



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 67:	
Question considered by the second emergency special session of the General Assembly from 4 to 10 November 1956 (<i>continued</i>).....	533
Agenda item 9:	
General debate (<i>continued</i>).....	533
Speeches by Mr. Carbajal Victorica (Uruguay), Mr. Pinard (Canada) and Mrs. Meir (Israel)	

President: Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON
 (Thailand).

AGENDA ITEM 67

Question considered by the second emergency special session of the General Assembly from 4 to 10 November 1956 (*continued*)

1. Mr. HANIFAH (Indonesia): As my delegation has already made its position clear on several occasions as regards the question of Hungary, I can be very brief in explaining the vote by my delegation on the fourteen-Power draft resolution.
2. We believe that it is the inalienable right of every country to determine its own destiny, free from outside pressure from any quarter. My Government and people, therefore, have viewed with deep concern the events transpiring in Hungary, in particular the reports of deportations. Indeed, this concern has been felt by people throughout the world.
3. The question of Hungary consequently is one which deserves the attention of the United Nations. At the same time, however, it should be stressed, as my Foreign Minister stated from this rostrum last week [600th meeting], that the United Nations in dealing with this question should bear in mind that no speedy and peaceful solution can be achieved as long as this question is not divorced as much as possible from the expediencies, the passions and the strategies of the "cold war". He went on to say that, both within and without this Organization, we should aim at encouraging conditions under which the process of change towards greater liberalization in Eastern Europe could take place peacefully, resulting in stable and democratic governments, friendly to their neighbours.
4. The co-operation of all Member States, especially the States concerned, is of course essential. While some progress has been made towards the attainment of this essential co-operation—and I would like to take this opportunity of expressing the appreciation of my delegation for the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General in this matter—we deeply regret the fact that the Government of Hungary has not yet responded fully to the urgent appeals of this Assembly to permit

United Nations observers to enter the territory of Hungary. We deplore even more deeply recent reports that deportations of Hungarian citizens have actually taken place. This is indeed a very grave matter.

5. On the basis of these considerations, my delegation was in agreement with most of the provisions of the fourteen-Power draft resolution.

6. However, there were some points on which we entertained serious reservations. We felt that it would not be helpful to include in this resolution a stringent time limit for receiving the replies of the Soviet Union and Hungary as regards the entry of United Nations observers into Hungary. We have desired and asked for their co-operation; then we must reciprocate by our confidence in them. Likewise we felt that the words "and other countries" in paragraph 3 of the operative part would raise difficulties harmful to our first objective, namely, permission for United Nations observers to enter the territory of Hungary, to travel freely therein, and to report their findings to the Secretary-General.

7. It is because of these reservations that my delegation felt compelled to abstain in the vote on the fourteen-Power draft resolution as a whole.

8. Now that it has been adopted, however, I wish again to express our hope that the full co-operation of Hungary and the other States concerned will be forthcoming, so that, in the interests of the Hungarian people, a peaceful settlement and the restoration of friendly relations among all States concerned will be speedily brought about.

9. As regards the statement of the Secretary-General [608th meeting], we are glad to state that we agree fully with the decision of the Secretary-General to go to Budapest even if it is not fully clear to us whether he can get all the necessary information we expected to get from the United Nations observers under the resolution. At least the negotiations of the Secretary-General can be the first step towards a real solution and the sending of United Nations observers to Hungary.

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

SPEECHES BY MR. CARBAJAL VICTORICA (URUGUAY),
 MR. PINARD (CANADA) AND MRS. MEIR (ISRAEL)

10. Mr. CARBAJAL VICTORICA (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*): I should like to give, as succinctly as possible, the views of Uruguay on the United Nations Charter; I shall discuss both the ideas underlying the Charter and its practical application, point to defects in its structure and shortcomings in its operation and consider the results of the experience gained during its ten years of existence.

11. At the San Francisco Conference, Uruguay was among those countries which criticized the veto privi-

lege granted to the permanent members of the Security Council. This privilege appeared to us unjustifiable in view of the principle of the equality of all States expressly laid down in the Charter.

12. The Charter of the United Nations was not the product of some unrealistic doctrine. Its spiritual descent is not traceable to academic abstractions claiming to control events by pure thought—divorced from reality and out of touch with world affairs. On the contrary, the Charter was born to the mighty sound of historic events, the most potent influence attending its birth being that of the forces victorious in the Second World War.

13. Through the force of circumstances, the ideal of organizing a community under law had to be adapted to a powerful reality, but this was done in furtherance of purposes and principles worthy of mankind, in an attempt to regulate the behaviour of all States in a realistic setting. But, like any endeavour in which ideals have to be sacrificed to possibilities, it showed obvious defects. The structure approved at the San Francisco Conference was rightly criticized by the smaller States, although they finally voted in favour of the United Nations Charter. We could not hesitate when confronted by the dilemma of setting up either a legal system offering opportunities solely for academic deliberation without any effectiveness, or else a system of international law, suffering admittedly from flaws and imperfections but wielding a potential influence in favour of international peace and security and requiring States to submit to the rule of law and to practise the only legitimate democratic policy: that which respects human rights and offers full scope for the fundamental freedoms of all peoples.

14. Since its foundation, therefore, we have cherished no naïve illusions that the Organization would be an infallible instrument capable of solving all international problems. Our attitude has been one of calculated and well-founded confidence in an organization, imperfect perhaps but potentially effective.

15. Today, after ten years of experience, our attitude to its defects has not changed, but we feel in duty bound to recognize before world public opinion that the Organization has maintained peace in difficult circumstances, by taking successful action against aggression, as in the case of Korea; by criticizing with laudable firmness the use of force in contravention of the rules of the United Nations, as in the case of Egypt, where it has achieved a cease-fire and the cessation of hostilities; and by condemning in appropriate terms the tragic foreign attack on the independence of a nation, as in the case of Hungary. Thus, although fully aware of its imperfections, we continue to support the United Nations and we wish to assert categorically that we see no cause for discouragement and still place our hopes in the Organization.

16. I should now like to comment on several basic aspects of the Charter, namely, the veto privilege, the duty of States to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, and other matters of vital importance for the United Nations.

17. Since it was obvious that, without the veto power vested in the permanent members—previously agreed at Yalta—an international community under law would not materialize, Uruguay presented its reasoned criticisms, but nevertheless signed and ratified the United Nations Charter.

18. With a foresight that has been borne out by events, we stated that even if the veto might be justified dur-

ing the initial period, it was inadmissible that after ten years of experience the veto privilege should persist to prevent amendment of the Charter, to the point of subordinating any modification of the international system to the will of a single State.

19. Today we reaffirm the position we took in 1945. The veto privilege, accepted as inevitable, as a feature of the constituent instrument that was more or less dictated by the outcome of the war, no longer has any *raison d'être* so far as the revision of the Charter is concerned.

20. Since, however, revision is impossible without the support of the five permanent members of the Security Council, some means must be sought to alleviate the unfortunate consequences of the abuse of the veto, through an interpretation of the Charter which will not arouse the opposition of the main protagonist of this discretionary power to obstruct.

21. We know that we cannot count upon the support of certain permanent members for any proposal to eliminate the veto. We still remember the reasons advanced in justification of this special status. It was, admittedly, an improvement over the procedure in the League of Nations, where the veto privilege, on questions of substance, was general and absolute, whereas in the United Nations it was to be held only by the five permanent members which could not take any major decision or make any recommendation without the support of two non-permanent members.

22. The Secretary-General of the League of Nations once said that it was believed that the existence of a reciprocal power of obstruction would tend to promote agreement and compromise solutions based on the unanimous support of the permanent members. This argument has been taken up by those who see in the veto a device which made the existence of the United Nations possible and which is capable of producing agreement as the inevitable outcome of the interplay of the conflicting views that hamper action in the Security Council. This is a twentieth-century manifestation of the truth perceived by Montesquieu—that Powers which are capable of checking each other are forced to collaborate.

23. We believe it is childish to consider, at the present time, that the Charter can be made dynamic through a Security Council in which States would have equal influence and where decisions would be taken by majority vote. We do insist upon equality of States and of their votes in the General Assembly, although we do not ignore the historical fact—pointed out by Sir Winston Churchill—that there is a difference between the power of large and small States and that, in view of this difference, equality appears to be an unattainable ideal.

