

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ELEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



PLENARY MEETING 597th

Tuesday, 27 November 1956,
at 10.30 a.m.

New York

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 66: Question considered by the first emergency special session of the General Assembly from 1 to 10 November 1956 (continued)	345
Agenda item 9: General debate (continued)	350
Speeches by Mr. Belaúnde (Peru) and Mr. Louw (Union of South Africa)	

President: Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON
(Thailand).

AGENDA ITEM 66

Question considered by the first emergency special session of the General Assembly from 1 to 10 November 1956 (continued)

1. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (translated from Russian)): At first glance it might seem as if the discussions on the Egyptian problem were closed, with resolutions adopted and little need for further speeches. But that only seems to be so. The stark fact remains that the armed forces of the United Kingdom, France and Israel are still on Egyptian territory and have so far shown no intention of withdrawing. The threat to Egyptian independence has not yet been removed.
2. The eleventh session of the General Assembly is faced with an extremely important task: to put an end to United Kingdom, French and Israel aggression in Egypt, restore peace and tranquillity in the Middle East and prevent the aggressive forces from unleashing a new world war. And it is a fact, harsh but undeniable, that the aggression in Egypt has brought the nations face to face with the threat of a third world war.
3. The course of events has shown that Israel's attack on Egypt was merely the prelude to a preconceived plan for seizing the Suez Canal. The attack was followed by the British-French ultimatum to Egypt and the rushing to the Egyptian shores of armed British and French forces previously concentrated in the eastern Mediterranean.
4. While the representatives of the United Kingdom and France paralysed the Security Council by the use of the veto and prevented it from adopting appropriate measures to put a stop to Israel's aggression, the United Kingdom and France, trampling underfoot the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law, launched their intervention against the independent Egyptian Republic.
5. As regards Israel, meanwhile, the policy of its extremist groups intent on fanning hostility towards the Arabs and crushing them, in reality endangers the cause

of peace and is fatal to Israel itself. It is a policy which is solely in the interests of reactionary groups in the United Kingdom and France anxious to restore colonialism, and contrary to those of all peoples of the Middle East, including the people of Israel.

6. The aggression of the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt has aroused the anger and indignation of all peace-loving peoples, and progressive public opinion throughout the world has pilloried the actions of the aggressors. The overwhelming majority of the people in the United Kingdom and France, too, have expressed their condemnation of the aggression.

7. In common with all progressive mankind, the Byelorussian people expresses its deep sympathy with the Egyptian people in its just struggle in defence of its national independence against the aggressors. In its statement on the armed aggression, the Government of the Byelorussian SSR, voicing the will of the Byelorussian people, condemned the aggressive acts of the United Kingdom, French and Israel Governments as being incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations and a gross violation of the obligations assumed by United Nations Member States and urged the adoption by the United Nations of resolute measures to deal with the aggressors.

8. As a result of British and French sabotage in the Security Council, the question of restoring peace and tranquillity in the Middle East was referred to an emergency special session of the General Assembly convened by a majority decision of the Security Council.

9. You will recall that at its emergency session the General Assembly adopted two resolutions reflecting the views of the overwhelming majority of its Members and urging agreement on an immediate **cease-fire** by the parties involved in hostilities and the withdrawal from Egyptian territory of all United Kingdom, French and Israel armed forces. The three countries disregarded the Assembly decisions. Instead of immediately halting hostilities against Egypt in accordance with the resolutions, the British-French forces continued their operations and occupied part of the Suez Canal.

10. After the General Assembly had adopted the nineteen-Power resolution [1002(ES-I)], that is, after a second United Nations decision on a cease-fire and withdrawal of troops, the British-French forces continued to subject peaceful Egyptian towns and population centres to savage bombardment. As the invasion of the Canal zone proceeded, the destruction of non-military objectives and cultural monuments in Egypt became even more widespread and the toll of victims among the civilian population—women, children and old people included—steadily mounted.

11. The atrocities committed by the aggressive forces are typically described in telegrams sent to various United Nations delegations by social, scientific and cultural organizations in Egypt. For example, the Egyptian Civil Servants' Association and the Associa-

tion of Professors and Lecturers at Egyptian Universities state in a message to the Byelorussian delegation that bombs were dropped on dwellings, public buildings, places of worship, schools and hospitals. The areas concerned, which were bombed indiscriminately, contained pumping stations, electric power plants, private undertakings, telephone exchanges and wireless stations, the message says. These are all in densely populated areas, and the bombing caused heavy casualties among the civilian population.

12. The facts about the terror conducted by the British-French forces in occupied Port Said are universally known. The slaughter of peaceful citizens and the destruction of whole sectors of Egyptian towns are confirmed by photographs distributed by the Egyptian Mission to the United Nations. *The New York Times* of 18 November 1956 has a photograph showing the large-scale destruction of civilian dwellings at Port Said and Port Fuad.

13. The *France-Presse* agency correspondent reported on 14 November 1956 from Amman that the Jordanian parliament had sent a message to the heads of the Arab States who were meeting at Beirut informing them that the slaughter, looting and pillage perpetrated in the Gaza area by the Israel troops and their French and British allies had caused profound alarm among the Jordanian population and calling for the adoption of the necessary measures to end the atrocities and bring about the removal from the Gaza area of foreign troops. The worthlessness of the assurances of the representatives of the colonial Powers of their devotion to the cause of peace and their hypocritical claims to have the freedom and independence of the nations at heart is now obvious to all.

14. To the long list of crimes committed by the British and French authorities against the peoples of Malaya, Kenya, Cyprus, Algeria and other territories and colonies are now added those against the peace-loving peoples of Egypt.

15. The result of the military action by the United Kingdom and France against Egypt, has been, of course, to put out of commission the Suez Canal, that waterway of such prime economic importance for the Arab countries, Western Europe and many other parts of the world. According to a report in *The New York Times* of 17 November 1956, the Canal has been damaged at forty-nine points through the destruction of bridges, sinking of ships, and the like.

16. The aggression by the United Kingdom, France and Israel has caused damage not only to Egypt but to many other countries. The war has closed the Suez Canal to the ships of all the user countries; it has deprived the European countries of the bulk of their Middle Eastern oil supplies and created economic and other difficulties for the aggressors themselves. Governments in European countries are now issuing decrees for rationing petrol and other oil products and imposing other restrictions.

17. The United Nations has shown itself incapable of preventing the occupation of a considerable slice of Egyptian territory by the aggressors. Despite the General Assembly resolutions, the aggressors did not immediately cease hostilities: it was not until 7 November that they announced the cease-fire. The ending of the hostilities is due to the heroic struggle of the Egyptian people and the resolute resistance of all the forces of peace which rallied against the aggressors.

18. These aggressors are now seeking to cloak their action in the authority of the United Nations. They are

trying to use the United Nations to force Egypt, under the pretext of settling the dispute, to accept conditions incompatible with international law and the United Nations Charter.

19. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR cannot allow the authority of the United Nations to be used as a cover for the aggressive acts committed by the United Kingdom, France and Israel. We regard the presence of their armed forces in the sovereign State of Egypt as impermissible. In the meantime, although there is a cease-fire in Egypt, not only is the withdrawal of United Kingdom, French and Israel troops from Egyptian territory being delayed, but armed forces are actually being concentrated in that area, as reported in all United States newspapers. This can only lead to further complications.

20. It will be obvious to the General Assembly that the United Kingdom and French Governments are using every possible shift to remain in the Suez Canal zone.

21. On 23 November [591st meeting], Mr. Lloyd, the United Kingdom representative, announced from this rostrum that British forces would be withdrawn from Egyptian territory "as soon as possible" after the United Nations Emergency Force had arrived and begun to discharge their functions. He deliberately interprets the General Assembly's demand for an immediate withdrawal of the aggressors from Egypt as a justification for the further presence of the United Kingdom armed forces on Egyptian soil. In this way, he avoided giving a clear answer to the General Assembly's question as to the date when his Government would withdraw its forces from Egypt. When will withdrawal take place? Let him name the date!

22. The United Kingdom Government's true intentions are even more openly revealed by Mr. Butler, Acting Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, who said, according to *The New York Times* of 23 November 1956, that Britain "is not prepared to withdraw until we consider this [United Nations] force competent to discharge the tasks which the [General] Assembly has given it to do and these tasks are set out in resolutions for all to read".

