

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWELFTH SESSION

Official Records


697th  
PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 2 October 1957,  
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 9:	
General debate (continued)	
Speech by Mr. Boyd (Panama) . . . . .	225
Speech by Mr. Núñez Portuondo (Cuba) . . . . .	227
Speech by Mr. Shukairy (Saudi Arabia) . . . . .	230
Speech by Mr. Rapacki (Poland) . . . . .	235

**President:** Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand).

## AGENDA ITEM 9

### General debate (continued)

1. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (translated from Spanish): The delegation of Panama, which enthusiastically supported the election of Sir Leslie Munro, has great pleasure in seeing him presiding over the twelfth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and congratulates him on the high honour which has been bestowed upon his country in his person.

2. The gesture of the eminent statesman Mr. Charles Malik, in withdrawing his candidature in order that the representative of New Zealand might be elected almost unanimously, is a proof that even in this era of gross material interests higher spiritual values can prevail.

3. My delegation also wishes to congratulate the Secretary-General on the extension of his term of office for a further five years in recognition of the competence and responsibility with which he has discharged his functions.

4. Fortunately, the spirit of conciliation which characterized the election of the President of the Assembly is not the only example of unity and harmony in the United Nations. Thanks to the friendly co-operation shown by the foreign offices of Argentina and the Dominican Republic, the family of American nations has also acted in harmony by unanimously agreeing to put forward Panama as the single Latin American candidate for one of the seats in the Security Council traditionally assigned to that region. This decision is all the more important for small countries like ours in that it represents a vigorous reaffirmation of the principle of rotation in the membership of United Nations bodies and gives full force to the principle of the legal equality of States which also implies equal responsibility in serving the United Nations.

5. My country became a candidate for this high position in the United Nations in the most spontaneous and disinterested way. Certain friendly countries thought it fair that Panama should be represented on the Security Council and offered their enthusiastic support. Then, following cordial negotiations between our

foreign offices, Panama's candidature won the unanimous support of the Latin American countries.

6. Now that my country has been elected, I wish, on behalf of the Government and people of Panama, to convey my warmest thanks to the countries of America for their generous support and to all States which voted for us. In the position to which it had the honour of being elected yesterday [695th meeting], Panama will dedicate itself unceasingly to the service of the United Nations as the authentic spokesman for the Latin American viewpoint and as the faithful interpreter of the ideals which are the life's blood of the Latin American democracies.

7. The Government of Panama is perfectly aware that the Security Council is the organ of the United Nations which has the most delicate and important functions, for it is the organ primarily responsible for the maintenance of peace, security and international justice.

8. Panama will take its seat in the Security Council not in order to satisfy any feelings of international vanity but to fulfil an honourable and lofty responsibility: to seek with the utmost determination to strengthen international co-operation so that it becomes clear and unmistakable.

9. Panama will take its seat in the Security Council to help strengthen faith in the democratic way of life. With sincerity and without jingoism, with simple joy and without desire for foolish self-praise, we can state that Panama has been and is a genuinely democratic country and that its history provides a good example of a clean and honest struggle in defence of freedom and justice. Panama, a country torn asunder in order to unite the world, has been a sentinel and a warrior, a strong arm and a fortress, and a torchbearer for freedom in two world wars. There is no single instance in its history when it has failed to uphold democratic ideals.

10. In the Security Council, Panama will strive to ensure respect for fundamental human rights; it will work for a valid system of safeguarding human rights so that man's basic achievements are not left open to attack by the enemies of peace; and so that the ideals of universal harmony shall not remain mere empty words but become firm guarantees of solidarity and co-operation.

11. The concept of justice is not limited to specific circumstances or applicable only at certain times; it is of universal validity. That is why, in the Security Council, Panama will speak up in defence of the inalterable principles of equity and will vigorously oppose those who seek to reduce man to a mere cipher.

12. The small countries, by the very nature of their interests, usually appraise with reasonable objectivity

and fairness the conflicts which torment the world, particularly when their Governments are the genuine expression of the will of the people and when their representatives act with dignity and courage. The experience of the last session of the General Assembly has shown the decisive part which certain small countries have played in the solution of the gravest international disputes.

13. Undoubtedly, the intervention of the United Nations in the Suez Canal conflict was an extraordinary triumph for our Organization. The United Nations not only succeeded in preventing the spread of hostilities but also managed to end them quickly. The speed and efficiency with which the United Nations Emergency Force was able to re-open the Canal to shipping is the most striking proof of what decisive international action and respect for United Nations decisions can do.

14. We must recognize and applaud the conduct of one great Power during this unhappy conflict. I refer to the United States. Its action was all the more laudable because there were other allied Powers involved, with which it had long standing bonds of friendship. However, the United States consistently followed a policy of co-operation with the United Nations and resolutely supported all its decisions.

15. Panama, which like Egypt, has on its territory a Canal which joins two oceans, cannot remain indifferent to the sufferings of that distant country whose interests are so similar to its own.

16. There are those who consider that the United Nations failed to achieve the same success with regard to Hungary as it did in the conflict in Egypt. However, this does not mean that the United Nations did not act decisively, diligently and efficiently. What is so lamentable and blameworthy in the case of Hungary is that the aggressor and the Hungarian Government which came to power as a result of the aggression have refused to respect the measures taken by the United Nations and have not carried out its recommendations and decisions. The Soviet Union and the present Hungarian Government have committed a serious error in so doing and those who believe that the free world can ever forget the horrible crimes perpetrated in Hungary are greatly mistaken.

17. The delegation of Panama has faith in the United Nations and every confidence in its ability to prevent conflicts, curb threats to fundamental freedoms and establish bonds of real friendship among the great variety of peoples represented in it. This confidence is not the capricious result of light-headed optimism but the fruit of a serious and deliberate analysis of its accomplishments.

18. The United Nations had brought its great authority to bear on the most serious, most difficult and most dangerous problem now confronting the world, that of controlling the outrageous armaments race. We know that the Sub-committee of the United Nations Disarmament Commission met in London until recently without reaching any definite solution. It will therefore be for this Assembly to discuss and to solve this complex problem. Although it possesses only a limited war potential, Panama will do everything in its power to bring about an agreement which lessens the possibility of a new armed conflict.

19. An atomic attack on the Panama Canal, which links two oceans and which is of vital strategic im-

portance, would mean the total and immediate destruction of the capital and probably of the city of Colón, which is second in importance to it in size and population. My delegation is filled with grave concern, not only when we think of Panama, but also when we consider the whole American continent and the small defenceless countries of Europe, Asia and Africa.

20. The problems of peace which concern the United Nations are inevitably linked with political, legal, humanitarian, social and economic problems within the Organization's competence. So long as the United Nations has not solved certain of these important problems, it will be unable to solve the problem of disarmament.

21. In the political field, for example, it is inconceivable that there should still be nations divided artificially and without representation in the United Nations. The most obvious case is Germany and we might also mention Korea and Viet-Nam.

22. At this point, I would like to digress for a moment to extend a cordial welcome to the new States, Ghana and the Federation of Malaya, which have just joined us. At the same time, I hope that those countries which are still unjustly being kept out of the United Nations will soon be admitted.

23. In the legal field, it is abnormal that the excessive rigidity of the Charter should prevent its being revised in the light of recent international changes. Panama has always considered that international agreements, whether multilateral or bilateral, should be amended to keep pace with the changes in the relationships which they govern.

24. Panama, which has always honoured its international commitments, has urged periodically and through direct negotiation, the revision of the treaties which govern our relations with the United States regarding the Panama Canal. In 1955, the Remón-Eisenhower Treaty was drawn up, together with the memorandum of understanding which recognizes certain of my country's aspirations.