24. We fully realize that States, although equal before the law, are not equal from the spiritual and material points of view, and they are not truly comparable. This may have been the reason for the system of privilege. The corollary of greater power is greater responsibility and the discretionary power of veto. Thus, as the Spanish professor Barcia Trelles has said, the Charter leaves us with the alternatives of unanimity or explosion. The late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was bowing to reality when he maintained that the application of sanctions to a great Power would bring about the war it was sought to avoid. Hence the belief that unanimity would be born of the experience of the war. The late Mr. Stettinius, too, was speaking realistically when he said that the great Powers had not acquired their might through the Charter.

25. The Charter was therefore adopted, giving preferential treatment to those Powers, and, although this was contrary to expressed principles, it soon became clear that the power of approval or veto in international affairs, held by each one of them, was compensated, limited and restrained by the fact that identical powers were held by the other permanent members.

26. From our experience with the Charter, however, we have all come to realize that it is illusory to believe a desire for unanimity will necessarily be the motivating factor in the Council. There have been abuses of the veto right, which the United Nations should endeavour to prevent or moderate. Interpreting Article 27 of the Charter, Mr. Alf Ross, the Danish jurist, has said that a great Power which discards moral scruples can by its veto frustrate any resolution of the Security Council. By means of the veto, it secures its immunity, even though it has acted as an aggressor, and can paralyse the Security Council through its votes and vetoes in successive decisions on questions of procedure and substance, and if the item relates to a situation or to a dispute, it violates not only the principle of equality but also the maxim that none can be judge in his own cause.

27. Still, the Council's paralysis owing to abuse of the veto has had one happy outcome which may perhaps stimulate interest in the solution we shall advocate: the extension of the power of the General Assembly through a wider interpretation of the provisions of the Charter, as contained in resolution 377 (V), entitled "Uniting for peace".

28. No one denies the competence of the General Assembly, the world parliament in which the principle of equality of States is observed, in which each State can vote as a means of voicing world opinion, a body capable of studying, discussing and recommending the principles and the regulation of disarmament, of deliberating on any matter affecting international peace and security, or on international political, economic or social co-operation, and of debating the peaceful settlement of any dispute. The General Assembly does not legislate, but demonstrates the effectiveness of its consultative power which, although only in the form of advice, judgements or warnings, does give expression to world opinion on the conduct of a State, an opinion which it is difficult to disregard without defying the rules of the civilized world.

29. Such action by the General Assembly has prevented the United Nations from being paralysed by the improper use of the veto. Agreement should therefore be sought to ensure that this discretionary power to obstruct will not be used in a manner prejudicial to the purposes of the Organization.

30. So long as the revision of the Charter is not possible, it might be advisable to temper the use of the veto by means of an agreement on the part of the permanent members to heed the resolution [290 (IV)] adopted by the General Assembly in 1949 on "Essentials of peace". In substance, that resolution recommends that the powerful veto privilege should not be exercised in deciding whether a question is procedural or not, whether a particular question involves a situation or a dispute and, particularly, in the case of all decisions relating to the peaceful settlement of international problems.

31. Although such agreement would still leave the way open for the use of the veto, the latter would be reduced to a legal weapon for dealing with questions

of vital importance, and would no longer be a political weapon to be used in any circumstance, in the just or unjust interests of a particular State.

32. With regard to human rights and fundamental freedoms, Uruguay wishes to stress, once again, that the Charter imposes a clear and unquestionable obligation upon States to support those rights and freedoms. Although repetition may be tedious, we would again refer to the preamble and to all the provisions of the Charter which require States to respect, in conformity with their legal system, the primacy of the human person and public liberties, without which political democracy cannot exist. The Charter does not prescribe any specific legal or political system as the only lawful one, since that would be contrary to the principle of self-determination of peoples. However, it is clear, in our view, that the Charter deems it iniquitous to set up any system of authority based on the denial of human rights and of the freedom of the peoples.

33. I would again refer to the provisions of the Charter in so far as they stress the supreme importance of human values, which it places even above political democracy.

34. The preamble, which, in accordance with universal theory and jurisprudence, establishes the spiritual basis of the document, proclaims the determination of the people to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small.

35. Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter states that one of the main purposes of the United Nations is the promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction.

36. Article 13 provides that the General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose, among other things, of assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

37. Article 55 specifically states that one of the bases for peaceful relations among nations is universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction.

38. Under Article 62, paragraph 2, it is one of the essential functions of the Economic and Social Council to make recommendations concerning the respect of those rights and freedoms and it is furthermore provided—with the admirable object of impressing the idea on our minds—that the Council's recommendations shall also promote the effectiveness of those rights and freedoms.

39. Article 73, in Chapter XI concerning the Non-Self-Governing Territories, lays down this guiding principle: the interests of the inhabitants of these Territories are paramount. With respect to the peoples which have not attained full self-government, the Charter imposes on the administering States the international duty to discharge a trust, which the Charter calls sacred, to promote their well-being, and charges those States with certain specific obligations: to ensure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social and educational advancement, their just treatment and their protection against abuses; to develop self-government; and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions. As a consequence of this responsibility, this administration is carried out under

United Nations supervision, which proves once again that this delicate task calls for international inspection.

40. Chapter XII, concerning trusteeship, adds to the duties of the Administering Authorities, as Article 76 states specifically, that of acting in accordance with the purposes of the United Nations. Under this Article, they have an obligation to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants; self-government or independence are set as targets, in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned, and sub-paragraph c, as a further reminder, stresses as a basic objective the encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

41. If we interpret the Charter, after first taking the precaution of reading it, we shall see that it is full of rules of positive international law which bind all systems of political authority not to present themselves before the United Nations with claims of legitimacy unless they are practising political democracy in which human rights and fundamental freedoms are respected. The Charter lays down a practical philosophy of freedom; it requires States to respect the dignity and worth of the human person; it demands universal and effective respect of fundamental rights and freedom.

42. Since it is laid down, with respect to the Trust Territories, that the people should express their wishes freely, our powers of interpretation are surely not strained by the other provisions which lay down in unambiguous terms that in all Member States the rights of the community of free men are paramount, that it is only free men who can exercise their political will and that they are the sole foundation of true sovereignty.

43. This interpretation of the Charter by Uruguay is recognized today as irrefutable by the leading authorities in international law, and has been stoutly upheld at this session of the General Assembly by various delegations, including that of Argentina and of States from other continents. The noble truth is beginning to make headway. An important step forward was the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which world opinion has taken as an expression of the spirit of the United Nations. We hope that the convention on the rights and the duties of States and the guarantees of the exercise of fundamental rights and freedoms will take shape in the near future.

44. The lessons learned during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries confirm the preeminence of the basic individualism which is today a feature of most modern constitutions. To these individualistic tenets are added economic and social rights as an essential complement to make that individualism socially effective and operative for all. The tendency of certain superficial Western thinkers to believe that respect for the human person is a preoccupation of times gone by and destined for oblivion with the eclipse of bourgeoisie is evidence of a deplorable levity, only conceivable in persons without an atom of human feeling or without the healthy counterpoise of a modicum of elementary education.

45. In answer to the Soviet representative's exhortation to mutual understanding and respect between the different economic systems, I should like to point to Uruguay's experience and to the conclusions it has drawn from the gradual evolution of its political and social beliefs.

46. The problem does not lie in the differences between economic and social systems. From the point of

view of the observance or the violation of the Charter, the most important question, quite regardless of the economic features of the system of a particular State, is essentially whether human rights and fundamental freedoms are respected or not.

47. From the point of view of the Charter, from the point of view of strict compliance with its terms, all dictatorships are reprehensible—whether black or red, of class or of party; the same is true of all forms of despotism, which are the more blameworthy when they are systematic, for they give not the slightest scope to freedom, although their representatives may come to this Assembly to speak in defence of the emancipation of persons and peoples, when it is notorious that at home the rulers alone have the right to feel, think and desire in the name of a people condemned to silence.

48. From the spokesmen for those régimes we have heard criticism of the colonial Powers and of the Powers administering Trust Territories. However, we know the tragic truth which deprives their complaints of any authority whatsoever. The peoples living under despotic rule have no protection, not even as much as the peoples of the colonies, for the free expression of their wishes. And yet, from this rostrum representatives of those régimes have questioned delegations to this Assembly, asking them what instructions they have from their peoples.

49. This Assembly can become a true world parliament only through the presence of the delegations of the democratic States, where human rights and the freedoms of the people are respected and effective.