23. Judging by all available evidence, the French Government, too, has no intention of withdrawing its forces from Egypt. On 14 November 1956, Mr. Soustelle, the former Governor-General of Algeria, announced at a meeting in Paris that there could be no question of the British-French forces in Egypt leaving their positions to be taken over by international forces which would be smaller than themselves. He could not have put it more clearly.

24. The Government of Israel, for its part, has openly announced its annexationist plans for the Gaza area, the Sinai Peninsula and the Islands of Tiran and Sinafir in the Gulf of Aqaba.

25. In his statement of 23 November [592nd meeting], Mr. Eban, the Israel representative, used every possible argument to justify the intervention of Israel forces against Egypt. He even went so far as to defend and preach, in effect, the doctrine of preventive war—a doctrine totally incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. He, too, failed to give the General Assembly a precise and clear answer as to the date when Israel troops would be withdrawn from Egyptian soil and evacuate the areas seized by them. When will evacuation take place? Let him name the date!

26. Grossly slandering the Arab peoples who are fighting for their freedom and independence, he tried to

mislead world opinion concerning the real reasons for Israel's aggression against Egypt. The United Nations must forthrightly condemn Israel's annexationist plans. We consider that an end must be put to Israel's provocative actions against Arab countries.

27. In his statement of 23 November, Mr. Pearson, the representative of Canada, attempted from this high rostrum to justify before world opinion the aggression committed by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt. It is astonishing, to say the least, to find that after all that has happened there are still representatives willing to shield those who started war against the Egyptian people. What Mr. Pearson's arguments boil down to is that all the Members of the United Nations are responsible for the aggression against Egypt by the United Kingdom, France and Israel. This, I think, is really the limit.

28. Turning to the subject of the United Nations Emergency Force, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR feels impelled to make the following points:

29. Since the Government of Egypt has agreed, in principle, to the introduction of an international police force into its territory, steps must be taken to ensure that they are disposed along either side of the demarcation line between Israel and Egypt as established by the Armistice Agreement. These forces must not be stationed in the Suez Canal Zone, for that would be contrary to the 1888 Convention. The question of the deployment of the international police force and how long it is to stay on Egyptian soil must obviously be decided in definite agreement with the Egyptian Government, and they must obviously not include armed units of States which supported the attack. No doubt the Egyptian representative will speak on this point in greater detail.

30. In any case, the United Nations Emergency Force must leave Egyptian territory immediately the Egyptian Government considers it necessary. It would be impermissible for an international police force to be used as an instrument for putting pressure on Egypt in the general settlement of the Suez problem and the Arab-Israel conflict.

31. The responsibility for the consequences of the aggression against Egypt falls squarely on the Governments of the United Kingdom, France and Israel. We therefore support the equitable proposal that those countries should compensate Egypt for the damage caused through the destruction of Egyptian towns and population centres, the putting of the Suez Canal out of commission and the destruction of Canal installations.

32. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR yesterday [596th meeting] voted against the draft resolution proposed by the Secretary-General for the allocation of a preliminary sum of \$10 million for the maintenance of the United Nations Emergency Force. We consider that the United Kingdom, France and Israel, which perpetrated the aggression against Egypt, should bear the burden of any expenses arising from the maintenance of the Force.

33. It is the duty of the United Nations, under the Charter, to defend Egypt, the victim of aggression, and so justify the hopes which the nations place in it. At the present time, the most important question demanding urgent solution, is the restoration of peace and security in the Middle East, and this requires the immediate withdrawal of the armed forces of the United Kingdom, France and Israel from Egyptian territory, as urged by the Egyptian Government and by the Gen-

eral Assembly resolutions of 2, 7 and 24 November 1956.

34. So long as the armies of the aggressors are in Egypt, there can be no assurance that war will not flare up again. Nor can the United Nations ignore the activities of the United Kingdom, France and Israel who are creating threatening or tense situations on the Israel-Jordan and Israel-Syrian frontiers. In this connexion, I would draw your attention to a report in the Beirut newspaper *Al-Diyar* of 23 November 1956, confirmed by the representative of the Jordanian Government, that five British-French-Israel army brigades are concentrated on the Syrian frontier and forces of much the same strength on the Jordanian frontier. According to information received from the same sources, 150 French aeroplanes have arrived in Israel in addition to the British planes already there. We must insist that such actions as the concentration of armies on frontiers, reconnaissance flights and so on, cease forthwith.

35. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR calls upon the General Assembly to take resolute measures, and not merely formal ones, to defend the freedom-loving Egyptian people and put an end to the aggression against Egypt.

36. Mr. FAWZI (Egypt): I feel it my duty to start my submission today by telling the Assembly of the atrocities committed by the invaders in Egypt and of the tragic plight of the people of Gaza and of Port Said at their hands.

37. I have before me some of the many pictures illustrating these atrocities. With your permission I will read some of them and try to give the Assembly a word-picture of what I see. In this connexion it was claimed that only military targets were hit. So claimed the Governments of the United Kingdom, France and Israel. What about the pictures I now have before me, showing many private homes and cottages right in the middle of Port Said completely destroyed? Are they military targets? And what is there to say about the civilians, including women and children, who have been slaughtered without mercy? Are they also military targets? Was the little girl of Sinai—whose picture most of us saw a few days ago—who had a bullet in her lungs and was sitting beside the dead body of her mother a military target? Was her mother also a military target?

38. These atrocities, together with many other thousands committed by the invading forces—mass destruction, demolition of hospitals and damage to the water and drainage systems in Port Said—must not be left without thorough investigation and without proper retribution and redress.

39. At a moment when Egypt had shown the world in clear outline its full readiness to reaffirm in treaty form its obligations of 1888, guaranteeing for all at all times the freedom of navigation in the Canal, at a moment when, even by the admission of Mr. Spaak in his statement on Saturday [594th meeting], such progress towards the peaceful solution of the Suez Canal question had been made that only a little more effort was needed to accomplish it at this moment of promise and hope the tripartite aggression on Egypt took place. The world was naturally very profoundly shocked and the hour was as dark as it could have been. But then came the dawn—or so it seemed—and, giving expression to the feelings and opinions of mankind, the General Assembly called upon Israel, France and the United Kingdom to withdraw immediately their armed forces from Egyptian territory. This call, although repeated several

times by the General Assembly over a period of twenty-four days, remains unheeded by the three aggressors. Just as they failed to justify their breach of the pact of the Charter and their treacherous attack on Egypt, they have failed just as thoroughly to explain why more than three weeks are not sufficient for withdrawing their armed forces when less than three days were sufficient for getting them in.

40. It was, therefore, natural for the General Assembly to express its deep concern and regret, in its resolution adopted on 24 November 1956, that its previous resolutions calling for immediate withdrawal were still being defied. Until this moment no answer has been given to the Assembly by any of the invaders saying in clear and definite terms that full withdrawal has taken place, or even fixing a date—any date whatsoever—for completion of the withdrawal.

41. Instead of this we read, and not for the first time, that French tanks are being landed in Port Said, that the British are turning around and building up their forces while pretending to withdraw. Atrocities are, of course, continuing in Port Said. I say "of course" because I know they are.

42. To illustrate this, I ask leave to draw the Assembly's attention to a cable I have before me from the United Press which states that, according to the United Press news agency in Paris, a French Defence Ministry spokesman today refused to confirm or deny a British press report that French tanks were pouring into Port Said in a massive new Suez Canal zone build-up.

43. Furthermore, the Socialist newspaper, *Daily Herald* in London reported today that a complete French tank regiment was landed at the Anglo-French invasion enclave at the northern end of the Canal. The paper said it was part of a huge Anglo-French build-up.

44. The British Defence Ministry said that it had no information concerning the report which came from the *Daily Herald* correspondent in Port Said. The General Assembly is obviously entitled to know what is really going on in this respect in Port Said. The Assembly is both duty bound and entitled to ask the representatives of Israel, France and the United Kingdom to come forth and tell it when the withdrawal of the invading forces from Egypt will be completed. If no satisfactory answer, followed by satisfactory compliance, is forthcoming, then the Assembly will be equally duty bound and entitled to consider, with the assistance of the Security Council, measures against the aggressors as stipulated in the Charter: economic measures, military measures, suspension of membership, and expulsion from membership in the United Nations.