25. This treaty, which is awaiting approval by the United States Congress, contains a law establishing a single salary scale and the principle of equal advancement and retirement pensions for Panamanians and United States nationals working in the Canal Zone. This law is essential for the complete and effective implementation of the treaty. We sincerely believe that, if this law is applied, we shall be putting into practice in this strip of our territory, over which Panama has always maintained sovereignty, the universal principle of equal pay for equal work for which we have been fighting for so many years.

26. In the social field, it is inadmissible that there should still exist colonial and semi-colonial countries where the indigenous inhabitants are discriminated against, exploited and subjected to an inferior wage system solely on grounds of nationality and race. In this respect, the Declaration signed in Panama on the occasion of the meeting of American Presidents held in our capital in 1956 constitutes the most sublime profession of faith in the human race that has ever been conceived.

27. In the humanitarian field, it is shameful that there are still peoples who are denied their fundamental rights and who, in spite of their maturity, remain under the yoke of foreign oppression and are prevented

from deciding their own destiny. Over and above agreement of a political nature, the Latin Americans respect the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States, but we protest when this argument is used as a pretext for subjugating defenceless peoples.

28. Panama considers that every people capable of self-government should enjoy peace, freedom and justice. To claim that oppressive régimes should be maintained because peoples have not yet reached sufficient maturity to enjoy freedom is fallacious in the extreme. The rights of the human person cannot be the exclusive heritage of minorities which set themselves up as superior beings.

29. In defence of these guaranties, my delegation wishes to state that it has supported the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and that it will strive to ensure that the validity of that Convention is not undermined by unfortunate interpretations. All aspirations to freedom must be unanimously supported; otherwise, we should place in doubt our creative, dignifying and inalienable right to determine our own destiny.

30. As the United Nations is an organization with such vast functions and such high aims, it is necessary to strengthen faith among men. In this connexion it may be well to recall the words spoken a year ago by the present President of the Republic of Panama, Mr. de la Guardia. Although they refer to the social climate of the Isthmus of Panama, they also have a universal application:

"For a long time it has been said that people believe in nothing and no one. There are certainly many proofs to strengthen this opinion. Above this prevailing atmosphere of pessimism, I wish to raise a voice ringing with sincerity, and I hope it will not fall entirely upon deaf ears. It is a voice calling upon you to conquer the past and to encourage people by diligent and courageous work to search their souls and rediscover faith and confidence in a better future. It is a voice which, guided by confident visions of the future, seeks to bring relief from this stifling pessimism which day after day proclaims the loss of hope and the impossibility of any improvement."

31. In the economic field, the fact that so many countries remain insufficiently developed causes universal disequilibrium, instability and disappointment. These countries are frequently told that they should follow the example of the great industrial nations which achieved their present high level of expansion and wealth by their own efforts. However, any student of political economy knows that such sententious advice is false when it is applied to the times in which we live. The circumstances in which those powerful and wealthy nations came to the fore were very different.

32. In the world today, a small number of industrial countries, which have reached a stage of maximum economic saturation and diversification, are surrounded by an enormous number of under-developed countries which are generally dependent on a single primary commodity and whose economies gravitate inexorably around the large industrial countries. It is absurd to ask these under-developed countries which are so dependent on others to help themselves. Of course, no one wants them to live on international

charity or do nothing for themselves. But it is obvious that, however much they strive, they cannot improve their economic structure unless there is a better and fairer relationship between them and the highly industrialized countries with which they are compelled to trade.

33. The economy of my own country requires more assistance from the United Nations, and more effective help from its true friends in order to stimulate its agriculture and industries for the permanent benefit of all its people.

34. Recent public administrations have tried hard to establish new sources of wealth and to diversify the national economy. Development and credit institutions are giving more and more assistance to the peasant and to the farmer. Various laws have recently been promulgated to encourage foreign capital investments and we have signed contracts with United States and European companies for exploring and exploiting some of the resources of our sub-soil.

35. Panama looks with optimism towards the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development which the Organization has so wisely proposed. We trust that during this session the Fund will meet with the enthusiastic and sincere support of the great Powers so that its proposed aims may become a reality. As a consequence, unsound economies and unhealthy economic relationships will begin to disappear. And as we go forward along this path we shall feel that we are advancing on solid ground towards real agreement on disarmament, peace and sincere international co-operation.

36. Amid the anxieties and misgivings which beset human beings today, only the United Nations can raise the flag of hope, extend the area of agreement between peoples and strengthen the civil and political rights of mankind. Towards these ends the delegation of Panama will work wholeheartedly at this twelfth session of the General Assembly.

37. Mr. NUÑEZ PORTUONDO (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): The Cuban delegation's purpose in participating in this general debate is to state briefly, owing to the great number of speakers listed, our Government's views on the most important items on our agenda.

38. Also, we should like to lay before the delegations for their consideration what might be called a summary of our country's economic situation and the great work carried out by our Government in the past few years in spite of the difficulties that have arisen. These difficulties are due chiefly to the unremitting action taken by the Cuban Government against the infiltration of international Communism into the island and to our staunch stand in the United Nations in defence of the democracies, in opposition to a new imperialism and a new colonialism which, it would seem, will yield only to those moral and material forces which are opposing it and will make their final triumph impossible.

39. We consider disarmament the most important item on our agenda. We have stated repeatedly that, although it is true that only the great Powers can effectively solve this problem - since they are the only ones capable of launching a total war - it is equally true that those nations which do not have great military strength are those that suffer most



from wars, without ever reaping any benefits from the outcome of wars. That is why we are presenting our views, for right and truth are not a monopoly of the great Powers.

40. The problem of disarmament must not be considered without taking into consideration certain circumstances which are fundamental in placing the question in its proper context. As long as we do not do this, any statements made in this Assembly will be futile. The Assembly should never be used as a forum for propaganda intended to deceive unwary nations.

41. There is one fact that cannot be denied: it is the reason why the situation is so complicated. During and after the War, the so-called Western Powers ended their political domination over thousands of square kilometres of territory, and millions of human beings acquired the right to be called citizens of independent and sovereign States. India, Pakistan, Burma, Tunisia, Morocco, Sudan, Ghana, the Federation of Malaya, the Philippines, Laos, Cambodia, Viet-Nam, among others, serve to demonstrate the accuracy of our statements.

42. While this was taking place, we were alarmed to note the rise of the new imperialism and a new colonialism threatening the freedom of all mankind. One State seized control of thousands, millions even, of square kilometres of foreign territory, and imposed its pitiless yoke on millions of hitherto free men, women and children. That the number of subjugated peoples was not greater was due to the decision of the United Nations and the exceptional sacrifices of the United States and its allies, which routed aggression in Korea. Thus it was possible to save South Viet-Nam from subjugation by a State which was overrunning peoples and territories.

43. This background, which is apparent to all and cannot be denied with mere rhetoric, is what is destroying the mutual trust essential to any discussion of disarmament. As long as guarantees acceptable to all parties are not provided, it would seem futile to hope for any favourable outcome from the negotiations. It is well to remember the obvious fact that it is due only to the strength of the United States in atomic weapons that it has been possible for the rest of the world to remain free.

44. In our view, and we say this with full awareness of our responsibility, all that renunciation of atomic weapons represents, in the absence of complete and absolute guarantees that aggression will not be unleashed following such renunciation, would be an act of imprudence which the great Western Powers cannot risk.

45. The Soviet Union too is entitled to insist on guarantees. We do not deny this. But such guarantees have been offered to it in profusion. Yet when the Western Powers request guarantees to protect them against surprise attacks, atomic tests and secret manufacture of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Government balks at granting them and launches a vast propaganda campaign through its militant communists and fellow-travellers in all parts of the world, whose sole purpose is to prove that it wants to abolish the use of atomic weapons in order to be able to launch its final and complete conquest.

46. Furthermore, the Cuban delegation sincerely believes that it is contrary to the most elementary rules of logic even to suppose that a lasting peace can be achieved as long as the division of Germany, against all principles of justice, is maintained. We cannot understand how Soviet statesmen can imagine that this division can be made permanent without endangering international peace. It is an artificial division of the State which has the greatest economic potential in all Europe and of a people who constitute an entity and have one of the world's most advanced cultures.