50. In countries where no genuine elections are held, or where elections are merely entertainments for government partisans, where an opposition is out of the question and the Press, radio, cinema, theatre, science and the arts are all government activities, only the opinions of the powerful can receive currency, and the views of the enslaved people are unknown, though they can be guessed at. The representatives of such States in the United Nations cannot be regarded as anything but the spokesmen of authoritarianism, and cannot be said to be speaking as representatives of communities of men.

51. The Purposes and Principles of the United Nations will be observed in the world only to the extent that the General Assembly becomes the meeting place of the representatives of democratic Governments which are themselves genuinely representative of their peoples and which have been elected in an atmosphere of freedom; these alone can help to build peace. As we read in the preamble to the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, "it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed"; the Second World War "was made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality and mutual respect of men", and peace must be founded "upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind."

52. How can Governments that live in open war against their own peoples and who make warlike forays against peoples in order to impose their totalitarian beliefs upon them with fire and sword be builders of peace? The lesson of our own life impels us to condemn all kinds of despotism absolutely.

53. Our point of departure is the individual, but to forestall the injustices of individualism we have increased the State's responsibilities in the social field

and converted the State into a vast service organization, an agent of brotherhood. We draw on legal thinking in order to work out just solutions by means of constantly and peacefully evolving legislation.

54. Among our people, no citizen believes that a State which offers security as the dispenser or distributor of rations is worth the loss of freedom. As the United Kingdom representative on the Commission of Human Rights said at Geneva, we do not think it an ideal mode of life for a people to form a body of slaves who are passably well fed by the State.

55. As State intervention for purposes of public interest extends, so the reaffirmation of respect for the classic individual rights and the economic and social rights which allow all human beings to live in dignity becomes more necessary. The more a State grows, multiplies its activities and extends its influence, the more alert we must be in our guardianship of freedom and the unimpeded exercise of political democracy.

56. The State must then possess a sound structure of guarantees, a system of decentralized administrative authorities and decentralized local and municipal governments; there must be a certain balance between the public and private sectors of the economy, while at the same time a complex system of distinct agencies, with properly defined judiciary functions, assures the individual, under constitutional guarantees, of physical freedom, of protection against all undue pressure, of respect for the right of property, which gives him independence without the power to exploit his neighbours, of the inviolability of his home and his correspondence, thus affirming in the face of authority the sacred character of his privacy, full freedom of the mind and of opinion, which means that he can utter his thoughts through any medium without prior censorship. Without such rights and freedoms there is no real living democracy.

57. By means of such a system, without outlawing any political party, and while permitting spontaneous activities on the part of any one in accordance with public desire, Uruguay offers the spectacle of a true democracy gradually eliminating Communist influence. In Uruguay, citizens and foreigners enjoy equal and exemplary protection in their rights and property; we have an independent and high-principled judiciary; our Supreme Court of Justice can declare unenforceable laws which are contrary to the Constitution, and the Administrative Court can set aside irregular administrative decisions; the State and the public authorities are answerable for any injury they cause by their irregular acts or by their discharge of functions in the course of the public service.

58. In this way the State can further the public interest without impairing the dignity and worth of the human person, because by virtue of the law and through the action of the judiciary its responsibility is under constant scrutiny.

59. We are in favour of the United Nations. In accordance with this approach, we advocate the Organization's universality, though not at the cost of an increase in political barbarism, and support the effective respect of human rights and the freedom of peoples.

60. The General Assembly has a duty to promote the study of the guarantees for the effective respect which any political authority owes to human rights. On this point, Uruguay will maintain the position it has adopted on other occasions.

61. We should strengthen the international machinery for ensuring the respect and effectiveness of these rights and freedoms, preferably by means of consultative procedures. A world or regional agency should have competence to receive complaints and petitions. The body making the complaint would first be classified, and then there would be an investigation, an examination of the facts, culminating in a recommendation to the offending State. As a complement to this system, which can hardly be opposed by States wishing the Charter to be enforced, provision should be made in specified cases, for jurisdiction by a section of the International Court of Justice or some special body capable of rendering decisions in defence of human rights.

62. As we have said, the flagrant and systematic violation of human rights and the freedom of peoples raises a question of international public interest. It is a crime against humanity, and to plead the defence of domestic jurisdiction is merely frivolous. It is not our intention, as some publications have said, to internationalize everything. Just as we want the State to be dedicated to a whole range of values—the human being, the family, the trade union, the school, the university, the municipality, private institutions generally—so we want the international community to admit national self-determination as having an intrinsic value, subject, of course, to international law and ethics which demand respect for the dignity and worth of the human person.

63. We respect, as a logical consequence to the independence of States, the American doctrine of non-intervention, but in its one and only true sense. We reject all recourse to force, any action by one State to impose its will on others, all undue interference, all imperialist claims, any aspiration on the part of one State or a group of States to wield authority over the internal or external affairs of another State. This healthy repudiation of imperialist force implies putting the law above States; the State must deal fairly with its citizens, be the servant of the people and respect the equality of other States.

64. I have listened with alarm in this General Assembly to certain statements on the subject of sovereignty which seem to date from well before the beginning of modern times; it is as if we were returning to Pope Gregory VII or Pope Boniface VIII and were witnessing once again the beginning of the struggle of the national kingdoms against the Papal State and the Empire. Claims are being made for the absolutism of political power to justify crimes against humanity. Certain States appear in their political pride to be adorned with papal infallibility for all their works on this planet, and even to desire those who urge control over the effectiveness of human rights to be condemned to do penance at another Canossa.

65. Sovereignty in our times affirms democracy; it is a tenet of this creed that the people are the sole lawful basis of a society governed by law. Thus, in many constitutions, such as that of Argentina, sovereignty is the source of individual rights and guarantees not specifically enumerated.

66. If sovereignty in international law should mean supreme power, outside the notion of duty which is inherent in the law and not governed by the rules of law, then that idea of sovereignty would be an imperialist theory of tyranny of the great Powers over the others.

67. Under the Charter, national sovereignty must be tempered by respect for human rights, which is implicit in the fundamental principle of the political self-determination of peoples.

68. Until safeguards for the effectiveness of these rights are established, we trust that the General Assembly will ensure their respect, which is a fundamental purpose of the United Nations. Due regard for these rights is essential in the colonies, in keeping with the trusteeship system; *a fortiori*, if possible, these rights must be respected in independent States. In a document which has been circulated among all delegations by the Assembly of Captive European Nations, it is said that 100 million Europeans are groaning beneath the totalitarian yoke.

69. Our principles are wholly consistent. We do not ask for free, internationally guaranteed elections for Hungary alone; we put forward this recipe for exterminating despotism in all parts of the world.

70. We trust in the United Nations. Under its universal system we can achieve that peace and security which are today indivisible. The United States President, Mr. Eisenhower, has said that the free nations must live together or die separately. The truth is that no great Power is great against atomic weapons. With these weapons, even the exercise of the right of self-defence could mean the end of mankind. Indivisible peace is bound to come when all mankind submits to morality and law.

71. We long for the great nations to agree on the control of atomic weapons, to harmonize their plans for disarmament and take steps to promote the peaceful uses of atomic energy which could transform the world economy.

72. Throughout this continent of America, united in political and economic co-operation, we fight in the cause of the world. In the Americas, we are at the beginning of the road to economic co-operation. The underdeveloped countries, with low standards of living, are one of the breeding-grounds of disturbances to world peace and, because of the understandable resentment that arises, of the psychology of violence. The countries of Latin America import machinery and wish to attract foreign capital because they do not wish to stagnate in a primitive economy as mere producers of raw materials. They demand opportunities of full economic development and industrial progress under an international system of co-ordinated economies, governed by fraternal understanding, to the benefit of all countries.

73. In order to strengthen the rule of law over all nations, we demand an unrestricted system of international justice. The Under-Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Hoover, has complained that the list of countries recognizing the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice was not increasing. We echo his complaint, adding that only eight countries have ratified the American Treaty on Pacific Settlement signed at Bogotá in 1948, which is the most advanced instrument of its kind and which stipulates the universal and compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

74. In closing my long speech, whose abuse of the patience of my audience has sometimes perhaps been attenuated by wandering attention, I should like to redefine the spirit which guides all our considerations. We are not so vain as to speak as teachers of democracy, particularly not when addressing our sister nations in America, whose uneven political evolution we understand because our own experience has been similar. Even less would we wish to do so as the democratic system of the United States is becoming stronger, a country

whose people we love and admire and whose recent presidential and senatorial elections set an example to the world.