45. This is a far cry from the kid-glove and spineless stand which Mr. Spaak on Saturday recommended that the Assembly should take in the face of a violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter which is most disruptive to world peace and security and to its future prospects. In this connexion, I must admit that nothing could remind me more of the danger element than the overflowing bounties of the eloquence of my distinguished and learned colleague, the Foreign Minister of Belgium, Mr. Paul-Henri Spaak.

46. This is distinctly illustrated by the position he chose for himself and his Government when, in shrieking dissonance and glaring contrast with his stand on some other issues, he was so exceedingly meticulous in wanting us all to avoid even a hint at hurting the most delicate susceptibilities of those who have not hesitated to launch upon a series of actions which are most shocking and most humiliating to the United Na-

tions and to the civilized world at large and which have nothing whatsoever to do with the principles and the decencies of the United Nations Charter. This, in turn, is a reminder of the attitudes adopted by a few delegations—luckily only a few—in relation to this most grievous question which the Assembly has before it now.

47. Distinctly erroneous interpretations were given by a few speakers—just a few—of the position taken by the General Assembly in relation to the present crisis. We still believe, however, together with the overwhelming majority of the Members of the Assembly that, among other things, it has been and remains clearly the intention of the Assembly to secure, without any conditions whatsoever, the withdrawal from Egypt of the invading armed forces of France, the United Kingdom and Israel, and fully to respect Egypt's sovereignty.

48. We still believe that the General Assembly resolution of 7 November 1956 still stands, together with its endorsement of the principle that the General Assembly could not request the United Nations Emergency Force to be stationed or to operate on the territory of a given country without the consent of the Government of that country. This is the proper basis on which we believe, together with the overwhelming majority of this Assembly, that the United Nations Emergency Force could be stationed or could operate in Egypt. It is the only basis on which Egypt has given its consent in this respect. Furthermore, it is important to leave no place for any equivocation, not only regarding the basis on which this Force is stationed or operates in Egypt, but also regarding what its functions are and what they are not.

49. Our clear understanding—and I am sure it is the clear understanding of the Assembly—is that this Force is in Egypt only in relation to the present attack against Egypt by the United Kingdom, France and Israel, and for the purposes directly connected with the incursion of the invading forces into Egyptian territory. The United Nations Emergency Force is in Egypt, not as an occupation force, not as a replacement for the invaders, not to clear the Canal of obstructions, not to resolve any question or settle any problem, be it in relation to the Suez Canal, to Palestine or to any other matter; it is not there to infringe upon Egyptian sovereignty in any fashion or to any extent, but, on the contrary, to give expression to the determination of the United Nations to put an end to the aggression committed against Egypt and to the presence of the invading forces in Egyptian territory.

50. In other words, as must be abundantly clear, this Force has gone to Egypt to help Egypt, with Egypt's consent; and no one here or elsewhere can reasonably or fairly say that a fire brigade, after putting out a fire, would be entitled or expected to claim the right of deciding not to leave the house. I would like to submit, in this connexion, that we are in the process of creating quite an important precedent. This being the first time that such a Force as the present one has been established by the United Nations, it is essential that we establish and carefully observe right principles as a basis for its work and relationships. Otherwise, we would, from the very beginning, be casting serious doubts on the whole process and damaging the prospects of continuing in this direction.

51. Another important precedent in relation to clearing the Canal of obstructions might be in the process of being set by the United Nations. I have already referred to this matter in my brief statement to the Assembly when I pointed out, as I am doing again today, that the

failure of the invading Powers to withdraw from Egypt is holding up and delaying the clearing of the Canal, and that we could not possibly conceive of such a clearing taking place as long as those forces remain in Egypt, as long as clashes continue, and as long as there is still a possibility of the recurrence of hostilities.

52. The General Assembly has already been informed by the Secretary-General that during his recent visit to Cairo he discussed this matter with the Government of Egypt, which asked him for United Nations assistance on arrangements for this purpose as a matter of priority, he also informed the Assembly that the Government of Egypt considered that the work should start immediately upon the withdrawal of non-Egyptian forces from Egypt.

53. In regard to this matter, two points require particular attention, the first being the type of relationship between the United Nations and Egypt in this respect. The Government of Egypt requested United Nations assistance in clearing the Suez Canal of obstructions. The United Nations, in its resolution of 24 November 1956, authorized the Secretary-General to proceed with the exploration of practical arrangements and the negotiation of agreements in this regard. It follows from this that the Egyptian Government will assume the work of clearing the Canal of obstructions, with the assistance of the United Nations, in pursuance of the resolution of the General Assembly and of the agreements which would be concluded with the Government of Egypt.

54. The second point relates to the equities, the responsibilities and liabilities resulting from the destruction of installations and property, and from the paralyzing of traffic in the Canal following the aggression committed by Israel, France and the United Kingdom.

55. I hardly have to recall in this respect that, before this mad aggression took place, the affairs of the Suez Canal were being carried on with perfect efficiency. In about the three months during which it was under Egyptian administration, well over 3,000 ships passed through the Canal without mishap and with automatic precision. At the present moment, and maybe indefinitely, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and Israel, are inventing and manufacturing all kinds of pretexts and subterfuges for delaying their compliance with the resolutions of the General Assembly calling upon them immediately to withdraw their forces from Egyptian territory.

56. One illustration of this mischievous escapism is found in the fact that the spokesmen of the three invading Powers are claiming that their Governments are entitled to place conditions upon the withdrawal, while the General Assembly has formulated no such conditions. Their claim cannot be sustained and is devoid, obviously, of any authoritative basis whatsoever.

57. The Secretary-General in his letter written yesterday [A/3395] to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel stated that he would not permit the conditions placed by Israel on the withdrawal of its armed forces to delay, in any way, the withdrawal of these forces in compliance with the unqualified and unconditional demand of the General Assembly.

58. It has also been claimed by France and the United Kingdom that when they invaded Egypt it was really a police action. They have, however, failed and they will continue to fail to show us in what capacity or with what warrant they could assume such a role. Furthermore the British Foreign Minister last Friday [591st meeting] claimed—and we have heard it more than once—that the attack on Egypt was aimed at

stopping a small war from growing into a big one. Can anyone doubt that what has been done and is now being done by France, the United Kingdom and Israel is exactly contrary to what the British Foreign Minister and some of his associates are claiming it to be? Is it not clear beyond a doubt that this British-French-Israel aggression provides an ample illustration of an aggressive action such as might be expected of an outlaw, and that it is in great danger of growing into the mightiest of wars?

59. The British Foreign Minister most cynically expressed his concern and apprehension lest the United Nations be brought into disrepute. Does he really mean to tell this Assembly, and through it the whole world, that what his Government and its associates have been doing is not already shaking and shocking the world, demolishing the foundations of peace, endangering the reputation, indeed the very existence, of the United Nations. The British Foreign Minister furthermore denied any collusion with Israel in this aggression committed against Egypt. We can hardly expect him to confess guilt on the part of his Government. The time will, however, come for investigating all these episodes of the tragedy through which the world is passing, as a result of the irresponsible and completely anti-Charter policy adopted and carried out in the form of aggression against Egypt. When that time comes and when the telling sequence of the closely-knit cycles of the tripartite aggression and the other facts of this crisis are exposed, many of those who are now pleading innocence and painting themselves white will not dare to do so any longer.

60. A thorough and most searching investigation must be made; responsibility must be established and those who are guilty of aggression must be made to pay for it. Wrongs must be righted and redress made. All this is necessary to ensure future peace and to ensure that the prospects of peace are not to be blasted and the dignity, the authority and the effectiveness of the United Nations will not be blown into smithereens. Here again we ask, as indeed we should all ask, when are the atrocities and the humiliations inflicted by the invaders upon our people in Gaza and Port Said going to stop? When is the contemptuous insult to humanity in the shape of continued aggression by France, the United Kingdom and Israel against Egypt going to end? When are the invading armies going to withdraw? With the rest of the world we shall be waiting to receive an immediate answer—we are entitled to one.

61. Mr. SARPEN (Turkey): I wish to place on record the following brief statement. We abstained yesterday [596th meeting] on the resolution contained in document A/3383 (annex)/Rev.1 because my delegation is not authorized to commit the Government of Turkey to the financial implications of the resolution. I must make it quite clear that I reserve the position of my Government in this matter.

62. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): My delegation has heard, as I am sure the rest of the Assembly has heard, the statement made by the Foreign Minister for Egypt quoting the news published in London of the refusal of the Defence Minister of France either to confirm or deny that forces have been landed on the Anglo-French concourse at the northern end of the Suez Canal, as part of an Anglo-French build-up confirming the determination to keep battalions in the area. The British Defence Ministry has said that it has no information concerning the report which it gave to the newspaper correspondent.

63. My delegation, as is its habit and practice in these matters, has no desire to accept this news report as factual but, in view of the history with which we are all familiar, and the way in which invasion has been launched against Egypt, a *prima facie* case has been made out by the Egyptian Foreign Minister in apprising the Assembly of this very serious matter because, if on the one hand, forces are being introduced while, on the other, they are reported to be withdrawn, then the whole purpose for which the Assembly has been striving will be frustrated. Furthermore, the United Nations has sent into this territory under its own authority, units of armies from different countries for the purpose of supervising the withdrawal of non-Egyptian forces and the cease fire.

64. It is the request of my delegation that the Government of France be called upon immediately either to confirm or deny these reports. In making this request I am making no allegation and I lend no support to such reports but, on the other hand, if a matter of this kind has been published, one would hope and expect that the French Minister of National Defence would deny it at once if it is untrue although it can be argued that it is not the business of a Government to contradict every newspaper report.

65. My delegation, therefore, requests that the Secretary-General enter into immediate communication with the Government of France in order to put the mind of the General Assembly at rest in regard to this report because, if the report is false, it is very necessary, in the interests of peaceful developments, that its circulation should be stopped. I make this request and I leave it in the President's hands for a few minutes to find out whether, without a formal motion, this can be done. We have no desire to prolong our proceedings in this matter, and if the Secretary-General would agree to make such a move on his own authority, a formal motion would not be necessary.

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

SPEECHES BY MR. BELAÚNDE (PERU) AND MR. LOUW (UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA)

66. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (*translated from Spanish*): I should like to begin with a few words of cordial welcome to the delegations of the friendly countries which have recently been admitted to the United Nations. We regret the absence of Viet-Nam and Korea. We hope for the unification of these countries and for their early admission to the United Nations. We also regret the unjustified postponement of the admission of Japan; we trust that Japan will take its place among us this year and enrich our membership with its traditional prestige.

67. We cannot resign ourselves to the partition of Germany. Its unification once achieved, that country, with its glorious tradition of Leibniz, Goethe and Kant, should also be admitted to the United Nations.

68. Permit me to address a few brief words to the delegations of Spain, Portugal and Italy, to which we are bound by ties of blood, religion and culture.

69. Spain, the creator of many nations, occupies a place of honour in the United Nations—that *civitas maxima* which was visualized by Vitoria and Suárez, the founders of international law.

70. Mankind is indebted to Portugal for the brilliant achievements of its navigators and explorers, and we

in America are indebted to Portugal for the Brazilian nation, whose progress we follow with pride.

71. The Roman Empire ostentatiously granted citizenship to assimilated peoples. The Italians of today, carrying their traditional culture to all parts of the world, are assimilated into their adopted countries, thus providing an example of a new conception of the universality of mankind, which preserves due respect for the individual qualities of each country.

72. I should also like to pay my respects to you, Mr. President. In your own person you combine the age-old culture of your country with the best features of Western education. Your brilliant career has been crowned by another achievement, the Presidency of the General Assembly. From this position, with skill and wisdom, you are presiding over our meetings at a decisive moment for humanity.

73. I also extend my tribute and heartfelt good wishes to our Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjöld, who has carried our message of justice and peace to the Middle East. We trust that tomorrow he may carry our words of liberty and hope to the people of Hungary.

74. Tension in the individual is caused by the contest between mind and matter; tension in international affairs is caused by the contrast between right and might. The course of civilization has tended to soften this contrast if not to eliminate it. When Europe attained a state of balance, an international order took shape the object of which was to foster good will and honour among nations and which was guaranteed to some extent by the so-called balance of power.

75. It was the tragic destiny of the twentieth century that this system of international relations under law, however imperfect it was, should be destroyed by the First World War. There then arose the desire for a legal system based not on the balance of power but upon strict law and on the rejection of war as an instrument of international policy. After barely fifteen years, an outraged humanity witnessed the revival of the cult of force and the bankruptcy of the organization which was at that time the embodiment of law and order.

76. After an immense sacrifice of life and property, there was reborn in the minds of all men the longing for a universal system of law supported by provision for enforcement action and based upon agreement between the leading Powers which had been the victors in that war. And so the United Nations came into being, the crowning point of our civilization and the focal point of our hopes. All the smaller Powers of Europe and America became Members. In the process of the liquidation of the old colonial system, countries of Africa and Asia became independent, with the co-operation—it must be admitted—of the Western Powers. The countries of Latin America have greeted with enthusiasm the admission of these new nations to this body.

77. However, we must consider the profound, underlying reality beneath the system established by the Charter. Humanity has always lived on two planes: an ideal plane based on law and another plane where the struggle for power has raged with ever-increasing intensity, although in a disguised and underground form. Here we have the classic contrast between raw violence and the dictates of justice.

78. The last war, which was fought to defend the independence of Poland and to protect the right of self-determination of the small countries of Europe, unfor-

fortunately ended with the extension of the power of Soviet Russia to a line which the Czars themselves had never dreamed of, although, paradoxically enough, it had been foreseen by Marx and Engels, men blind to the power of the spirit but keenly interested in the expansion of physical power.

79. It must be frankly admitted that since the Second World War the world has lived in an atmosphere which has been poisoned by this fundamental evil. The might of a great nation, if unchecked by spiritual factors and democratic institutions—and I repeat, it is necessary for it to be checked by both elements, by spiritual or moral factors and by democratic institutions—has an intrinsic tendency to expand. Soviet Russia was not content with extending its influence to the line which runs from Stettin to the Adriatic; it also sought to extend its power into Europe and Asia, it swallowed up the Baltic republics, it attempted to occupy Iran permanently, it helped the Chinese Communist Party by giving it Manchuria, it supported the invasion of the Republic of Korea, it kept afoot a war of subversion in Greece with the hope of extending its influence to the Mediterranean, and it has tried to extend its power to the Middle East. It disturbed the peace and balance of this uneasy region by a policy of encouraging armament, and while playing this dangerous game of power politics it posed as the defender of self-determination in the Mediterranean. At the same time it denied, as it still continues to deny, this right of self-determination to the countries of Eastern Europe.

80. The Security Council was paralysed by the Soviet Union's abuse of the veto. This veto was cast eighty times, and I must recall that when the veto power was approved at San Francisco it was conceived not as a privilege but as the mere statement of a dissent after a *bona fide* attempt to reach unanimous agreement. The Soviet Union refused to co-operate in any way in the establishment of a General Staff for the United Nations and it then obstructed the conclusion of agreements between all the nations and the Security Council, under Article 43 of the Charter, relating to enforcement actions under law.

81. That the United Nations is still alive is a miracle. The only bright spots in the picture are its accomplishments in the economic and technical field and in the protection of children. The loftiness of the purposes of the Organization and the fine principles of the provisions relating to human rights contrast starkly with the brutal conditions under which a considerable part of humanity is living in the largest empire in history, which extends from the Baltic to the Pacific.

82. We read with dismay the recent offer of the Soviet Union on disarmament, an offer in which it states that it could have occupied all Europe if the possibility of using atomic weapons did not exist. This confirms our conviction that the only thing which saved humanity from such a terrible conquest—besides, of course, the heroism of the peoples concerned—was fear of the atomic bomb possessed by the United States. And when the Soviet Union acquired the secret of this invention and the armaments race moved from the field of conventional weapons to that of nuclear weapons, peace was preserved, it is true, but in an unstable and humiliating way, by a kind of mutual fear and hesitation. During this uneasy phase of precarious balance, while total war was apparently being avoided for the moment, Soviet imperialism continued its expansion by waging

a war of subversion, by engaging in political infiltration, by making false promises of economic aid, and by tempting other countries with alluring hopes of aggrandizement to alter the international *status quo*.

83. Fortunately, the United Nations proved equal to its responsibilities and conceived the idea of holding emergency special sessions of the Assembly in cases of failure to act on the part of the Security Council. It organized an international army to defend Korea against aggression, and in every case it adopted resolutions by an overwhelming majority which constituted an appeal to the universal conscience and mobilized the imponderable factor of public opinion. Then gradually and sporadically the international tension began to ease.