47. The Cuban delegation subscribes unreservedly to the Berlin Declaration of 29 July 1957, signed by the Governments of France, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Federal Republic of Germany, in which all other States are informed of the urgent necessity of achieving rapidly the much desired unification of Germany.

48. We are astounded too that Soviet statesmen, who always analyse problems in accordance with materialistic principles, do not realize that for their own security the right of self-determination must be fully granted to those peoples in Europe and Asia whose lands are occupied by the Soviet Army. This could be achieved through broad guarantees to the effect that under no circumstances would those liberated peoples become belligerents against the Soviet Union itself.

49. The Cuban delegation is in a position to collaborate to the full extent of its ability in all measures designed to reach at least preliminary agreements in attempting to solve this vast problem affecting all mankind. But under no circumstances would it cast its vote in support of any proposal which, yielding to the pressure of biased and skilfully directed propaganda, would represent a renunciation of freedom and independence for the peoples of this part of the world, and of their right to live according to their traditional democratic principles.

50. The Algerian question was the subject of much discussion during the eleventh session of the General Assembly, at which the Cuban delegation expressed its views. It cannot change those views for fundamental reasons which I shall briefly summarize.

51. The Charter of the United Nations - which, of course, should be more widely disseminated among the peoples of the world so that they would not consider the Organization as a body to provide solutions to internal political problems of the Member States, solutions which are always requested to suit the taste of the party making the request - is our constitution, and therefore its provisions are mandatory upon all Member States. Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter reads as follows:

"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter..."

52. We have said this before and we repeat it again. When France joined the United Nations it considered Algeria, unlike Morocco and Tunisia, as an integral part of its national territory. Several Member States

have overseas provinces which they consider to be integral parts of their national territory, and so would the United States if Hawaii became a State of the Union. At the time France became a founding Member of the United Nations, no Member State objected to having Algeria considered an integral part of its national territory. This problem has arisen in the past few years.

53. The Cuban delegation feels that it will be possible for the United Nations to act in this matter only in so far as France accepts such action. What the French Government does not agree to discuss would be outside our competence. This does not prevent us from expressing the hope that a settlement of this problem may be achieved in keeping with the noble traditions of a nation which the people of Latin America love and admire so much.

54. On the agenda of the current session of the Assembly there is a draft code of offences against the peace and security of mankind, whose title is not in keeping with its content. This draft introduces a mutilated definition of genocide and makes Communism immune to charges of such offences. The result is that the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, a convention ratified by fifty-five nations, would be repealed. There is no doubt that endeavours are being made to reach a settlement which would combine the definition of genocide with the so-called inhuman acts carried out against the civil population, which is a vague legal definition.

55. In accordance with the Convention on Genocide, constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials and private individuals may be held criminally responsible. Under the draft code, private individuals do not bear criminal responsibility. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is composed of private individuals; accordingly, it would be declared immune from any criminal charge. The history of the Communist Party is a long chain of acts of genocide, several of which have been admitted by Mr. Khrushchev, and the most recent of which were the atrocities committed in Hungary.

56. Furthermore, in contradiction with the principles of individual responsibility in criminal law, in the draft code, the authorities of a State are held responsible. Private individuals can be considered responsible as an exception, but only if they acted at the instigation of the State authorities. However, everyone knows that in the Soviet Union the Government acts at the instigation of members of the Communist Party, and not the other way around.

57. In these circumstances, the Government of Cuba, which is proud to have initiated, together with the Governments of India and Panama, the Convention on Genocide in the United Nations, strongly protests against this attempt to thwart any progress in the application of this civilizing concept. We hope that the General Assembly will reject the draft code of offences, since to adopt it at this time would be detrimental to the community of nations.

58. For the majority of Member States, which, like Cuba are classified as under-developed countries, economic questions acquire exceptional importance. We maintain our opinion that the highly industrialized, and therefore wealthy, countries must realize that their privileged situation entails moral obligations and that in the long run a contribution to the economic

development of other nations will redound to their own benefit as well. This cannot be achieved solely through a flow of private capital to our countries; we also need another kind of economic assistance to enable us to undertake non-self-amortizing projects, which are essential for the welfare of our people. Hence we shall devote our utmost attention to an item on the agenda we have before us concerning the establishment of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development.

59. It would seem appropriate, since I am now referring to economic subjects, to give a broad outline at this point of the economic situation in Cuba and the steps we have been taking to solve some of our most pressing problems.

60. In order to give a clear picture of the present economic situation in Cuba, we must go back to the conditions prevailing during the prosperous years of 1951 and 1952, in which our nation achieved exceptionally high exports - principally of sugar - invested part of the funds raised through the Government loan of 1950-1980, floated in the amount of \$120 million, and - in the second of those two years - harvested the greatest crop ever achieved in the history of Cuban sugar production. After those years, as a result of the impact of the immense volume of the 1952 sugar production upon a conspicuously inadequate market, there appeared a depression trend which originated in the sugar industry, but which tended to spread disastrously throughout the entire national economy.

61. In 1952, the present Government of Cuba, under the Presidency of Mr. Batista y Zaldívar, started the process of recovery, with such complete success that in 1956 the national income reached the 1952 levels and the sugar depression was wiped out. This was done, first, through a compensatory policy based on deficit spending, on the one hand, and public credit, on the other hand, plus the carrying out of emergency public works; and secondly, through a policy of economic development initiated in order to attain a given tempo of investment in agriculture, industry, mining, railways, ship-building, and the like, through various official credit institutions and private initiative.

62. All these measures, together with a 1957 sugar crop that exceeded 5.5 million tons, with excellent prices on both the world and the North American markets - although improvement in the latter area was not so pronounced - led to the economic situations prevailing this year.

63. Owing to high private and public investments in industrial and agricultural development plans, the recurrence of an abundant sugar crop with high selling prices, and high public expenditures, the economic situation in 1957 has been satisfactory. This combination of factors - until 1957 the last of them was missing from the national economic picture - will no doubt continue throughout the year. The result, readily predictable at this juncture, will be that gross national product, which in 1956 was slightly under \$2,500 million, will probably reach \$3,000 million in 1957, thereby providing an increase of perhaps 20 per cent in the national income and the highest total ever reached.

64. So substantial a rise in employment and living levels will be evidenced - as it is already - in higher figures for exports, imports, bank deposits, as regards

both current and savings accounts, the public revenue, and so forth; and for 1957 these figures are expected to be the highest ever reached in Cuba's economic history. Here it is only fair to state that it has been possible to achieve all this only through the effective co-operation of the National Bank of Cuba, which is presided over with unerring skill and integrity by Mr. Martínez Sáenz.

35. With respect to public works, to cite only one of the activities of the Government of President Batista, the Ministry of Public Works, headed by Mr. Arroyo Márquez, has carried out the following projects.

66. In the past few years, plans have been made for construction of 3,132 kilometres of main highways. One hundred and forty-two of the planned highways have been completed and the remaining eighty-nine are in process of construction and will be finished soon. Fifteen new hospitals, with more than 4,000 beds, have been completed. Sixty-one new bridges have been completed and five more are under construction. Two hundred and eighty-three streets have been provided with sewers, drainage and paving, and work on seventeen others is in progress. Fifty-three two-way avenues have been extended, provided with drains and paved; similar work is proceeding on thirty-three more.

67. These public works carried out by the Government of Cuba are in addition to those we mentioned [600th meeting] during the general debate at the eleventh session of the General Assembly.

68. By an overwhelming majority, the General Assembly in its eleventh session [576th meeting] agreed to place the question of Hungary on the agenda of the current session. Not to have done so would have been to fail in an obvious duty. As long as that unfortunate country continues to be occupied by the armed forces of a foreign power, the United Nations must use all the means at its command to effect the liberation of a people, such as the Hungarian people, whose history and the courage it has displayed entitle it to the support of all honest men throughout the world.