75. We desire to see a speedy end of colonialism, despite the fact that in some cases it has brought peoples to independence and we regard as the worst colonialism that of the totalitarian States over their own people; we urge the emancipation of human communities; we regard the Charter as a political canon which repudiates both black and red totalitarianism, for in the United Nations we act with conscious humility based on our well-learned lesson from the eminent teachers of Spanish law. Those teachers tell us that a State can be judged just like a private person.

76. Our attendance here is that of a democratic republic, subject to scrutiny, discussion and possible trial like any State. In view of this possibility, we shall not threaten to withdraw, nor do we—in the case of the international system of human rights—seek refuge in the plea of domestic jurisdiction. In accordance with the *Magna Carta* of 1215, in accordance with North American law, with the *jus naturale* enshrined in all modern constitutions, we shall merely ask for time to address this supreme world tribunal, and there give our evidence and present our case.

77. Mr. PINARD (Canada): In the brief but turbulent history of the United Nations, there was surely never a time when we stood in more obvious need of the humane and objective viewpoint represented, if I may say so, by the President's own qualities of calm intelligence and broad understanding. The Assembly is fortunate indeed to have Prince Wan Waithayakon as our President as we seek the rational and peaceful solutions which we must find if we are to avoid the "universal disaster" he spoke of in his address of welcome to the new Members [576th meeting].

78. I should like to add my own word of sincere welcome to our new Members. We can rejoice that our Organization now more faithfully represents the world as it is in all its diversity. We look forward to the early admission of those that have not yet taken their rightful place among us—notably Japan, which we confidently expect to welcome before this session is ended—a welcome which has been too long delayed. Nor can we be satisfied until the German people are properly represented here—and also the unhappily divided nations of Korea and Viet-Nam. Then we hope soon to have among us new States like Ghana, the former Gold Coast, which, thanks to the energy and initiative of its people and an enlightened colonial policy, are now taking their place as stable members of the world community.

79. This expansion of our Organization does, however, present us with some new problems. There is danger that we might dissipate our energies in the confusion of voices and stagger under our own weight into anarchy. We cannot continue to act as we did when, though certainly never streamlined, we were a smaller company. We shall require enormous self-discipline if we are to meet the increasing necessity for swift, effective and, above all, responsible action.

80. Increasingly, also, we are dividing ourselves as Members of the United Nations into smaller groups. I think that this is in many respects a healthy phenomenon. It can be a partial solution to the problem of size I have just mentioned. When there is not time to hear every voice, there is a good deal to be said for choirs.

81. Most of our groups, moreover, are not hard blocs. They are flexible and they are, fortunately, not exclusive. It is only natural and fitting that like-minded countries should work together; but it is neither natural nor fitting when a group is forced to become—superficially, at least—so united that it automatically votes as one, on even the most unimportant procedural issues. Fortunately for the work of our Organization, there is only one such bloc—and even here there have of late been hopeful signs of a restless intelligence at work. May the rest of us refuse to move backwards, because the only result of the ossification of blocs will be that the United Nations will grind to a stagnant halt, with the veto of the single State in the Security Council being replaced by the veto of the voting bloc in the Assembly.

82. Perhaps some will say that this is today more than ever a great-Power world—a world of the super-Powers—in which the freedom of action and influence of the lesser, the non-atomic, Powers is circumscribed as never before.

83. While there is an element of truth in this view, it is not the whole truth. While the greatest Powers have the obligations to do what they can to see that the big issues are dealt with through the United Nations, and not only when it suits them, we of the smaller Powers have the no less direct imperative duty to make it possible, by our actions and attitudes in the United Nations, for the greater Powers to have no excuse for by-passing it. If we lesser Powers act with discretion and a recognition of our responsibilities, we are not powerless. If we do not, if we concern ourselves only with our own national, or group, or racial interests, then the United Nations will soon cease to be a place where the bigger Powers co-operate with us and with each other for any common purpose.

84. At this late stage in our general debate, there are only two or three topics on which I should like to comment. The Chairman of my delegation, Mr. Pearson, has already outlined the position of the Canadian Government on the developments in the Middle East and in Hungary [583rd meeting].

85. About the Middle East, I wish only to state my belief that the success or failure of the experiment which we have set in motion there may well determine whether in our lifetime the influence of the United Nations will continue to grow.

86. Nothing can remain static for long. New challenges arise in new forms; and, if we cannot meet the central challenge of organizing—as the Foreign Minister of Norway put it the other day [598th meeting]—peace with justice through the United Nations, that attempt will be made outside the United Nations and with less and less regard for the common standard to which we have all subscribed under the terms of the Charter. It is my conviction, and that of my Government, that our best hope for attaining peace with justice is still to work through the United Nations. In the long run, this will be made possible in practical terms to the extent that we want to organize ourselves within the United Nations in order to do better than merely pass resolutions calling for cease-fire or condemning aggressions.

87. Now, I would not for a moment underrate the enormous moral effect which such resolutions of the General Assembly have in mobilizing public opinion, at least in the countries where such pressures may act directly upon Governments. But can we not go further? I feel that the time may be ripe for taking another step in international co-operation to secure peace.

88. The representative of Iran, whose long experience and wise judgement are respected by every member of this Assembly, pointed out to us on 29 November that the Force which the United Nations had placed in Egypt was not an international army as those who framed the Charter intended the United Nations to have. Mr. Entezam went on:

“It is none the less true that the creation of this international police force marks a great step forward and will make it easier, later on, to organize that international army without which the Organization can never enforce its decisions completely, in spite of its great moral influence.” [602nd meeting, para. 139.]

89. The United Nations is a collectivity of fully sovereign States. We must recognize that up to the present time we have not been successful in organizing in advance a United Nations police force ready for action anywhere at any time. Since the Korean experience, we have tried through the Assembly to have Member States earmark units of their armed forces for United Nations police action. Although I think the Canadian Government has gone at least as far as any other in this respect, no Government seems to be prepared, without any qualification, to place its forces at the disposal of the United Nations for such a purpose.

90. If, for the time being, we must accept this as a fact, we need not, I think, be thrown back wholly on the moral effect of what we say here and the resolutions which we may adopt. As the Middle Eastern experiment has already shown, we now have the possibility of using an intermediate technique between merely adopting resolutions or having to fight a war. The United Nations Emergency Force is not so much a fighting force as a police contingent endowed with international authority which the United Nations has decided to interpose between forces which have themselves accepted a cease-fire and the obligation to withdraw on the understanding that the United Nations will put its own independent forces into the area to secure and supervise the cease-fire.

91. This experiment must succeed, because we all recognize in this Assembly that it would be much too dangerous to allow it to fail. It is our hope and expectation that no country, large or small, will withhold co-operation either by making contributions, if requested, to this international force, or by letting it operate in its own territory, for the alternative would be to risk a local conflict which could develop into something more general and, of course, more dangerous.

92. If our experiment works—and that is, of course, the first prerequisite—it may be that the United Nations might usefully consider some means of having units of armed forces of the smaller countries made available at short notice for such supervisory duties, on the call of the United Nations. The United Nations might also think of a permanent organization available to the appropriate United Nations authority to provide the necessary central machinery which would organize these contributions and put these forces effectively into operation when the need arose.

93. I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not hinting necessarily of making the present United Nations Emergency Force a permanent force, although we should build upon that experience. Shall we go back once again to the situation in which the United Nations found itself both in June of 1950 and in November of this year, when everything had to be improvised, when there were no units, and no financial and administra-

tive procedures to which the Secretary-General could turn in the task assigned to him by the Assembly of putting a United Nations force into a very dangerous and rather delicate situation?

94. If the United Nations had had such an organization available in September and ready for use in our time of emergency, I think that many of the difficulties and delays which arose could have been avoided. The Secretary-General's truly amazing energy and devotion brought something together out of nothing with what I thought to be remarkable speed. But we have not the right, in all prudence, to expect the same miracle to be accomplished next time, if there is to be a next time, and we would wish to make sure that a cease-fire will be sustained and that the United Nations forces will arrive in time, if there is another occurrence, so that there would be no danger of a local outbreak of fighting growing into a general conflagration. That is the nub of our problem for the future.

95. If we do not begin to think about a longer-term solution of this problem, we may miss the psychological moment when national Governments may perhaps be more prepared, under the impact of these recent events, to commit themselves to such procedures in advance for the sake of increasing the collective authority of this Organization.