84. Unfortunately, there was no frank, noble and decisive change of policy, but only short breathing-spaces which threatened to end at the first favourable moment. In view of the continuation of all these unfavourable factors, and in view of the fact that there was no noble, resolute and straightforward desire to seek peace and agreement, we were not surprised by the tragic crises which rose to confront us both in the Middle East and Hungary—twin crises which the United Nations has met with dignity and justice.

85. So far as the first crisis is concerned, in view of the almost unanimous acceptance of the Assembly's resolution, we should receive, we hope to receive and ask and claim to receive the co-operation of all the Powers concerned. There is a cease-fire. The contingents of the United Nations Emergency Force are arriving like the heralds of a new era; Peru has offered to contribute to these contingents. We impatiently await the establishment of the peaceful atmosphere which is urgently needed before the great problems of the Middle East can be solved. The first of these problems is that of Israel's coexistence with the Arab nations, a coexistence which will be possible if both sides observe the Assembly resolution and remember that in the final analysis their interests and destinies are closely interconnected. The second problem is that of the Suez Canal, concerning which the United Nations has decided on some very effective and helpful principles, such as isolation from political influence and respect for the sovereignty and legitimate interests of Egypt. And I should emphasize that the Charter makes international co-operation mandatory in all matters involving the economic and cultural interests of humanity and the very existence of the peoples of Europe and Asia.

86. However, there is another problem which we have unfairly neglected: the internationalization of the Holy Places. Respect for the three great religions demands internationalization, and we should therefore deal with this matter without further delay. I believe that the effective presence of the United Nations in that area would have provided a guarantee of peace and promoted respect for moral authority and law and order.

87. Turning now to other aspects of the serious problem of the Middle East, I must state here that my delegation fully supports the two draft resolutions which the United States delegation proposed during the emergency special sessions of the Assembly for the purpose of achieving a definitive settlement of the problems of that region. We must face the Middle Eastern problem realistically and in the light of these resolutions. Thought should also be given to the idea of United Nations action to carry out, in co-operation with all countries, an intensive programme of economic devel-

opment and stabilization in that region, which would eliminate the structural factors that seem to have aggravated the crisis there.

88. Since in this case, objective criteria and the lessons of experience coincide with moral imperatives, I believe that if a generous and comprehensive economic policy were worked out, and that if there were large-scale co-operation, in meeting the broad needs of the Middle East, particularly among the Powers which have the economic resources to carry out such a programme, we could invest the peace in that area with an economic stability backed by the guarantees of moral and legal principles.

89. The Soviet leaders, aware that Stalin's policy of brute force had carried their Administration to unimaginable extremes, took the final step of openly repudiating that policy before mankind, a step the consequences of which they themselves were unable to foresee and which must inevitably increase the longing of those peoples for a new system of government based on freedom and democracy and, above all, on national independence.

90. The incipient crisis in Poland was adroitly evaded. In Hungary, however, the crisis was characterized by unprecedented tragedy and violence because the Soviet Union, or more properly the leaders of the Soviet Union, insisted on bending all their energies to maintaining the Stalinist régime in Hungary while tolerating its modification elsewhere. To the horror of the world, the Soviet Union took advantage of the situation in the Middle East to carry out, or attempt to carry out, a new conquest of Hungary. It mobilized a vast army of 200,000 men and 5,000 tanks and attempted to drown in blood one of the finest and most heroic actions in human history.

91. The response, which we must reassert from this rostrum, was one of world-wide protest. From the countries of the north to the countries of the tropics, from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean, all humanity shares in the sorrows and the sacrifices of Hungary.

92. Speaking with incontestable authority, His Holiness Pope Pius XII asked the Soviet Union to heed the world's outcry. In the deeply moving eloquence of his most recent address, the Holy Father appealed to all peoples to unite for justice and peace.

93. Dr. Manuel Prado, the President of the Republic of Peru, acting under the authority conferred upon him by the democratic movement which brought him to power and on the precedent of his Government's participation in the cause of justice in the great war, immediately replied to the message of the Holy Father in these simple words:

"I share the anguish of Your Holiness and, in behalf of the Government and people of Peru, I express my firm, determined and absolute support of your call to the Christian and democratic peoples to unite in securing the restoration of dignity and freedom in Hungary."

The Government of Peru, giving expression to the feelings of the Peruvian people, has offered to admit 1,000 Hungarian refugees.

94. Hungary today is not merely a symbol of the principle of national sovereignty, it is the final and supreme test of the existence of an international system of law. The United Nations cannot silently condone or overlook the existence of a system irreconcilable not only with law but with basic humanitarian principles. We must examine the crime committed in Hungary

and condemn it, we must join together in unceasing protest and we must mobilize world opinion and the moral forces of the world to compel the Soviet Union to allow the establishment in Hungary of a régime worthy of the Charter of the United Nations.

95. In earlier days, the wars waged by national armies, because of the type of weapons used, did not threaten the destruction of the world. There was a whole gamut of situations which could be settled and surmounted. That world no longer exists. Today, as a result of nuclear inventions, we are painfully aware of the impending danger of world destruction. It is in this light, then, that we must consider, in all their ominous consequences, the moves of sectarian international policy and the surreptitious manoeuvres of those who mean to secure expansionist advantages by abusing the good faith and good intentions of nations, while these nations exercise patience in their effort to avoid the catastrophe of war.

96. The conscience of mankind is now rising up against this state of affairs. It has been said—and I have said it here several times—that we small States are as the members of the chorus in a Greek tragedy, impotently watching the approach of destiny with all its tragedy and infamy. But this is not enough: we are unwilling to be mute and impotent witnesses to a tragedy, because we too would be destroyed in such a tragedy. As in the Greek play, all the figures on the stage would be destroyed. This seems to have been overlooked by those who should realize most of all that a spark ignited anywhere in the world can cause a universal conflagration.

97. Since 1946 we have been attempting to work out a plan for the reduction of armaments. According to Article 26 of the Charter this is one of the special functions of the Security Council. In a liberal and generous gesture, the United States was willing, at a time when it had a monopoly of the atom bomb—the history of the year 1946 should be studied in the version of impartial authors—to share it with other Powers, including of course the Soviet Union, with a view to preventing its use except in self-defence or in defence of the principles of the Charter.

98. I shall not at this time recall the sorry history of the opposition offered to the United States gesture by the Soviet Union as it pursued the hope of successfully producing nuclear energy while engaging in a sinister race for power. Every compromise of the Great Powers with the Soviet point of view—and to this I can bear witness, for we have been discussing the matter in the Assembly since 1948—proved to be futile in the face of an evasive policy which one day, by way of an apparent concession, was in agreement with reduction of conventional armaments and the next day turned about and offered unyielding opposition to the supervision and inspection which are indispensable prerequisites not only to the reduction of conventional armaments but to the elimination of the atom bomb. The prohibition of a bomb without a treaty, without guarantees or without controls is a prohibition on paper, it is a prohibition in theory or in the abstract, it is a prohibition merely for propaganda purposes.

99. After long debates and arduous studies and after working actively to carry out the mandate given me by the Assembly when it elected Peru to the Security Council and, by the same token, to the Disarmament Commission, I have reached the following conclusions which I modestly submit to the Assembly: (a) The field of conventional armaments is inseparable from

the field of nuclear weapons. Any action undertaken must be carried out simultaneously in both fields, not only as regards reduction preparatory to prohibition but also, and primarily, as regards inspection; (b) Atomic weapons cannot be prohibited by halting production and destroying stockpiles but by providing for effective inspection and control and by granting decisive powers that cannot be paralysed by the veto; (c) Although the checking of stockpiles is extremely difficult in view of the technical problems involved, negotiations could begin immediately with a view to effecting their destruction on a basis of equality and reciprocity; (d) Aerial inspection cannot be restricted to a specified area, for this would mean that most of Russia and Siberia would still be able to produce and stock nuclear weapons and to erect bases that today, because of effective means of transportation, do not have to be close to the targets against which they are to be used; it is evident that if the bases are eliminated or placed under supervision, in cases where means of transportation are limited, such inspection would be adequate. However, given modern means of transportation and the fact that the targets are always close, inspection must now be total and absolute; (e) In view of the urgency of the situation—and I would draw the attention of the Assembly to this point—it is imperative, even while a general and comprehensive treaty on the reduction of armaments and the elimination of nuclear weapons is being drawn up, that a commission should immediately be formed to exercise control and to prohibit atomic tests. Such a commission would also be responsible for supervising and co-ordinating the complementary Eisenhower and Bulganin plans and for conducting negotiations with a view to achieving, on a basis of equality and reciprocity, a cessation of the production of atomic weapons and the destruction of stockpiles. A supervisory committee of this type would be a kind of watchman or sentry, an advance guard, so to speak, with the function of solving the most immediate problem, that is to say, control of nuclear tests, for we do not know how far the level of radioactivity has risen in some countries. In some countries an increase in radioactivity may not constitute a danger; in other areas, however, even the slightest increase might have fatal results.