69. The question of Hungary continues to be a source of anxiety to the Government and the people of Cuba. We have said so on several occasions and we repeat it now. The United Nations cannot be divided into Member States who comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly, and one State - which, it is true, has great military strength - which systematically flouts them and shows Olympian contempt for the opinion of the great majority of the Members of the United Nations.

70. The delegation of Cuba considers it essential that we should not approve the credentials presented by the representatives of the Kadar régime, who obviously do not represent either the Hungarian nation or the Hungarian people. We feel that if the General Assembly did not approve their credentials when the events which had occurred in Hungary had not yet been officially proved, it would be contrary to the most elementary principles of logic and law to approve them now when we have an official report from the Special Committee on the problem of Hungary [A/3592] in which there is a plethora of evidence that the Kadar régime has been imposed on the country by the invading forces of the Soviet Union.

71. We have great faith in the frequently demonstrated skill of Prince Wan Waithayakon, to whom the General Assembly has entrusted the difficult mission of obtaining from the Moscow Government and the Budapest régime a satisfactory solution of the Hungarian problem. We wholeheartedly wish him complete success in all his efforts.

72. The delegation of Cuba has come to the current Assembly, as always, to work with the greatest enthusiasm and good faith for the cause of international peace. We shall do our utmost to help to achieve satisfactory solutions to the extremely serious problems which affect the whole world. We feel that if the principles of Christian charity are put into practice it will be possible to solve the majority of the problems dividing us, for the good of all peoples and for the greater glory of the United Nations.

73. Mr. SHUKAIRY (Saudi Arabia): Here we are in solemn assembly again, and once more we meet to survey the past, tackle the present and map out the future. It is a supreme task, but its completion is endless. For no sooner do we deal with the present and future, then they pass to the realm of history and we have only to face a new present and a new future. Thus, in our search for peace, in our struggle for liberty, in our quest for justice, the United Nations in fact is in continuous session. Indeed, in this atomic age we are called upon to be in the field at all times, always ready for action without retirement or resignation.

74. The United Nations, however, can handle international situations only with a true understanding of the facts, and nothing but the facts. A mistaken appraisal might lead to a breach of the peace, especially where the region concerned is highly inflammable. I do not wish to talk in the abstract. I have in mind a vivid illustration that is just to the point. From this rostrum there has been a great deal of loud talk about Arab nationalism. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece, in a highly valued analysis, has enriched international knowledge with a most eloquent statement on Arab nationalism [689th meeting]. On the other hand, statements of a different character made here in the Assembly, have attributed to Arab nationalism dangers, perils and what not. I must declare here before this august body that there is nothing dangerous about Arab nationalism. It is only when any national movement is misunderstood that danger becomes imminent. The truth is that Arab nationalism is a peaceful, constructive and creative movement. It seeks friendship and international co-operation upon equal terms and mutual respect. Dynamic as it may be, Arab nationalism has no plans for aggression or expansion of any sort or of any character.

75. As ancient as the Arab world, Arab nationalism has preceded the present conflict of ideologies that divide the world into camps and blocs. Although Arab nationalism is undergoing the inevitable process of exchange, of give and take, no foreign indoctrination in the Arab world is taking place or will ever take place.

76. As to the main objectives, Arab nationalism stands for the final liberation of every span of Arab territory from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic Ocean. Furthermore, Arab nationalism strives to shape our economic and social systems in accordance with our own needs and the best of our national traditions.



It is our aim that all aspects of our life should spring from within, making our past, present and future a living, vibrant, continuing reality. In particular, our defence build-up is to be our own. It is exclusively dedicated for defence and defence only. Our whole military set up, with its bases, arms and equipment from whatever source they may come, are exclusively in the service of Arab sovereignty and independence. Mr. Lloyd, in his statement before the General Assembly [685th meeting], charged that arms delivered by the Soviet Union to certain Arab countries are intended "to pre-stock forward bases for the Soviet Union...." This is sheer fallacy. It is nothing but an insult to our national honour, which we must reject outright without hesitation. We must declare, however, that Arab armies, no matter of what colour their equipment may be, have one single allegiance, one single loyalty, one single flag. It is Arab nationalism. No one should, therefore, be deceived or become the victim of his own deception, imagination, humiliation, if I am allowed to put it in this way.

77. I must emphasize that in dealing at length with Arab nationalism, I am not going out of my way. The question of the Middle East has now become part of our general debate. Should it proceed in the manner it started, it is likely to be the major question of the session. Mr. Dulles and Mr. Gromyko [680th and 681st meetings] have dealt in detail with the general situation of the Middle East. Mr. Lloyd also has stated the position of the United Kingdom on this question. Other delegations have expressed their views one way or the other. We have witnessed attacks and counter-attacks; we have heard proposals and counter-proposals. In the heat of the debate, it appeared as though the Middle East had become an orphan with no say in the matter. The Middle East seems to be dragged into the cold war whether it wills that or not. But the central fact is that the Arab States are fully independent and fully sovereign. The Arab States are fully represented here in the General Assembly. Their affairs are their own and no one is entitled to interfere. Even the General Assembly — and I put it with all due respect to the dignity and authority of the Assembly — in its totality cannot interfere in any prerogative of any national sovereignty.

78. In the general debate, more than one delegation expressed fear and anxiety over the state of affairs in the Middle East. We too feel fear and anxiety, but in greater depth, for we are the people and the area is ours. But our diagnosis and remedy are totally different. It has been said in the General Assembly that Soviet technique aims at inciting Arab nationalism to break all ties with the West. Arab ties with the West are breaking. This is no secret to reveal. It is no secret either that the Arab countries are eager to establish the best relations with the West on a level of equality and mutual respect. But it is the policy of the West which is destroying ties with the Arabs. It is the West which is destroying the West. We need only cite Syria as a case in point. In 1919 it was Syria that expressed to the American Crane-King Commission its choice for an American mandate as an alternative to Syrian independence and Syrian sovereignty. What a great faith Syria had displayed at that time. The change, however, did not come from Syria. It is the West again.

79. In the course of the debate, a number of delegations urged the General Assembly to discuss the situa-

tion in the Middle East, reserving the right to submit concrete proposals. The case as stated, however, does not disclose a problem that could legitimately be discussed by the United Nations. We were told — and this is the case against Syria — that the true patriots of Syria have been driven from positions of power. We were told also that Syria is getting arms from the Soviet Union, thereby endangering the security of its neighbours. This is the gist of the case against Syria. Clearly this is no matter that can be seized by the General Assembly. The affairs of Syria are for Syria and not for the United Nations. Who is in power and who is not in power in Syria is the concern of Syria alone; it is not the concern of the United Nations. We are here to deal only with international questions. We are not here to deal with the change of leaders or with the change of Governments. This domestic realm of internal affairs must remain immune, for it has been declared immune in the Charter.

80. As for the arms deal, we see no valid justification to interfere. Every State has the sacred right and duty to secure its defence and safety. All States represented in the General Assembly are engaged in arms shopping, seeking arms here and there. I am very sorry to use this fantastic term "arms shopping", but this is the term which describes what has been taking place so far with regard to the arms race. In this regard, Syria is neither the first nor the last. In any event, it is no luxury for Syria, nor is Syria the only amateur in this field.