96. Even while considering how we can best organize collective security through the United Nations within the limitations of our situation, we must not neglect the parallel efforts which have to be made to reach solutions of the points of most acute friction and danger. We must not imagine, needless to say, that the creation of this or any kind of international force is liable to solve the acute problems which we have to face. Such a force is a most useful instrument for ensuring a negative kind of peace. But peace, to be lasting, must be positive.

97. As Israel, French and United Kingdom forces are withdrawn in accordance with the General Assembly's cease-fire resolution, and as the United Nations Emergency Force is moved into the area, a momentum for peace is created which should not stop short of a political settlement of both the Palestine and Suez questions.

98. A cease-fire is better than fighting; but it is precarious at best and must be used to begin work here and now on a political settlement which will provide an honourable and secure basis for the lasting peace of that area. This is not a settlement which can be imposed by the international Force. It must be a settlement on which all interested parties will agree. The Force can only be the instrument of the settlement and not its creator. An international force to hold the ring can be useful, and in the short term necessary; but it is no substitute for grappling with the more intractable political problems before the sense of urgency and danger has gone out of them, leaving the same old tinder exposed for the next explosion. The world, the United Nations, cannot afford another such explosion.

99. It might be asserted by some, in the present circumstances of increased international tension, that there is little point in expecting serious discussion of disarmament at this session of the General Assembly. While it is true that progress towards agreement on disarmament cannot be divorced from the international situation in general, nevertheless the need to make a start, however modest, towards disarmament grows steadily more urgent every day. The rate of scientific development, particularly in the field of nuclear and

thermonuclear armaments, and in the means of delivering them, and the growing realization of the terrible consequences of the use of such weapons, compel us to continue the efforts to agree at least on the beginnings of a disarmament programme.

100. Two weeks ago, the USSR made public certain proposals on disarmament and on methods of negotiation [A/3366]. It came at a time when almost all the Governments of the world were condemning Soviet savagery in Hungary. This move, in other words, was made in rather sinister circumstances indeed. The Soviet Government statement was followed within a few hours by the cynical announcement of a large-scale nuclear explosion, and its proposals were also accompanied by boasts about the vast military might of the USSR.

101. In such circumstances, we must consider carefully how much faith we can put in the assertions of the same Soviet leaders of their peaceful intentions. As prudent men who have a responsibility to our several peoples, we must make certain that our desire for peace does not expose those who have given us office to the same dark power of tyranny which stalks Eastern Europe.

102. Nevertheless, the Canadian Government is prepared to show its faith in the United Nations by approaching these proposals of the USSR for an examination of their merits as though they had been put forward in less equivocal circumstances.

103. Some of the proposals are quite familiar. Indeed, the general framework appears to us the same as that of recent Soviet plans. The main new element is an apparent readiness to accept the principle of aerial inspection. If this acceptance proves to be real, it will represent an advance which we could regard with satisfaction. It would be the one spark of hopefulness to come from Moscow in these gloomy weeks of crisis.

104. But although the value of aerial inspection appears to be gaining acceptance among the Soviet leaders, they seemingly have yet to grasp its principal merit. It would be an advantage if the secret manoeuvres of the Red Army could no longer be executed threateningly right on the borders of the Western world, but the greatest danger to mankind lies in possible massive surprise assault with all the modern apparatus of mass destruction. The Soviet proposals still would afford no means of gaining assurance that forces of destruction were not being prepared in the vast regions of the Soviet Union.

105. Having said this, I would repeat that we are prepared to join in the examination of the new Soviet proposals. It has always been our view that the United Nations offers the proper framework for achieving disarmament. However, we have never thought that the substance of the problem could be brought nearer to solution by increasing the number of the negotiators. We therefore look with scepticism on the Soviet suggestion for a conference based upon the participation of Powers signatory to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Warsaw Pact. While we in Canada would welcome any advance which might be initiated by exchanges between the great Powers, we are doubtful that in the present tense situation any helpful results could be achieved. It is no use pretending that confidence has not been severely shaken and that an improved political atmosphere has not become absolutely necessary.

106. In so far as we may draw conclusions from the general terms in which the Soviet proposals are presented, we fear that these proposals, like too many of their predecessors, may be aimed simply at the weakening of the non-communist world, particularly by the disruption of NATO, and at continuing the division of Germany and of all Europe. We shall continue to hope, however, that there is some more constructive approach to the problem of Germany and of that part of Europe which is involved.

107. On the crucial question of control, the proposals give no sign of readiness to clarify the Soviet attitude, which has never emerged from behind its veil of obscurity. Nor do they reflect the difficulties, which the Soviet Union acknowledges as existing, of detecting concealed stockpiles of nuclear weapons.

108. Nevertheless, we will study these Soviet proposals with great care. We will never refuse any opportunity to seek after even the germ of an agreement on disarmament.

109. My delegation was much impressed, as I am sure others were, by the suggestion of the Foreign Minister of Norway last week that there should be some kind of United Nations registration of nuclear test explosions. In our opinion, it is neither necessary nor realistic to contemplate an immediate ban on all such tests. That is our conclusion after weighing the best scientific evidence available to us. However, the scientists are the first ones to admit that their evidence is by no means complete or conclusive. They are somewhat reassuring about the present level of radiation in our atmosphere, but while the averages appear to be comforting, an overdose in one small locality might occur.

110. Therefore, while we can take limited comfort from the absence of alarming conclusions—or indeed any conclusions—in the first yearly progress report of the Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation [*A/3365 and Corr.2*], it does not seem to me that we would be justified in looking into the future with equanimity. My view is that the United Nations should give close attention to the question of nuclear tests, and I can assure you that we will support the Norwegian proposal for early and serious consideration of the whole matter.

111. It seems to me that any agreement on nuclear tests is likely to be in the nature of a compromise. We must be guided by two considerations: we must try to meet whatever may be competently estimated as the requirements of the objective scientific situation, and we must allow the needs of defence in a dangerously divided world to be given reasonable satisfaction.

112. Because both of these are indefinite quantities, there can for the present time be no facile and final solution, and I do not think we can hope to find a satisfactory arrangement, even of a temporary character, which fails to take into account either consideration. So long as the nuclear Powers continue to conduct tests at their own discretion, there will be widespread agitation to change the situation, but so long as the proposed solutions exaggerate the importance of one of these two factors and wholly neglect the other they are unlikely to provide an acceptable basis for negotiation.

113. If we consider what we may hope to achieve in the present circumstances, I think we may all conclude that we should try to help the nuclear Powers in the first instance to agree that they should set, as a self-denying ordinance, some annual or other periodic limit

on the volume of radiation to be generated by test explosions. There would have to be some agreed method of allocating quantities between the Powers concerned. To maintain confidence, there would also have to be some arrangements for notification of the proposed tests and for their verification, and this need not, in my view, give rise to insuperable difficulties.

114. A system along these lines might serve for the time being, but it might be reviewed from time to time in the light of the data on radiation hazards which the Scientific Committee will be gathering. It would be my hope that in due course this interim measure would be supplanted by an agreement on disarmament which would deal in a more definitive way with nuclear weapons as well as with other aspects of disarmament.

115. Although our efforts in these past few weeks have necessarily been directed towards a search for lasting solutions to the critical political issues which beset the international community, we must not permit our preoccupation with these problems to divert our attention from the need for increasing co-operation in pursuit of the economic and other objectives of the Charter. It has been suggested that the political problems with which we are confronted are so serious that initiatives in other fields, important though they are, should not be attempted. However, it is my belief and the belief of my delegation that, as the members of the international community demonstrate their ability and willingness to co-operate in finding constructive solutions in the political field, so our capacity and our responsibility for finding better and more dynamic methods for strengthening the international economic fabric are enhanced.

116. I further believe that we should consider the best methods for assisting the countries of the Middle East to restore their normal economic life, following the present crisis, and to make plans for their continuing economic progress and growth. The United Nations should ensure that any political settlements in the Middle East crisis take account of the need for solution of the pressing economic problems of that area.

117. Lastly, I believe that the United Nations should continue to improve and strengthen the programmes which have been initiated to assist in the economic development of the under-developed countries. To this end, my delegation will propose in the Second Committee that the United Nations undertake a study of existing programmes of bilateral and multilateral economic aid, in the expectation that such a study will result in a better understanding of the scope and nature of the problems still to be resolved.