100. I do not say that we should commit ourselves to unconditional prohibition, leaving the entire matter to good faith when such good faith is non-existent. Nevertheless, a commission should be set up immediately to control these tests and prevent them from being held, or at least limit their scope. The commission would also have the function of sounding warnings when necessary and it would co-ordinate the Eisenhower and Bulganin plans, since there is general acceptance of the Bulganin plan, that calls for inspection at such key points as railway centres or aerodromes.

101. I think I may say that there is hope that the Soviet Union will accept the Eisenhower "open-skies" plan. For the reasons I have set forth and by virtue of reciprocity, considering that the United States is willing to open its skies unreservedly and absolutely, there is no reason for the Soviet Union to open only 800 miles of sky to inspection while keeping the vast expanses of Siberia closed. Unconditional acceptance of the Eisenhower plan, without reservations, would be the greatest evidence of good faith and co-operation.

102. To be sure, a policy of reducing armaments and prohibiting the production of nuclear weapons must never serve as a pretext—or be used as a concession—

in order to obtain a free hand in matters relating to the sovereignty of nations or to respect for human rights nor in questions bearing on the unification of countries which have been unjustly divided and on free economic co-operation, untrammelled by artificial political barriers and police supervision. The question of armaments must be considered separately and not as something to be decided in terms of a policy designed to maintain the *status quo* in opposition to law and morality. We have said on occasion that peace is indivisible; justice, which is the basis of peace, is also indivisible.

103. We are not trying to establish a new balance of power in order to permit imbalances to occur in the sphere of law. A policy of armaments reduction must go hand in hand with a change in the existing situation in a number of countries, a situation which is the result of circumstances which should never be regarded as permanent.

104. In the very grave situation now confronting us, we are sorrowfully witnessing the disappearance of the traditions of what was known as peaceful coexistence and of all attempts at understanding. Acts of force are linked with intemperate words and threats that augur grave conflicts. It is therefore imperative that the unsettled problems be resolved and that we overcome differences which may exist between peoples which cherish democratic institutions and spiritual values, between peoples who—in respect of religion, morality and law—speak the same spiritual language.

105. The harmony of the West is indispensable and it must be restored. Therefore solutions to existing problems must be reached promptly if this harmony is to become a reality. A necessary concomitant of this harmony will be impartial co-operation with all the peoples of Asia and Africa, who are jealously apprehensive of their independence. Such a course is imperative if we are to survive and preserve human dignity. At the same time, it may be the principal factor in inducing the Soviet Union to change its policy. We have no desire to exclude or isolate the Soviet Union. We want it to be a member of a true brotherhood of man, bound together not only by principles but also by actions.

106. In another debate, the delegation of Peru noted with satisfaction that the Asian and Arab countries condemn the presence of Soviet troops in Hungary. The Peruvian delegation, on the strength of its unexceptionable line of conduct in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, notably in the most recent situation, feels that it is entitled to address an appeal to all those peoples who cannot themselves be the authors of a policy based on power but who can be the victims of such a policy. The only safeguard for the independence and future of these peoples, other than their own heroism, is strict compliance with the principles of the Charter.

107. The Charter is not a mere theoretical pronouncement, less so today than ever before. The Charter and the Organization of the United Nations are living entities and constitute powerful moral realities in our day. If the Organization is zealous and courageous in giving effect to the Charter, the Organization and the Charter will be our strength, our shield and our defence. Collaboration by these Powers in a state based on law and making no distinctions of latitude and longitude is the strongest guarantee against the dangers of tomorrow. Let us not imagine that this guarantee lies in a restoration of the balance of power, let us not cherish dreamy hopes and illu-

sions and let us not place our trust in the false concepts underlying suspicious friendships. The sole guarantee of the independence of small countries lies in their resoluteness, their courage, their sense of justice and their strict compliance with the principles of the Charter. This is why I was deeply moved by the statement of President Eisenhower—who now, his tremendous personal prestige having been reaffirmed in the recent elections, governs the nation which, as foreseen by de Tocqueville, has become the greatest Power on earth—that he cannot conceive of peace except within the framework of respect for the United Nations and the organs of the United Nations.

108. We therefore have an awareness of belonging today to an institution which holds the fate of the world in its hands. But I hope and believe that the leaders of the Soviet Union will realize it too. Let us set aside the legitimate emotion that may go hand in hand with respect for lofty principles of justice and let us appeal to the understanding of realities often demonstrated by the Soviet leaders. I hope they will realize that, in the prevailing mood of the world where spiritual forces have been awakened and where there is unanimous opposition to all methods of force, it is impossible to pursue a policy which is in conflict with the realities. Blind insistence on such a policy will not be accepted with resignation or silence by humanity or even by the conscience of sane elements among the Soviet people. On the other hand, persistence in this policy will open the way for unforeseen developments, for despair and for unprecedented violence.

109. Perhaps the conviction will take root in the minds of some that the determination to die with dignity does not lead to the grave but to victory. Neither the Soviet Union nor any other country can set itself up against all humanity. To yield to humanity would not mean to become weak and to lose repute but to fulfil an imperative duty and to be worthy of the highest honour. Since my youth I have cherished the deep conviction that two things are inseparable in a noble life: duty and honour.

110. Mr. LOUW (Union of South Africa): In the course of my statement on 15 November [577th meeting], when I protested against the inclusion of items 24 and 61 in the agenda of this session of the Assembly, I said that the time had arrived for the Union of South Africa to take stock of its position as a Member of the United Nations. I had in mind more particularly the fact that for the past ten years, in contravention of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter, South Africa has annually been subjected to interference in its essentially domestic affairs—interference, moreover, which generally has been accompanied by violent attacks on successive Governments of the Union and on the European population of South Africa. During the debate on the inclusion of the item, these attacks were repeated—for the eleventh time now.

111. At the conclusion of this statement, I shall announce the action which the Government of the Union of South Africa proposes to take.

112. I do not intend once more to traverse the ground that I covered when I fully set out my Government's objections to the inscription of items 24 and 61. In order, however, to keep the record straight, I must refer to the statement of the leader of the delegation of India [577th meeting]—a statement which, as has so often been the case in the past, contained allegations which were not in accordance with the facts. I do not intend to deal with the Indian representative's allega-

tions regarding the treatment of the Indian and other non-white people in my country, except to deny emphatically and categorically that these people are being oppressed or that they—to quote his words—“live in conditions that are just beyond slavery”. The representative of India has sufficient information in his possession to know that his statement is not true. Not only do I deny his accusations, but I repeat my previous statement—namely, that, generally speaking, the South Africans of Indian origin are materially much better off and far happier than masses in the Indian representative's own country. That is why the South Africans of Indian origin refuse to take advantage of the repatriation scheme arranged between the two Governments in 1947.

113. The Assembly will have noted that the leader of the Indian delegation carefully avoided the legal points relating to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, upon which the South African Government's objection is based. He of course realizes that the Union of South Africa has an unimpeachable case in resisting interference in its domestic affairs. He also realizes—we have produced the proof—that in 1945 the San Francisco Conference decided, by special resolution, that Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter, relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms, could not be used to circumvent Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter—as India has been doing, with, unfortunately, the approval of successive sessions of the General Assembly.

114. The support which, during the past years, has been accorded by the General Assembly to the Indian delegation and its allies is a sad reflection on the extent to which the United Nations has moved away from its own Charter—not only in regard to Article 2, paragraph 7, but also in regard to other fundamental aims and purposes. I shall deal with this subject later.

115. I wish to devote just a few moments to a statement made by the representative of India, to the effect that the South African Government has refused to discuss with the Government of India the settlement of this dispute.