81. Syria's defence build up, however, is no danger to any neighbour — and I wish to stress, to any neighbour. All Member States are preoccupied with building up their defence, and there is hardly any Member in the General Assembly without a neighbour. Syria is not at fault because it has more than one neighbour. With Turkey as a neighbour, Syria's defence should be no reason whatsoever for alarm. Syria, out of determined policy let alone physical potentialities, harbours no malicious designs against Turkey. As regards Syria's Arab neighbours, it is nonsensical fun to speak of danger. The elementary truth is that no danger would arise one way or the other. It is unthinkable that any Arab country could be a source of peril to any other Arab country. It is inconceivable for any Arab soldier to be a menace to any Arab State. Differences of opinion may exist among Arab States. This is natural and understandable. But for Mr. Lloyd to refer to the latest note from Jordan to Syria as an indication of danger is an argument entirely devoid of any atom of truth. What may possibly arise amongst Arab States are divergencies, but never emergencies. This is the absolute truth that I can convey to the General Assembly in unequivocal terms. As for Israel, an armistice neighbour, Syria is not at fault should a neighbour disturb the water, as the old story goes.

82. It is thus clear that the matters raised in regard to Syria do not fall within the competence of the General Assembly. We shall therefore strongly oppose any discussion touching upon matters relating to the affairs of Syria. Saudi Arabia shall stand by Syria in the defence of its sovereignty and independence. Saudi Arabia will not fail to discharge this duty, a duty which springs not only from pacts but from the strongest bonds of Arab brotherhood.

83. There remains the question of the proposals which may be submitted in regard to the Middle East. Certain delegations seem to be trying to invoke the resolution on the essentials for peace of 1949 [resolution 290 (IV)]. Others appear to prefer a resolution declaring certain principles. At this stage of the debate we shall not take a position. But one thing must be amply clear: we shall resist any attempt to interfere in the affairs of Syria. We shall refuse any discussion of the Middle East in the context of division between East and West. We shall not allow the Middle East to be plunged into any cold war of any character or colour.

84. The affairs of the Middle East are, should be and should remain the sole concern of the people of the Middle East and the States of the Middle East. We shall oppose any proposal that does not take full consideration of the sovereignty of the Arab States as Members of the United Nations. However, we can think of only one proposal — if anyone is eager to know of a proposal which squarely meets the situation in the Middle East, a proposal which offers a healthful solution to relieve tension in the Middle East — a proposal that would urge the Western Powers to settle their differences with the Arab world in Palestine, in Algeria, in Yemen, in Oman and in Buraimi, in accordance with the principle of self-determination as enshrined in the Charter.

85. This is the background of the situation in the Middle East. The danger is there, we entirely agree. It is no use concealing these facts. But it is the cause upon which we differ, it is the diagnosis upon which we differ, and it is the remedy upon which we differ. The actual danger in the whole area, in our view, springs from a set of problems — call them the relics of imperialism, call them whatever you wish. They form the main source which breeds unrest and tension. It therefore becomes our duty and the duty of the General Assembly to examine these problems in complete frankness, in a manner worthy of the cause of international peace and security and worthy of the dignity of the United Nations.

86. I shall begin with the question of Algeria. I do so because there is war in Algeria, and we meet here to commemorate the third year of that war. It does not require a genius to state the case for Algeria. In plain words, the Algerians, like any other people in the world, have an inherent right to sovereignty and independence. The position of France in Algeria is a position of imperialism — pure and simple — and no amount of eloquence can defend a position of imperialism. At present, France is engaged in laying down a special régime for Algeria — the régime which led to the fall of the Government of France. On Algerian soil, France is throwing all its weight behind an attempt to reconquer the country. Both objectives are bound to meet with miserable failure. A political régime for a people can be established only by the people themselves. The ultimate destiny of the war in Algeria is victory for freedom, victory for the people of Algeria. If any testimony is required, we need only look at the twenty States which have emerged on the battlefield of freedom and have forced their way to membership in the United Nations.

87. We should not, however, fail to express our indignation at the savage acts of repression committed by the French troops in Algeria. In homage to military

traditions and the rules of war, French soldiers employed in Algeria can hardly be classified as troops. The human conscience has been deeply moved at the unspeakable, the unthinkable brutality committed by the French authorities in Algeria. In France — and this is a happy coincidence — free-thinkers and men of letters have registered their indignation in angry terms. The French Minister for Foreign Affairs was met with excited demonstrations in Latin America in protest against these brutalities — that Continent which is far removed from the scene of events but which is still so close because of its spirit of human brotherhood.

88. That in a nutshell is the situation in Algeria — a theatre of blood, destruction, repression and everything else that human suffering entails. In the words which the General Assembly proclaimed in the preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights — and I would remind the Assembly of these words — the people of Algeria have been "compelled to have recourse ... to rebellion against tyranny and oppression". It is my humble submission that the right of tyranny — if it can be called a right — can be redressed only by the right of rebellion. This is a new right which is joining the other human rights: the right of rebellion against tyranny and oppression. The people of Algeria are now exercising their right of rebellion against French tyranny and oppression. The rebellion became a regular war, but France unfortunately reduced it to genocide.

89. We cannot sit idly by, with arms folded, witnessing this human calamity. France must be reduced to obedience and respect for the wishes of the international community. The very minimum duty of the United Nations is to investigate on the spot. A United Nations mission or representative could bring to light the abominable conduct of French authorities in Algeria. Our Secretary-General, the great servant of our Charter, will not fail to patronize this investigation.

90. As to the substance of the issue, it is our sincere belief that nothing short of freedom will suffice to extinguish the holy flame glowing in Algeria. And nothing short of Algerian membership in the United Nations will lead to peace and tranquillity. We have only to lend our ears and our hearts to the dignified and eloquent appeal to France made in the Assembly by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ireland in his able and eloquent statement [682nd meeting]. I come here to applaud his sublime stand and to salute the bravery of his people. He has urged France to liberate itself from Algeria — and, truly, it is a process of French liberation from Algeria. If France were to respond to that call, it would be writing history again, as it did in the days of the Revolution.

91. Closely allied with the question of Algeria are the problems of Yemen and Oman. There, the British are bent on a campaign of aggression, in an attempt to retain a position of imperialism in the Arab Peninsula. Air bombardments of towns and villages in Yemen — a State Member of the United Nations — are becoming the news of the day. In Oman, the British forces are causing havoc and destruction to the defenceless and innocent people. British military attacks against Yemen and Oman are reminiscent of the nineteenth-century colonial campaigns in Asia and Africa. Such breaches of the Charter call for immedi-



ate action. It is our belief that a team of United Nations observers, posted along the areas under attack, would help restore tranquillity, as a prelude to an honourable settlement in accordance with the principles of the Charter. In any case, we shall have occasion to deal with these matters before the proper organs at the proper time.

92. I turn now to the question of the Gulf of Aqaba. Basically, this is not an international question. I bring it to the attention of the General Assembly only to disprove its international character. The facts are simple to state. The Gulf of Aqaba is a national inland waterway, subject to absolute Arab sovereignty. The geographical location of the Gulf is conclusive proof of its national character. It is separated from the Red Sea by a chain of islands, the largest being Sanafir and Tiran. The only navigable entrance — which, itself, is within Arab territory — does not exceed 500 metres. Thus, by its configuration, the Gulf is in the nature of a mare clausum, which does not belong to the class of international waterways. In the course of a visit which I made a few weeks ago to the Gulf of Aqaba, I deplored the distortion and wilful misrepresentation into which the whole issue has been plunged. The Gulf is so narrow that the territorial areas of the littoral States are bound to overlap among themselves, under any kind of measurement, even if we assume that the Gulf comprehends part of the high seas.

93. In the second place, the Gulf of Aqaba is of the category of historical gulfs that fall outside the sphere of international law. The Gulf is the historical route to the holy places in Mecca. Pilgrims from different Muslim countries have been streaming through the Gulf, year after year, for fourteen centuries. Ever since, the Gulf has been an exclusively Arab route under Arab sovereignty. It is due to this undisputed fact that not a single international authority makes any mention whatsoever of the Gulf as an international waterway open for international navigation.