118. This suggestion will be designed to promote, through an exchange of information, co-ordination of the economic aid programmes which are now being conducted either by the United Nations or by other organizations. A better understanding of the scope of existing programmes and of the experience acquired in implementing them would undoubtedly pave the way to more informed and realistic consideration of the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development and of other programmes which will be under consideration.

119. In conclusion, may I say that although we may find this session somewhat frightening and discouraging, it has nevertheless accomplished useful work. Our concrete realizations as yet are few, but we do see the hope of progress and improvement in the great experiment in international co-operation carried out by this Assembly. We have all learned a great deal in the past

few weeks, and the experience should make us wiser in the future.

120. Mrs. MEIR (Israel): I should like first on behalf of the Israel delegation to express to Prince Wan Waithayakon our warm felicitations on his election to the high office which he now occupies. His unanimous election is a tribute not only to his country and to the peoples of Asia, but to him personally, in recognition of the long and distinguished service which he has rendered to the cause of international understanding, and of the high qualities of chairmanship which he has shown in previous sessions.

121. The past year has been an important milestone in the progress of the United Nations. It has been marked by notable developments both in its composition and in its responsibilities. Our membership is at last approaching that ideal of universality to which my delegation has always subscribed. Many European nations, which had until now been unrepresented among us, have at last been admitted in our numbers. At the same time, the swift process of African-Asian emancipation is reflected by the addition to our body of many countries which, like my own, had until very recent years been under colonial or mandatory tutelage.

122. We, on the western limits of the Asian continent, are identified with these other countries of Asia in their struggle for independence, and we have rejoiced with them in their ultimate triumph. We look to them, out of their own experience, to have understanding for our desire and determination to maintain our national existence in peace and independence.

123. In our belief that the interest of the world community will best be served by a maximum representation within this body, we have not refrained from voting in favour of countries where our own good will has yet to be reciprocated. It is our assumption and hope that every State which accepts the privileges and responsibilities of membership of our Organization will abide by the basic principles of its Charter, which enjoins upon every Member the duty to live in peace and friendship with every other Member.

124. I shall inevitably be obliged to concentrate most of my statement on the political problems which directly affect the people of our area, and which have taken up so much of the time of this Assembly in the past weeks. If I fail to deal with other important problems, it is due to no lack of interest or attention on our part to matters which affect the world community in general.

125. On the matter of Hungary, my delegation has already given expression to its position in the statement made and in the votes recorded. We shall express ourselves on other issues in the relevant Committees.

126. I should, however, like to take this opportunity to refer to one aspect of United Nations work which is, I believe, a source of satisfaction to all of us: that of the Technical Assistance Administration.

127. The work of building up and reconstructing our land and integrating our immigrant population has continued uninterruptedly despite the heavy tensions and difficulties of the past years. Our relations with the United Nations and with the specialized agencies in the field of technical assistance are highly valued by us. It has been a fruitful association. We have received the advice and help of experts in various fields, from health and labour relations to productivity and taxation techniques.

128. We are glad to pay tribute to the manner in which the officials concerned have carried out their assignments and to their devotion to the ideal of international co-operation and mutual help amongst nations. At the same time we, for our part, take some pride in the fact that we are not only recipients of international technical assistance, but have also been able to make a modest contribution in supplying expert help to other countries in certain fields in which we have acquired a more specialized experience.

129. On the broader scene, I would like also to add the following on a topic which affects the very destinies and existence of mankind. During the last decade the world has suddenly become aware of the invisible danger lurking in the background: the possible biological effect of atomic radiation, a danger which may cause irreparable harm to many generations to come.

130. Many countries of the world are vigorously carrying out scientific investigations of the various facets of the new and extremely complicated problem of radioactive contamination. However, the United Nations bears a particular responsibility in this matter, since it has the authority as well as the technical means to deal also with the political problems involved—such as the control of tests of nuclear weapons.

131. A few days ago, the representative of Norway suggested to this Assembly [598th meeting] that, as a first step, any planned tests, expected to cause measurable world-wide radioactive fall-out, should be registered with the United Nations. My delegation was impressed by this proposal, and hope that it will receive the attention of the appropriate organs of the United Nations.

132. The desire for peace is deeply rooted among the people of Israel. And when, just nine years ago, the United Nations General Assembly, by more than a two-thirds vote, adopted its resolution [181 (II)] that a Jewish State be established in Palestine, our profoundest wish was that the hand of friendship which we then extended to our Arab neighbours would be accepted. Can it be doubted that, had that then been done, the benefits to all the peoples of our region resulting from the peaceful, co-operative endeavour of the Arab nations and of Israel would have been of the highest order?

133. It is revealing to recall the reactions on that very day of the representatives of Iraq and Syria respectively to that resolution of 29 November 1947. The Iraqi representative said:

"I wish to put on record that Iraq does not recognize the validity of this decision, will reserve freedom of action towards its implementation . . ."¹

The Syrian representative, referring to the General Assembly resolution, declared: "My country will never recognize such a decision." And he went on to say: "Gentlemen, the Charter is dead."²

These statements were echoed by the representatives of all the other Arab Member States.

134. On that same day we in Jerusalem heard of the decision of the United Nations. As the head of the Political Department of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem, it fell to my lot to address a huge demonstration there of our people and to appeal to the Arabs in Israel and in the neighbouring countries: "Our hand is of-

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, 128th plenary meeting, p. 1427.

² Ibid.

ferred to you in peace and friendship." A few hours later we buried our first victims of Arab attacks.

135. Six months passed, and on 14 May 1948, in pursuance of the General Assembly resolution, Israel was proclaimed an independent State. Within twelve hours, Tel Aviv was subjected to bombardment by Egyptian planes.

136. The story of the invasion of reborn Israel by the armies of the Arab countries is too well known to need repetition. But in view of the new-found enthusiasm of Egypt, witnessed by us here in the past few weeks, for the resolutions of the United Nations, it is worth while to recall the statement made to the Security Council at that time by the Egyptian representative when, after battle had raged for eleven days against Israel, the Council called for a cease-fire. He said:

"The Egyptian Government regrets that it cannot abide by a recommendation of the Security Council to cease fire in Palestine. . . ."³

And Egypt and the other Arab countries did not comply with the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly. Israel was left to its own fate. If Israel is alive today, it is due solely to the heroic self-defence of its people, young and old.

137. If I have ventured briefly to recall the events of eight and nine years ago, it was to emphasize three things: first, the role played by the United Nations in the establishment of Israel; second, the immediate attempt at its destruction by the Arab States—all but one of which were already then Members of the United Nations; and third, Israel's profound and unequivocal desire for the establishment of peaceful relations with its Arab neighbours.

138. The same day, in May 1948, that Egyptian bombs began fall on Tel-Aviv, the first Jewish refugee ship from the camps in Germany reached the shores of Israel. Six million of the seven and a quarter million Jews of Europe, outside of the Soviet Union, had been slaughtered by the Nazis; and now the survivors were coming back not as the banned "illegals" of the mandatory régime, but to the greeting prophesied by Jeremiah: "Thy children shall come back to thy border."

139. These two episodes are symbolic of the life of Israel since its inception—rescue and reconstruction, menaced constantly by the destructive efforts of its neighbours.

140. Israel's people went forth into the desert or struck roots in stony hillsides to establish new villages, to build roads and houses and schools and hospitals; marauders, later organized as *fedayeen*, entering from Egypt and Jordan, were sent in to kill and destroy.

141. Israel dug wells, brought water in pipes from great distances: Egypt sent in *fedayeen* to blow up the wells and the pipes.

142. Jews from Yemen brought in their sick, undernourished children with a tradition that two out of five die; that number has been cut down to one out of twenty-five. While we were feeding those babies and curing their diseases, the *fedayeen* were sent in to throw bombs at children in synagogues and grenades into baby homes.

143. This parallel went on for eight long years, day in, day out, and night after night. Men, women and children—the remnant who survived the Hitler atrocities,

and the more than 400,000 Jews from Arab-speaking countries, broken in body and spirit; people seeking to rebuild their lives, the new settlers of the Negev desert—these were the objects of the terror to which we were subjected.

144. For eight years, now, Israel has been subjected to the unremitting violence of physical assault and to an equally unremitting intent to destroy our country economically through blockade, through boycott and through lawless interference with the development of our natural resources. Since Israel's efforts to repulse the concerted Arab onslaught in 1948, my country has had no respite from hostile acts and loudly proclaimed threats of destruction.