116. What are the facts—facts with which the representative of India is fully conversant? In December 1954, the South African Government, while reserving its position on the question of domestic jurisdiction, took the initiative in making a friendly approach to the Governments of India and Pakistan, respectively, informing those Governments that the Union Government was prepared to discuss this dispute.

117. While the telegrams were being exchanged that are usual in such cases—telegrams relating to the basis for the proposed discussions and other relevant matters—Mr. Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, considered that that was an opportune time to make violent attacks on the Government of South Africa. In two speeches at New Delhi, he said the following, *inter alia*:

“I call upon Russia and the United States to declare their stand on the tyrannical oppression of people of Indian origin in South Africa by the white South African Government.”

To enlist the aid of the Soviet Union in regard to alleged tyrannical oppression is, in the light of recent events in Hungary, distinctly ironical. But I shall let that pass.

118. The Prime Minister of India went on to refer to what he termed “the naked racial persecution being perpetrated by the capitalist white Government of South Africa on African and Indian people”. Not content with

making these baseless charges, the Prime Minister of India spoke of the "dastardly happenings in South Africa". The Prime Minister of India received his education in the United Kingdom; he is well acquainted with the English language; and he knows the meaning of the word "dastardly". He went on to say that "the South African Government should learn some decency".

119. I might add that the Government of India admitted, in reply to a query by the Union Government, that these statements had really been made by the Prime Minister of India.

120. May I remind my fellow-representatives that this attack was made while telegrams were actually being exchanged between the two Governments, in consequence of the South African Government's suggestion that the Governments concerned should get together round a conference table.

121. After this outburst by the Prime Minister of India, the South African Government naturally concluded that the Government of India was not serious about continuing these discussions, and that, in fact, the Prime Minister of India was deliberately trying to wreck the proposals for a discussion which had been initiated by the South African Government. In the circumstances, the South African Government decided that it would be futile to continue with these discussions.

122. In fairness to the Government of Pakistan, I must add that it was in no way to blame for the breakdown of the negotiations. It was, however, not possible to continue the discussions with Pakistan separately, because of the fact that there is complete freedom of religion in South Africa, and no distinction is made between different religious faiths and groups. It is thus not possible to single out the Muslims, who are, moreover, there in a small minority compared with the Hindu and other religious groups. It is also a practical impossibility to determine whether the forbears, the ancestors of persons of Indian origin in South Africa came from those parts of India which now form Pakistan.

123. In the light of this information, I am entitled to ask my fellow-representatives how much value can be attached to the statement of the leader of the Indian delegation that the South African Government has always refused to discuss the matter with the Government of India, or, to quote his own words, that "no such negotiations were forthcoming". I also ask how much value can be attached to his assurance of, I quote his words, India's "desire to live in peace and friendship with South Africa".

124. The leader of the Indian delegation told the General Assembly on 15 November that his delegation has "at all times scrupulously refrained from the use of vindictive, violent or vituperative language". One wonders in what category he places the unsavoury remarks of his Prime Minister, which I quoted a few minutes ago.

125. I commenced by saying that the time has arrived for South Africa to take stock of its position as a Member of the United Nations, in view of the fact that the General Assembly repeatedly has been a party to a violation—I advisedly use the word "violation"—of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, thereby permitting the Government of India and its Soviet and other allies to carry on a vendetta against South Africa.

126. Apart from this interference in South Africa's domestic affairs, this negation—one might say re-

pu diation—of a fundamental principle of the Charter is evidence of what is happening in the United Nations. It shows how far the Organization has wandered from the path clearly defined by its founders, and it shows to what extent the United Nations is developing into an entirely different organization from that conceived and established at San Francisco.

127. It is not only South Africa that must take stock of its position. I suggest that it is in the interests of the United Nations itself, and also of other Member States, particularly the founder States, that they also should do some stock-taking. I suggest that there is also need for serious heart-searching.

128. Let us go back to San Francisco; let us go back to 1945. The founders of the United Nations clearly set out in the Charter the aims and purposes of the new Organization. The United Nations is therein described as "a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations". Article 2, paragraph 1, contains the clear and unequivocal statement that:

"The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members."

129. In Article 1 of the Charter was set out the main objective of the new Organization, the new Organization to which a war-weary world was looking with so much hope and confidence. That objective is:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression . . .".

130. Ten years have passed, and today not only South Africa, but also other Member States and the peoples of the world are asking to what extent the United Nations has carried out the purposes of its Charter, and whether the United Nations has come up to the expectation of its founders and has fulfilled the hopes of those countries, particularly the smaller countries, that in 1945 had hopefully looked to the new Organization as an effective instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security, for the furtherance of international co-operation, and "for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of their common ends".

131. The United Nations had been functioning for only about three years when already there was disturbing evidence that, while the ideals of the founders and the principles of the Charter were being continually and with very much emotion extolled from this rostrum of the Assembly, in actual practice they were being disregarded. As in the days of the ill-fated League of Nations, most Member States, while paying lip-service to the principles of the Charter, were continuing to act mainly in their own national interests or in the common interest of the particular group to which they belonged, or in accordance with the particular ideology to which they subscribed. Recent events have, I think, demonstrated the truth of this appraisal.

132. Amongst the purposes and principles set out in the Charter are "the development of friendly relations among nations" and "harmonizing the actions of nations". When we look back on the past ten years we find that almost since its establishment the proceedings of the Organization, in the Security Council, in the General Assembly, and in the Committees, have only too often been of an acrimonious nature and that the discussions have provided occasions for attack and counter-attack, which have had the effect of exacerbating feelings and causing international tensions, rather than "harmonizing actions" as enjoined in the Charter.

133. I can speak with feeling because, for the past ten years, my country has been the object of baseless accusations and violent attacks both in the General Assembly and in its Committees. Those who were present in the past years at these demonstrations of malevolence and hostility against South Africa, demonstrations which were invariably led by India acting in concert with its Soviet and other associates, will be able to testify that successive South African delegations replied to these attacks in restrained language and endured them with commendable patience.

134. I now turn to another development which was not envisaged by the founders of the United Nations. Soon after the Organization came into existence, various geographical, racial and ideological groups or blocs came into existence. The members of these groups generally act in concert and stand together when votes are taken on certain proposals. The existence of such groups is openly admitted, and they have become part of the structure of the United Nations. You, yourself, Mr. President, in your acceptance speech referred with approval to what has become known as the African-Asian group. With respect, I suggest that a better description would be the Asian and Northern African group.

135. There is something else. One of the contributory causes to the decline and fall of the League of Nations was the extent to which each member State looked to its own national interests when deciding to vote for or against a particular proposal. That attitude is perhaps not an unnatural one; it is in accordance with human nature. But as one who represented my country also at two sessions of the Assembly of the League of Nations, I can testify that the guiding and the compelling motive of self-interest exists to a far greater degree in the United Nations, where it is aggravated by the fact that delegations act not only in accordance with the interests of their respective countries, but, what is far worse, generally act in accordance with the interests of the group of States to which they belong. More often than not, they act in accordance with the decisions of the group caucus.

136. It often happens that delegations reverse their policies and abandon principle in the interest of political expediency. There were outstanding instances of this only about ten days ago. At Geneva the practice of what is colloquially known as horse-trading was also indulged in. But it was never carried on to the same extent as it is in the lobbies and lounges of the United Nations building. It is well known that in regard to many matters delegations record their votes not in accordance with the merits of the issue but as a *qui pro quo* for favours received. It is part of what is known as the horse-trading technique.

137. Then there has been the repeated action of the Assembly in violating Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, the Article which has rightly been described in the past as the cornerstone upon which the edifice of the United Nations rests. I dealt fully with this matter in the debate on the adoption of the agenda, and I do not intend to deal with it further.

138. I now come to what was after all the main purpose of the founders of the United Nations, namely, as set out in Article 1, paragraph 1, of the Charter:

“To maintain international peace and . . . to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression . . .”

This aim of the newly established Organization was further set out in Article 2, in which all Members were enjoined to:

“settle their international disputes by peaceful means . . . refrain . . . from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State . . .”

139. In view of the present difficult and tense situation, I prefer to refrain from commenting on the extent to which, during the past ten years, Member States have or have not acted in accordance with those aims; or have or have not carried out the undertakings which they voluntarily accepted when they signed the Charter, in order to make this Organization an effective instrument for maintaining peace.