94. It was last year, in the aftermath of aggression waged against Egypt, that the Gulf was claimed as comprehending an international highway. The fact stands now that Israel has not withdrawn from the Gulf — to say nothing of its acts of piracy and lawlessness duly reported to the Security Council. Israel warships, still in the Gulf, are one aspect of aggression. The resolution [997 (ES-1)] of 2 November 1956 calling for withdrawal of Israel behind the Armistice lines remains unimplemented as far as the Gulf is concerned.

95. Israel, I might say, has no right to any part of the Gulf. Israel's claim, were it to have any legs to stand on, could only be argued on the United Nations Plan of Partition or the Armistice lines. On either ground, the claim of Israel falls to the ground. On the plan of partition [resolution 181 (II)], Israel cannot claim Eilat before Israel is confined to the lines of the plan, with a final retreat from the districts of Jaffa, Lydda, Ramla, the central zone and Western Galilee, areas all behind the United Nations Plan of Partition. With regard to the armistice lines, again Israel has no ground to stand on, for a simple reason. Under the express provisions of the armistice agreements, the demarcation lines are purely "dictated" by "military considerations" and have no political significance. These are the words of the armistice agreements.

96. Thus, the area under Israel is nothing but a military control without sovereignty whatsoever. Israel has no sovereign status in the Gulf of Aqaba. Israel's position is one of aggression, and aggression never lasts, no matter how it lasts.

97. In his report to the General Assembly [A/3594], the Secretary-General referred to suggestions made by certain Members, urging for an opinion on the legal status of the Gulf of Aqaba, to be pronounced by the International Court of Justice. It goes without saying that our respect to the Court is unreserved and unlimited. But the matter is not to be decided exclusively on judicial grounds. The question involves matters of the highest order pertaining to pilgrimage and other national and political considerations. As a keeper of the Holy Places, his Majesty King Saud is not prepared to expose to question any matter touching upon the Holy shrines and the free passage of pilgrims to Mecca.

98. However, recourse to the International Court of Justice calls for a reminder, regrettable though it may be, but still a reminder worthy of being brought to the attention of the General Assembly. On more than one occasion Arab delegations have endeavoured to seek the advisory opinion of the Court of Justice on the Palestine question, but they were defeated. Recourse to justice at that time was denied and now we are faced with a plea to hurry to the Court, leaving behind us a bleeding legacy of grave injustice.

99. One other point was raised in the Secretary-General's report in connexion with the right of innocent passage. In spite of divergencies of opinion on every question falling within the province of international law, not a single legal precedent has declared a right of passage, innocent or otherwise, in a closed or inland water.

100. Innocent passage, however, raises the question of innocence. It is true that innocence is always the presumption, but with regard to Israel the presumption has been mercilessly defeated and rebutted. Israel has been condemned by the Security Council and the General Assembly, on more than one occasion and on more than one verdict of lawlessness and aggression, in entire negation of innocence. Again, innocent passage, as far as Israel is concerned, invites paradoxical irony. It is a fact that Arab refugees expelled from their country have not been allowed innocent passage to their homes. Again, the idea of innocent passage is raised in connexion with the Palestine refugees. It is fantastic that for Israel cargo, every argument for innocent passage is advanced, while for Arab refugees, all arguments of innocent passage must be suppressed or denied or ignored. Should we accept such a position, the United Nations would become a chartered organ for cargo, rather than a United Nations organization to uphold human rights and human dignity.

101. Last, but not least, I come to deal with the Palestine problem, a question that has been referred to and dealt with by many representatives in their speeches. On this issue we have a radical approach to place before the Assembly. We must strike at, and not around, the bush. We do not mean to be offensive, but the Palestine problem, which has been described by many delegations as the keg of powder for a global conflict, should not be treated in sugar-coated and sweet expressions. The Palestine question is the

centre of gravity in the whole situation of the Middle East, with its resources, its strategic position and its location in the heart of this troubled world. By this year, the Palestine question enters its second decade since it was first seized by the United Nations. With Israel's defiance, it was made a decade of fruitless conciliation and fruitless mediation, a decade of mounting tension characterized by military raids, violations of the armistice agreements and breaches of the Charter. These are matters of record in the books of the General Assembly or the Security Council. It is no use denying these facts; they are the facts and we must face them.

102. When the Palestine issue was first brought before the United Nations in 1947, the dispute was between two communities. Later it developed to a regional level, but recently it extended to international horizons. The question may be asked, what is wrong in the whole situation? Answering simply but candidly, the wrong is Israel and Israel is the wrong.

103. Israel was established against the will of the people of the land. Israel was wedged in the sub-continent of the Arab people against their determined refusal. The initial assumption—and I invite the attention of the Assembly now to this initial assumption—upon which the General Assembly recommended the creation of Israel was that partition would separate two conflicting communities. That was the assumption for the partition and the establishment of Israel: a separation of two conflicting communities. Succeeding events have vitiated this assumption. Instead of removing the evil, partition led to evil and conflict, but in greater proportions. In the words of the representative of the United States, while advocating partition before the General Assembly in 1947, the boundary between Israel and the Arab States "will be as friendly as the boundary which runs for three thousand miles between Canada and the United States" [124th meeting]. It is now for the United States and Canada to judge whether the armistice lines between Israel and the Arab States are "as friendly as the boundary which runs for three thousand miles between Canada and the United States". This was the assumption upon which partition was recommended. This assumption has collapsed mercilessly. We might better recollect the words that fell at that time from the lips of the representative of Canada when he said: "We support this plan with heavy hearts and many misgivings." What great misgivings have we encountered and how heavy are the hearts of the peoples of the world today.

104. We should not fail to remember that the General Assembly resolution on partition, as Mr. Lloyd pointed out, has unified the Eastern and Western blocs in an affirmative vote. Mr. Lloyd has invited the attention of the Assembly to this. Events have proved how ingenious was the vote cast by the East, and how stupid was the vote cast by the West. These are not my words; they are the words of the events that we face at the present moment. In his statement before the Assembly, Mr. Lloyd referred to the policy of the Soviet Union on the Palestine question as one of opportunism; the policy of the Soviet Union hinges, with regard to Palestine, on this pivot, a pivot of opportunism. Well, there should be an opportunity before there is opportunism. We cannot conceive of opportunism unless a state of opportunity exists. I should like to ask; who has provided the opportunity?

Who has provided the opportunity for opportunism? The author of an opportunity should not complain of opportunism—here in the General Assembly at least, where people can remember the positions of various delegations. In the effort to support one plan, one solution or other, one cannot stand here before the General Assembly and complain of opportunism. I do not wish to dwell, in one way or the other, on the policy of the Soviet Union with regard to the Palestine question. Whether it is opportunist or not, this is outside the relevant issue as we see it now. But if one stands before the Assembly to complain of opportunism, I think he must come with clean hands. If one delegation has provided an opportunity for another delegation to strike at opportunism, then it is he who is to blame and the complaint must be levelled against him.

105. But the question might be asked, what is the way out? It is no use talking about the past. What is the way out? This is a legitimate question; I think that it must be answered. The answer is very simple—if there is a will to accept the answer and to implement its implications. The journey started on a perilous road at the beginning and proceeded to a perilous destination.

106. I trust that my colleagues realize seriously the gravity of the situation. We are not here just to make eloquent speeches; we are not a debating society. We must realize the gravity of the situation. If the world is to be thrown into a third world war—which God forbid; everybody in the Middle East in the Arab world would lift his hands to the heavens to save the world from a catastrophe, the stage for which is already set in the Middle East—it would not come from the Far East; it would not come from Europe; but it would come from the Middle East, with Palestine as the powder keg.

107. Here is Israel with Zionism behind it to support aggression and expansion. Here is Zionism, that invaded a country, displaced a people, disturbed the peace of a region, and destroyed the loyalty of Jewish citizens to their homelands. Here is an expansionist movement that engineers the establishment of "Great Israel" between the Nile and the Euphrates.