145. It would be idle to pretend that the present situation can be discussed without regard to this background, or that the causes that precipitated Israel's recent security action can be ignored. If this Assembly is genuinely determined to restore peace to the Middle East, it must first determine from which source aggressive policies derive. It will serve little purpose to isolate one link in the chain of circumstances, to thrust the weight of resolutions upon one incident without considering the total effects.

146. Unless the United Nations is prepared to use its influence to prevail upon the countries of the Middle East to negotiate a fundamental solution, the Middle Eastern cauldron will continue to seethe and the region will be a powder-keg for others anxious to exploit its inflammable possibilities. Not only the well-being of Israel, but perhaps the peace of mankind, demand that the question of responsibility for unrest in this part of the world be squarely faced and the causes of tension removed.

147. Israel is ringed by hostile States which invoke the terms of the 1949 Armistice Agreements when they find it convenient, and which flout those agreements when they find them oppressive. They refuse to sign peace treaties, clinging desperately to the discredited theory of a "belligerent status" against Israel, while at the same time piously demanding the protections of peace for themselves. As long ago as 12 June 1951, an official Egyptian representative defended his country's obstruction of Israel shipping through the Suez Canal with the following extraordinary words:

"We are exercising a right of war. We are still legally at war with Israel. An armistice does not put an end to a state of war. It does not prohibit a country from exercising certain rights of war."

148. We know from agonizing experience what these "certain rights of war" are. They include indiscriminate terror, arson and economic attack. At the same time, any Israel effort to stop murder and pillage, to make existence tolerable for its beleaguered population, is met with an outcry about the violation of peace, a peace which exists only in so far as it accords with the convenience of those who have broken it. A comfortable division has been made: the Arab States unilaterally enjoy the "rights of war"; Israel has the unilateral responsibility of keeping the peace.

149. But belligerency is not a one-way street. Is it surprising if a people labouring under this monstrous distinction should finally become restive and at last seek a way of rescuing its life from the perils of regulated war conducted against it from all sides?

150. For the people of Israel, this paradox is not merely a question of logic or semantics. Among the

³ Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, 305th meeting, p. 46.

"rights of war" exercised against Israel has been the *fedayeen* campaign unleashed by Colonel Nasser in the summer of 1955. You know who these *fedayeen* are. They are gunmen, trained by Egyptian army officers and recruited chiefly from among the Arab population in the Gaza Strip, which was captured by the Egyptian army when it invaded Israel in 1948. *Fedayeen* gangs have been planted in Jordan, Lebanon and Syria. Very heavy concentrations of these *fedayeen* units were stationed in the Sinai desert. Israel's narrow borders and long frontiers make it particularly vulnerable to terror squads who cross the border at night with the sole objective of indiscriminately shooting or bombing any Israel house, or any man, woman or child.

151. The murders committed by the *fedayeen* were hailed by the Cairo radio on 31 August 1955 with words which left no doubt as to the identity of the organizers of these outrages:

"Weep, O Israel, because Egypt's Arabs have already found their way to Tel-Aviv. The day of extermination draws near. There shall be no more complaints or protests to the United Nations or the Armistice Commission. There will be no peace on the borders, because we demand the death of Israel."

152. The slaughter of six children and their teacher in the agricultural school of Shafrir, the bombing of a wedding in the Negev village of Pattish: these are examples familiar to the world of the kind of heroic exploits so lustily applauded by Colonel Nasser when he addressed a *fedayeen* unit in the Gaza Strip in the following terms:

"You have proven by your deeds that you are heroes upon whom our entire country can depend. The spirit with which you entered the land of the enemy must be spread".

153. The list of daily murders, of acts of robbery and sabotage, can be indefinitely extended. But let me only remind this Assembly of the events of 23 September of this year on another front, when a group of archaeologists was fired upon in Ramat Rachel from the Jordanian border. Five Israelis were killed and sixteen wounded. The next day two more Israelis—a man and a woman—working in their fields in different parts of the country, were killed by Jordanian units.

154. When, in response, on 25 September, deterrent action was taken at Husan by an Israel army unit, this action was officially described by the United Nations representative as "unprovoked".

155. May I say that the people of Israel cannot emulate, nor do they understand, this legalistic detachment. When their peaceable fellow-citizens are murdered in cold blood, in the course of their daily occupations, they are provoked, and they demand that their Government reflect that sense of provocation by affording them the protection which every State owes its citizens and which international bodies are apparently unable to provide.

156. If moral distinctions are to be made, then let me suggest that controlled military actions—with limited and well-defined military or police objectives—are less abhorrent, even to the most sensitive conscience, than wanton and indiscriminate murder which strikes not at military targets, but solely at civilians.

157. The campaign of terror unleashed against Israel was not stopped by the intervention of the United Nations. The cease-fire secured by the Secretary-General last April was not honoured. Instead, despite Israel's exemplary compliance with the cease-fire agreement,

violence was immediately resumed and increased on every border.

158. Every sign pointed to the fact that the Egyptian dictator was about to realize his cherished and fully-publicized ambition of a second round aimed at destroying Israel. He had amassed huge stocks of heavy armaments, secured largely from the Soviet Union and affiliated countries. He had concluded treaties with Jordan and Syria according to which the military forces of those countries were placed under the Egyptian High Command. We knew of large concentrations of armour and *fedayeen* in the Egyptian bases in the Sinai desert and the Gaza Strip directly along the borders of Israel. There was a minimum of reticence about the proposed "extermination" of the small neighbouring State.

159. We recognized the symptoms. Within the lifetime of nearly every person here present, a dictator arose who, like this disciple of his, informed the world in advance of his bloodthirsty plans. The ashes of the crematoria, the carnage of millions, a world in ruin, testified to the fidelity with which he kept his promises.

160. Such a lesson should not be forgotten. Certainly the people of Israel are not likely to forget what the threat of total extermination means.

161. It is not my intention to enter here into a description of the acts of hostility of the Egyptian Government in many other fields. But the Assembly cannot remain indifferent, above all, to the fact that ever since the Security Council resolution of 1 September 1951 [S/2322] was adopted—and, indeed, before that—the Government of Israel has patiently striven to solve the grave international problem of a double sea blockade imposed against Israel by Egypt in the Suez Canal and in the Straits of Akaba. The Security Council confirmed the illegality of this blockade and rejected the Egyptian argument of a "state of war" by which Egypt sought to justify the blockade. The Council ordered Egypt to terminate these practices.

162. In October 1956, the Security Council repeated its call for free passage without any discrimination, "overt or covert" [S/3675].

163. These decisions have been flouted. At the same time Egypt and the other Arab countries have sought by every means, direct, and indirect, by organized boycott and by indiscriminate threats and attempted blackmail of countries friendly to Israel, to cripple Israel's commerce and to strangle its economic life. It has extended that boycott of Israel even to the agencies of this very Organization, the United Nations.

164. We are a small people in a small barren land which we have revived with our labour and our love. The odds against us are heavy; the disparity of forces is great; we have, however, no alternative but to defend our lives and freedom and the right to security. We desire nothing more than peace, but we cannot equate peace merely with an apathetic readiness to be destroyed. If hostile forces gather for our proposed destruction, they must not demand that we provide them with ideal conditions for the realization of their plans. Nor should it be permitted that the sincere desire for peace, shared by so many, should be used as the shelter for such preparations.

165. The action of the Israel army in the unpopulated Sinai desert served to disrupt well-laid Egyptian plans to liquidate new bases of active hostility against us. The texts of captured Egyptian military documents which Israel presented to the Security Council on 15 November [S/3742] indicate how imminent was the

attack. I shall not repeat the long and detailed directives to the Egyptian commanders. But it would be salutary for all of us not to forget the introduction, which read:

"Every commander is to prepare himself and his subordinates for the inevitable campaign with Israel for the purpose of fulfilling our exalted aim which is the annihilation of Israel and its destruction in the shortest possible time in the most brutal and cruel battles."

166. I wonder if there are any other countries represented in this Assembly which live under similar conditions. And I wonder whether there is a people in the world prepared to commit itself to a policy that, if placed in Israel's situation, it would take no action in self-defence.

167. Is it conceivable that this Assembly should view the situation in Israel preceding 29 October 1956 as one of peace? Why should acts of cowardly murder of unarmed men, women and children, carried out for years, evoke less resentment than an open military operation against nests of *fedayeen* and bases of hostile forces?

