a language expressing a sense of justice for all, and may the great Powers of this community be mindful of the fact that true harmony may be achieved only when all work together and that only thus may a peaceful world be built.

152. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I appreciate this opportunity to speak for a few minutes under my right of reply. I do so to reply to three statements which the Soviet representative made concerning the United States, and I shall take them up in the order in which he made them.

153. The Soviet representative referred, and most inaccurately, to the number of United States overseas bases. He did not mention the large number of bases of the Soviet Union located in the Soviet Union and in the satellites. He would apparently have us believe that if one has to cross some water to get to a base, that is somehow very wicked, whereas there is something inherently beneficent in a military activity which is territorially contiguous, as in Hungary, for instance. Clearly a base which is territorially contiguous can be a greater menace to peace and a greater source of tension because it is closer to the basic sources of military power. That is a truth which he did not mention.

154. My second point is this. We are glad that finally the Soviet Union admits that aerial photography of military installations can have value. We felt sure that eventually this would happen, and we sincerely welcome this evidence of acceptance of the idea. But we should also set down that the proposal to use it in Europe only is not what we proposed. The United States asked that it be used over the United States and over the Soviet Union. We still think that this is the way it should be done, that it should be where the principal sources of military power are. That is what would give it its value. In fact, the Soviet reluctance to do this will inevitably cause questioning as to what it is in the Soviet Union that they want so much to conceal.

155. My third and final point is the following. It is a flat untruth to say that United States forces are conducting a *de facto* occupation of Formosa. The Government of the Republic of China is in full control of all of Formosa, as the world knows. When I hear the Soviet representative make such a fantastic misstatement, I can only conclude that his reason has been swamped by the tragic events to which his Government is a party.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.