108. Yet, the way out is still open before the General Assembly. To avoid a great catastrophe, the United Nations must reverse the course of action that has brought about this dilemma. We either pull back from the abyss or fall asunder. To accept the *de facto* situation is resignation and surrender on the part of the United Nations and is not worthy of the Organization. It is with this idea in mind that the United Nations must thrust its way through new avenues.

109. To begin with, the Palestine refugees must be allowed to go back to their homes. Repatriation is their inherent right and one which they are determined to exercise. All plans for resettlement or integration away from their homes have failed, since they were wholly unacceptable.

110. In the second place, Zionism must be outlawed anywhere and everywhere. It is an unlawful movement destroying friendly relations among nations. It is forging an alien allegiance in betrayal of allegiance to the sacred concept of home. All funds of Zionist organizations should pass to charitable, social or educational institutions of the Jewish communities in their respective countries.



111. In the third place, a United Nations agency should be established to facilitate the repatriation of the Israelis to their former homes. Thousands of Israelis, frustrated and deceived as they are, urgently strive to go back to their homelands in Europe and elsewhere, lacking only the means and facilities. To them, Palestine is not their home. They are the victims of the greatest disillusionment ever recorded in the history of mankind. And I am not speaking of abstract contentions or allegations.

112. In July 1957, a United Press correspondent reported from Jerusalem that only recently 80,000 Jews have migrated from Israel to settle abroad for the rest of their lives—80,000 Israelis leaving Israel to settle abroad for the rest of their lives. Now this is the key to the Palestine problem. Thousands and thousands of Jews in Israel are eager for a chance to pull out of Israel. A United Nations agency for the settlement of these refugees and their reintegration in their former countries is a humanitarian necessity. It is a basic step in the right direction to normalize the situation. Jewish immigration into Palestine has always been one of the main grounds for tension in the Middle East. With the passing of the Nazi and Fascist régimes, Jews in Israel look forward to picking up again their threads in Europe, if only financial facilities could be provided.

113. Here is the chance for the United Nations to help the Jewish masses in Israel to join their families in their countries of origin. Here is the challenge for Jewish organizations to assist in this great human task. It is only the tyranny of Israel which is keeping these people in this concentration camp called Israel. With this plan accepted and put into action, the Holy Land would again be set for serenity and tranquillity. Such a plan stands in need of our highly-talented Secretary-General. With Mr. Hammarskjöld lives the whole problem of the Middle East, and his shining name has become part of the history of the Middle East.

114. Thus it becomes clear that we do not propose to throw the Jews into the sea. We wish them a better and happier life in their homelands, where they can settle under United Nations auspices. Those Jews, the legitimate inhabitants of Palestine, who remain in the country can join with their Moslem and Christian fellow-inhabitants in a new life of amity and prosperity, shaping their political future in accordance with the best democratic institutions. Without statehood, the Jews can flourish wherever they may be.

115. As far as the Arab world is concerned, the best I can say are the words uttered in the French National Assembly at the time of the French Revolution: "To the Jews as a nation we grant nothing, to the Jews as men we grant all". In all sincerity the Arabs can now equally reiterate: "To the Jews as a nation we grant nothing, but to the Jews as men, as human beings, as fellow citizens, we grant all".

116. This is the high road to peace not only for Palestine, not only for the Middle East, but also for the whole of mankind. For our part, we pledge ourselves to join with the United Nations in this great task of achieving peace—peace based upon justice—now and for all time to come.

117. I have just a last word to say. The Assembly this year is beclouded with fear and distrust. Cold

war hangs in one area, intimidation reigns in another; while armed conflicts are dominating in more than one country. To our deep regret, the questions of disarmament, atomic weapons, nuclear explosions, unsolved as they are, continue to arouse general anxiety throughout the whole world. On the regional level the question of West Irian and the question of Cyprus—two legacies of colonialism—are among the outstanding problems that disturb the minds of freedom-loving peoples. Thus, in general, the world is not at ease and the pendulum of war is swinging on the horizon.

118. But the picture is not entirely gloomy. There is a bright side which should not escape our attention. With us, in this Assembly, are assembled the hope and faith of millions. World public opinion is becoming the greatest invisible force ever known in the long history of the human race. The voice of public opinion lives with us. It speaks not but we hear it in our innermost. All these forces assemble with us, under the flag of the United Nations, to fight a battle common to all and sacred to all. For surely, we are here fighting for liberty against imperialism; struggling for plenty against poverty; striving for knowledge against ignorance. It is a battle aiming at no aggression, at no expansion or domination. It is a battle to banish the danger of war for all time to come—a battle that registers defeat to none, but scores victory for all.

119. Mr. RAPACKI (Poland) (translated from French): It is the hope of the people of Poland, above all else, that the atmosphere of the current session of the General Assembly, the course of the debate, and the results achieved, will help to bring about a further relaxation in the cold war and promote constructive co-operation among nations, irrespective of their social and political systems. We are deeply convinced that in that objective, the vital interests of the Polish people are identical with the interests of all the other Members of the United Nations; and I can assure the President and all the delegations present in this hall that in that spirit the Polish delegation will do its best to make a positive contribution to the deliberations of the twelfth session, and more particularly, to the study of the problems which most directly affect us and with which we are most familiar.

120. In our view, the special responsibility conferred upon the great Powers under the Charter in no way limits the responsibility and the role of the smaller countries; every nation has its particular facilities for developing its relations with other nations and we feel that each nation should use them in such a way as to contribute, to the greatest extent possible, to the development of constructive co-operation, the restoration of mutual confidence and the rapprochement of all peoples.

121. Poland is a socialist State; and it is only because we have embarked on the path of socialism that we have been able to resolve the contradictions which held back economic, social and cultural progress in our country; only because we have taken that path have we been able to overcome the effects of the state of backwardness we inherited from the past, and to bring about the advancement of Poland in all fields. We also believe that, as a socialist State, Poland can be a positive factor in the growth of peaceful relations among nations. Strong and lasting bonds of solidarity



link us with the other socialist countries, bonds forged by common needs, by the common basic problems of socialist development and by the vital interests of the Polish people.

122. At the same time, it is our aim to maintain the best possible relations with other countries. We are therefore gratified to note the recent improvement in our relations with many Western countries, as well as the continued strengthening of our friendly co-operation with many countries of Asia and Africa. There is no, and there cannot be, any contradiction between our ties and our solidarity with socialist countries and the improvement and expansion of our relations with other countries. It is essential for the favourable development of our mutual friendly relations that the countries in question realize this. I think it is also useful for an understanding of the very meaning of the concept of constructive peaceful coexistence.

123. As you know, we have launched a vigorous programme to reorganize the forms and methods of government and economic administration in Poland. We are convinced that those carefully thought-out changes will enable us to make the most of the great achievements registered thus far and of the still greater future prospects of socialist development in our country with a view to enabling our people to live a better and fuller life. However, the success of this programme is dependent to a great extent on the development of the international situation.

124. We are fully aware of the difficulties in the way of any solution of the problems facing the twelfth session of the General Assembly, for we know how deep-rooted they are. No one, of course, imagines that the basic contradictions of our time can be disposed of by a kind of magic formula. Their solution is part and parcel of the historical process now taking place. Our action should therefore be determined by the realities of life and the laws of history. We should attempt, through a common effort of all peoples, to shape this historical process in the best interests of mankind; above all, we must prevent a catastrophe, the dimensions and consequences of which are unpredictable. Where our differences cannot be resolved within a reasonable time, we must reach at least partial agreements, and that is precisely where the United Nations can play a very important part.

125. The key issue before the twelfth session of this Assembly is disarmament. This is not the first time that the United Nations has had to deal with it. Towards the close of the last session, most delegations represented here expressed optimism as to the possibility of the discussions held that year leading at least to a preliminary agreement. Unfortunately, the results of the work of the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission fell short of that expectation.