168. The practical problems which, it is claimed, divide the Arabs and Israel are not beyond solution. The world, has, for instance, known and still knows refugee problems of far wider scope than that of the Arab refugees. In Korea, in India and Pakistan, in Greece and Turkey, in Europe after the Second World War, these numerically far larger problems have been or are being successfully handled. Who more than the Jewish people have endured the tragic fate of the refugee? If today there is no bitter Jewish refugee problem in the world, it is because Israel, supported by the solidarity of the Jewish people everywhere, and with the aid of friendly Governments, has largely solved it.

169. There need never have been a Palestine Arab refugee problem at all, had it not been created by the action of the Arab States. Given the co-operation of those same Arab States, this distressing human problem could readily have been solved and can be solved today. In its solution Israel, as has been previously stated on behalf of my Government, is prepared to play its part.

170. But while Israel was absorbing Jewish refugees to a number exceeding that of all the Arab refugees—and hundreds of thousands of those whom we absorbed came from those same Arab lands—the Arab States for their part, with the exception of Jordan, were erecting an iron wall between themselves and these kinsmen of theirs. And since then they have lost no opportunity of exploiting these people as a political weapon in their war against Israel.

171. The fundamental problem in the whole situation is the systematically organized Arab hostility against Israel. Arab enmity towards Israel is not a natural phenomenon. It is artificially fostered and nurtured. It is not, as has been here alleged, Israel which is an instrument of colonialism. It is the Israel-Arab conflict which keeps the area at the mercy of dangerously contending outside forces. Only by the liquidation of that conflict will the people of the region be able to work out their own destinies in independence and hope. Only in that prospect lies hope for a brighter future of equality and progress for all the peoples concerned. If hatred is abandoned as a principle of Arab policies, everything becomes possible.

172. Over the over again the Israel Government has held out its hand in peace to its neighbours. But to no

avail. At the ninth session of the General Assembly, the Israel representative suggested [491st meeting] that if the Arab countries were not yet ready for peace it would be useful, as a preliminary or transitory stage, to conclude agreements committing the parties to policies of non-aggression and pacific settlement. The reply was outright rejection. Our offer to meet the representatives of all or any of the Arab countries still stands. Never have we heard an echo from across our borders to our call for peace.

173. The concept of annihilating Israel is a legacy of Hitler's war against the Jewish people, and it is no mere coincidence that the soldiers of Nasser had an Arabic translation of *Mein Kampf* in their knapsacks. Those concerned sincerely with peace and freedom in the world would, I think, have been happier had some more ennobling literature been offered these men as a guide. We are convinced that these dangerous seeds have not yet succeeded in corrupting the Arab peoples. This fatal game is one which the Arab political leaders should halt in the interests of the Arab peoples themselves.

174. I wish at this point to renew an appeal already heard from this rostrum to Egypt to desist from the shameful and disastrous policy recently initiated of wholesale persecution of its Jewish population.

175. I shall not elaborate on the mass of detailed information now reaching us in this connexion, some of which has been incorporated in a memorandum [A/3412] which it was my honour to transmit to the Assembly on 1 December—the sordid and disgraceful story of deportations and concentration camps, of indignity and spoliation, of the holding of hostages to ensure silence on the part of those expelled, and of callous brutality. I can only hope that the shocked conscience of the world will have its effect on the rulers of Egypt and that they will yet desist, and desist at once, from the measures on which they have embarked.

176. What ought to be done now? Are we, in our relations with Egypt, to go back to an armistice régime which has brought anything but peace and which Egypt has derisively flouted? Shall the Sinai desert again breed nests of *fedayeen* and of aggressive armies poised for the assault? Must the tragedy be re-enacted in the tinder-box of the Middle East? The peace of our region and perhaps of more than our region hangs on the answers which will be given to these questions.

177. In a letter of 4 November 1956 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations [A/3291], we put the following questions:

"Does Egypt still adhere to the position declared and maintained by it over years that it is in a state of war with Israel?"

"Is Egypt prepared to enter into immediate negotiations with Israel with a view to the establishment of peace between the two countries as indicated in the *aide-memoire* [A/3279] of the Government of Israel of 4 November 1956 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations?"

"Does Egypt agree to cease economic boycott against Israel and lift the blockade of Israel shipping in the Suez Canal?"

"Does Egypt undertake to recall *fedayeen* gangs under its control in other Arab countries?"

178. Is it too much to expect clear, simple, binding answers? Are we, and not only we but you fellow Members of the United Nations, to take as an answer the announcement on Cairo radio, on 2 December 1956,

repeated again later in the day, that: "The *fedayeen* command has decided to launch a fierce campaign within Israel during the coming winter season"? Can the United Nations make itself responsible for the restoration, once again, on our southern borders, of murder and sabotage units pursuing a one-sided belligerency?

179. The blockade in the Gulf of Aqaba is now terminated. The battery of guns installed a few years ago by the Egyptian Government on the desolate and empty shore at the southern tip of the Sinai peninsula for the sole illegal purpose of preventing the passage into the gulf of Israel shipping no longer exists. Would it not be grotesque for an international body to permit the creation anew of the conditions which made that blockade possible; or to permit Egypt to perpetuate unhindered its parallel blockade in Suez? We cannot believe that that is the case. To do so would constitute a distortion of the very meaning and essence of the Charter.

180. My Government has undertaken an obligation to withdraw its forces from Egyptian territory, and we are implementing it. But we must know—I think the Assembly must know—what will be the role of the United Nations Force after the Israel forces are withdrawn. We are certain that it is not the intention of the Assembly to recreate the conditions laden with the identical dangers which produced the explosion of 29 October.

181. May I remind the representatives of the Soviet Union that there was a time, not so long ago, when they understood Israel's right to self-defence and appreciated the true disposition of forces in the Middle East? Mr. Jacob Malik declared in the Council in 1948 in words which are as apt today as the day they were uttered:

"Ever since its birth this State [of Israel] declared that it wished to live in peace and entertain peaceful relations with all its neighbours . . . It is not to blame for the fact that this appeal did not meet with any response from its neighbours."⁴

182. The truth is that, since 1948, when the words of the USSR representative that I have quoted were uttered, nothing has changed in Israel's desire or intentions. We seek, as before, to fulfil our historic mission of rebuilding our land for our harried people and to live in peace with our neighbours. But I say again neither peace nor war can be unilateral. A boundary must be respected by two sides; it cannot be open to *fedayeen* and closed to Israel soldiers.

183. What does Israel want? Its requirements are simple. We wish to be secure against threats to our territorial integrity and national independence. We wish

to be left alone to pursue the work of developing our country and building a new society founded on social justice and individual liberty. We wish to co-operate with our neighbours for the common good of all the peoples of the region.

184. These objectives do no more than give practical expression to the principles and purpose of our Charter. These are not special claims; they are the aims and policies of all peace-loving Members of the United Nations.

185. I would urge this Assembly to think of the future with the same vigour and insistence that it has dealt with recent events. Can this Assembly leave this subject without raising its voice, with all the authority it carries, in a call to all the Governments of the region immediately to enter into direct negotiations with the purpose of arriving at a peace settlement? We, the people of Israel, believe not only in the necessity but also in the possibility of peace.

186. Only last Wednesday, 28 November, the representative of Egypt, speaking from this rostrum, made the following statement:

"With the great majority of the peoples of the world, Egypt has been saying, and will continue to say, that all nations can and should, for their own good, moral as well as material, live together in equality, freedom and fraternity, and with modern science and its vast potentialities at the service of man, enabling him, carried by the momentum of liberty and faith, to live an infinitely more productive and honourable life." [600th meeting, para. 60.]

With that statement we whole-heartedly concur. We for our part are ready to make of it a practical reality. It is now for Egypt to do the same.

187. The countries of the Middle East are rightly listed in the category of the "under-developed". The standard of living, disease, the illiteracy of the masses of people, the undeveloped lands, desert and swamp—all these cry out desperately for minds, hands, financial means and technical ability. Can we envisage what a state of peace between Israel and its neighbours during the past eight years would have meant for all of us? Can we try to translate fighter planes into irrigation pipes and tractors for the people in these lands? Can we, in our imagination, replace gun emplacements by schools and hospitals? The many hundreds of millions of dollars spent on armaments could surely have been put to a more constructive purpose.

188. Substitute co-operation between Israel and its neighbours for sterile hatred and ardour for destruction, and you give life and hope and happiness to all its peoples.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

⁴ Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, 383rd meeting, p. 22.