140. Coming to more recent events, we all know that, despite the untiring and determined efforts of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Organization has been powerless to prevent the rape of Hungary and the destruction of many of its citizens. We are also painfully aware of the tremendous question mark which hangs over United Nations action in the Middle East. I shall say no more on these problems of the hour, other than to express the opinion that the adoption of temporary expedients is not likely to provide a solution of the troubles, but may tend rather to aggravate the fundamental disease.

141. Looking back on the past ten years of the United Nations and having in mind recent and present happenings, there appears to be good reason for the feeling of disappointment and disillusionment which in most countries is troubling those who looked to the United Nations to bring peace and security to a sorely troubled world. Many people are asking whether the United Nations has not become merely or mainly a forum where Member States can air their grievances, attack each other and conduct their ideological propaganda. They are asking what has become of the professed determination of the founder Members “to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours”.

142. Perhaps the shock caused by recent events may act as a challenge to those Members of the Organization who, in the past, by following the line of least resistance or for reasons of national policy, have permitted the United Nations to drift away from the ideals and objectives of its founders. We can but hope that the psychological effect of the shock will induce a return to the spirit that prevailed at San Francisco in 1945, a return to the Charter as drafted and intended by the founders of the United Nations, and not as later amended by a process of interpretation.

143. We trust that such a hope will eventually be realized. But having regard to the record of the United Nations during the past ten years and bearing in mind our experience during that time and again at the present session, it has become necessary for the Union of South Africa to take stock of this position and to decide where it stands in relation to the United Nations.

144. South Africa is one of the founder States of the United Nations, which was established for the primary purpose of ensuring peace and collective security. South Africa has always endeavoured to play its part in the realization of that objective. May I once more remind the Assembly that when the call came to send military contingents to Korea for the purpose of stopping aggression, South Africa was one of only sixteen Member States to respond to that call, thereby sacrificing the

lives of a number of our gallant airmen, as well as incurring a large financial expenditure. Most of the other Member States—and I think this is a fact we should remember today—ignored this call to resist aggression. Some compromised with their consciences by sending medical supplies. India whose Government has for eleven years in succession attacked South Africa and which likes to pose as the enemy of aggression and as the defender of human rights, as it did again during the past week, preferred to send medical units and supplies to Korea rather than to take the risk of incurring the displeasure either of Soviet Russia or Communist China by sending a military force. Now, however, when it suits its purpose, India is taking the lead in offering to contribute to the Suez police force, which is not a military force. Significantly enough, while the Indian offer has been accepted, offers of certain other countries which provided troops in support of the United Nations action in Korea seem to have been virtually if not actually rejected.

145. In spite of South Africa's loyal support of the United Nations, which it has again shown by responding to the call for assistance in Hungary, even to the extent of taking Hungarian refugee orphans, the Assembly has now, for the eleventh year in succession, at the behest of the Government of India, decided to interfere in the essentially domestic affairs of South Africa, and in so doing has violated—and I stress this last word—a fundamental provision of its own Charter. For eleven years, successive South African delegations have protested against this unwarranted and illegal interference in our domestic affairs. Unprejudiced delegations who are acquainted with the history of past sessions of the Assembly will admit that South Africa has borne this interference with as much patience as is consistent with national honour. One wonders what would have been the attitude of any of the great Powers if this Assembly had appointed a commission to inquire into legislation passed by its sovereign parliament, or even by its provincial or state legislatures. Not for one moment would any of them have tolerated such a violation of its sovereign rights and such an unwarranted and impudent intrusion into his domestic affairs.

146. May I remind the Assembly that national pride, and the right to conduct their own domestic affairs, are the prerogatives not only of the strong. The smaller States are equally jealous of their sovereignty, and of their national honour.

147. When addressing the Members of this Assembly on 15 November, I said that they should not make the mistake of assuming that South Africa's patience is inexhaustible. In spite of that warning the Assembly for the eleventh time acted in violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, and in complete disregard of the sovereign rights of a Member State of the United Nations.

148. May I remind this Assembly that South Africa, like certain other countries which shall be nameless, is faced with difficult racial problems which we are trying our utmost to solve in a manner which will take account of the interests of both the European and the non-European peoples, and which if carried out in the right spirit on both sides, will provide the basis for harmonious co-operation between the two sections of South Africa's population.

149. The continued interference of the United Nations in South Africa's problems, accompanied as it is by baseless charges of oppression and ill-treatment, made from the rostrum of this Assembly, has had the effect

of aggravating racial tensions and of seriously disturbing racial relations in South Africa. One wonders whether the more responsible delegations who have no knowledge of the actual position in South Africa, and who do not know what the Government is doing to provide housing, health and social services, and education for the large non-European majority—one wonders if these more responsible delegations realize what the effect is of their support of India's vendetta against South Africa, and what harm they are doing to the cause of co-operation between the white and non-white population of our country.

150. Earlier this month in the General Assembly [577th meeting] I quoted from a statement of Field Marshal Jan Smuts, when in 1946—more than ten years ago—South Africa for the first time protested against interference in our domestic affairs. He then said that if such interference were to be continued, South Africa—I use his words—and also other States, might find their position in the United Nations both impossible and intolerable.

151. Those are also the sentiments of the present Government of the Union of South Africa. We are not willing any longer to be even an unwilling party to the continued interference in South Africa's domestic affairs—interference, moreover, which is detrimentally affecting the maintenance and the promotion of harmonious racial relations in our country.

152. It has therefore been decided that until such time as the United Nations shows that it is prepared to act in accordance with the spirit of the San Francisco Conference of 1945 and to conform to the principles laid down by the founders of the Organization in Article 2, paragraphs 1 and 7, of the Charter, the Union of South Africa, while as yet continuing to be a Member of the United Nations, will in future maintain only a token representation or a nominal representation at the meetings of the Assembly and at the Headquarters of the Organization. Mr. Donald Sole, the able permanent representative of the Union of South Africa, who is known to many of you, will in due course return to South Africa, and our permanent representation will be appropriately reconstituted.

153. In respect to the normal work and the agenda of the Assembly and its committees the new arrangement will operate as from the close of today's proceedings. In view of the fact that the Union of South Africa will continue to be responsible for the payment of its annual assessments, a member of the delegation will attend the meetings of the Fifth Committee when necessary in order to watch South Africa's interests.

154. Until there is an easing of the present tense international situation, I intend to remain in New York with two members of my delegation, in order to be available for participating in the proceedings of the General Assembly if a critical situation should arise.

155. The decision which I have just announced was taken by the Union Government only after serious reflection and because it was considered to be necessary in the interests of South Africa. I want to say the following. The full sense of the responsibility—the responsibility for the step which South Africa has been obliged to take—rests and must rest squarely upon the shoulders of those Member States which, at the instigation of the Government of India, or in pursuance of their own policies, have since the first meeting of the Assembly in 1946 acquiesced in this interference in South Africa's domestic affairs and in the unjustified attacks to which we have annually, and again this year, been subjected.

156. There is a strong and growing feeling in my country that South Africa should withdraw from the United Nations. The Union Government, has, however, not entirely given up hope that the more responsible Members of the United Nations may yet prevail upon the Assembly to return to the ideals and the objectives of its founders. Relying on that hope, however slight, South Africa will meanwhile maintain its membership of the Organization. But, as I have said, our representation will be only on a purely nominal basis. It will be a token representation.

157. To those delegations which during the past years have supported South Africa in its resistance to unwarranted and illegal intrusion into our domestic affairs, I wish to convey the sincere thanks of the South African Government. May I, in my capacity as Foreign Minister of South Africa, also express to the Secretary-General and his staff my appreciation of the assistance given and courtesies extended to permanent representa-

tives of the Union of South Africa and to the members of their staff.

158. The PRESIDENT: Of course I have no comment to make on the statement made by the representative of the Union of South Africa; I will let it speak for itself. But on a point of personal explanation, I have to refer to a passage in that statement which concerns me personally. He said that in my acceptance speech I referred with approval to what has become known as the Bandung group. I wish to make it clear that I made no reference to the Asian-African group in the United Nations, but that I did refer to the Bandung Conference, which indeed was an historic world event.

159. Before we adjourn, I have an announcement to make. The Secretary-General states that, as a matter of course and independent of the initiative taken here, he gives official attention to the type of matter referred to by the representatives of Egypt and India.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.