126. As is apparent from the way the discussions developed in the Sub-Committee in London, the primary obstacle to progress was the concept of so-called "global strategy" of the Western Powers, which assigns a vital role to nuclear weapons. We have had an eloquent example in this very hall of where such reasoning can lead. There is no point in challenging the view put forward by the Secretary of State of the United States on the humanitarian benefits which it is alleged can come out of the development of nuclear weapons. There can be no doubt that the peoples of

the world prefer to have their security guaranteed by effective prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons rather than by even the most subtle moral and religious scruples of a given government.

127. The second obstacle to the Sub-Committee's progress was the insistence of the Western Powers that concrete measures for disarmament should be conditional on the simultaneous solution of other controversial international problems.

128. Finally, the third obstacle arose from the opposition of the Federal Republic of Germany and from considerations relating to the remilitarization of Western Germany.

129. As a result of these various factors, the discussions on disarmament were protracted and it was impossible to reach even partial agreement. Meanwhile, time is running out. Every month that the armaments race continues is becoming far too costly, in all ways, for the peoples of the world.

130. We are now witnessing a transformation in the military forces of the great Powers. Conventional armaments are being replaced by nuclear weapons. There is a growing danger that other countries will also have nuclear weapons. When armies equipped with tactical nuclear weapons stand face to face, there will be a greater danger that weapons of mass destruction will be used, even in local conflicts.

131. That is another reason why, if we cannot, at this juncture, reach agreement on the permanent and absolute prohibition of the use of all nuclear weapons, we believe that the proposal of the Soviet Union stipulating that the great Powers should undertake provisionally not to use nuclear weapons for a period of at least five years is a step in the right direction. The Polish delegation will support any move to bring us closer to the basic solution of this problem.

132. We shall likewise support any step towards the discontinuance of tests of nuclear weapons as soon as possible. That is what people everywhere want; that is the conclusion to be drawn from the warnings given by the most eminent scientists. There can be no excuse for further procrastination. In our view, the discontinuance of nuclear tests is not only a first step towards their prohibition, but a very important element in the relaxation of international tension, which everybody will welcome with relief.

133. The Polish delegation will, of course, present its views on the disarmament question at greater length in the First Committee. In my comments here, I should like especially to stress the importance of the question for the most vital interests of Poland. So far as we are concerned, armaments are primarily related to the situation in Europe, in the territory of Germany on Poland's borders. The remilitarization of the Federal Republic of Germany and the concentration of arms and troops on its territory constitute a policy which is very dangerous to the cause of peace in Europe and in the world. It is all the more dangerous because we are dealing with a State in which militarist and "revanchist" trends have by no means disappeared and exert a considerable influence. Western Germany must not be allowed to become an atomic powder-keg in the middle of Europe.

134. We understand the legitimate aspirations of the German people for unification and we support them in

the best interests of the whole of Europe. The example of our relations with the German Democratic Republic shows that the Polish people is capable of maintaining good-neighbourly relations with the German people. We know that there is also a large sector of public opinion in the Federal Republic of Germany in favour of good relations with Poland. But the process of reunification of Germany as a peace-loving, democratic State can only develop in an atmosphere of relaxed international tension, disarmament, growing feelings of security on the part of Germany's neighbours, and by a rapprochement and understanding between the two German States. It cannot thrive in an atmosphere of tension, of "revanchist" demands for arms, and certainly not in the spirit of certain statements which practically advocate absorption of the German Democratic Republic by the Federal Republic and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

135. Existing tensions are being aggravated by revisionist claims concerning our western frontier. That frontier is final, inviolable and not open to bargaining. Any statesman with a sense of realities surely realizes that. It would be a good thing for the diplomats of the countries which wish to maintain friendly relations with Poland to draw the proper conclusions.

136. We are against the dividing of Europe into opposing military blocs. Our views regarding the North Atlantic Treaty are well known. Every Polish citizen judges NATO primarily in relation to its policy in the German question. In the face of the danger which Western Germany's armaments within NATO represent for our country and for other European countries, Poland and its allies were forced to conclude the Warsaw Treaty, which safeguards our country's security until such time as an effective system of collective security is established instead of the present division of Europe. We want such a system and will help to achieve it to the best of our ability. Until a system of collective security is created in Europe, we will support even partial solutions directed towards the same ultimate objective. We will support them whether they are part of a larger plan or the subject of separate agreements. Accordingly, we have felt and we still feel that it would be useful to set up limited and controlled armaments zones in Europe. Thus far, no progress has been made in that direction. On the contrary, there are plans afoot to equip the West German army with nuclear weapons. If these plans are carried out, they will inevitably create more international tension and force States which feel threatened to draw their own conclusions as to strengthening their security. We should not let that situation continue. We want to help prevent such a situation. Hence I should like on behalf of my Government to make the following statement: In the interest of Poland's security and of a relaxation of tension in Europe, and after consultation with the other parties to the Warsaw Treaty, the Government of the People's Republic of Poland declares that if the two German States should consent to enforce the prohibition of the production and stockpiling of nuclear weapons in their respective territories, the People's Republic of Poland is prepared simultaneously to institute the same prohibition in its territory.

137. I am convinced that if that could be achieved, we would at least have made the first step towards solution of a problem which is vital not only to the

Polish people and the German people and their mutual relations, but to the whole of Europe and to all the peoples of the world.

138. One of the great historical processes of our time is the liberation of the dependent and colonial peoples, their organization and development as independent States. That is a phenomenon that can neither be halted nor reversed. Any such attempt would merely create new danger spots and fresh conflicts. We are now confronted with a dangerous situation of this kind in the Near East. Threats and pressures being brought against Syria are causing special concern. The only way to resolve this and similar conflicts is by adhering to the principle of the self-determination of peoples, by recognizing fully the right of independent States to shape their internal and external relations, and by seeking agreement on the basis of those principles.

139. The elimination of danger spots and of threats to world peace is one aspect of the problem. The other is the achievement of constructive co-operation among nations, irrespective of their structure and levels of economic development. Poland is very anxious to develop its economic relations with all countries to the full. We want to participate as actively as possible in international economic co-operation. That is why we are keenly interested in the development of the world economic situation and in the activity of international economic organizations. There have recently been certain developments favourable to world economic relations generally in the form of trade between certain capitalist countries and certain socialist countries of Europe and Asia; but the progress made is still too limited and discriminatory trade practices are still being applied to socialist countries. At the same time, the disparity in capitalist countries between the rich economically-developed countries and the scores of under-developed countries and territories, instead of disappearing, is increasing from year to year. Nearly half the people of the world, living in economically under-developed countries, still have no prospect of a more rapid rise in their living standards.

140. A group of the richest and economically most developed Western countries have thus far been able to maintain a relatively high level of production and employment; but they have refused to participate in a broader comprehensive international programme which would affect the whole world economy. They isolate themselves in a series of exclusive organizations and institutions which are often the counterparts of the blocs they themselves have created.

141. The arms race is creating more and more difficulties, serious difficulties. Even today, in many capitalistic countries of the West, Governments are being warned that it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain production and employment by present methods. We have heard such warnings in the course of this debate. We have only to glance at the daily press to realize the anxiety caused by the recent rise in the inflationary trend. Voices are being raised asserting that a halt to the arms race and the productive use of the economic resources of certain countries - especially the economically under-developed countries - would help to overcome many of the current economic difficulties more effectively and more permanently than any temporary boom created by an armaments race.

142. In some capitalist countries, there is a growing trend in favour of expanding trade with the socialist countries.

143. We believe that the United Nations should act more forcefully to strengthen economic co-operation between countries with different political systems and at different levels of economic development.

144. A genuine effort should be made to encourage more vigorous practical action on the part of the Economic and Social Council. Here in the United Nations and not outside it, we should work out a system of international consultations and later, international action. The consultations would embrace the main problem of world economy and its harmonious development. Such a programme, under the aegis of the United Nations, would substantially help the economically under-developed countries in their fight for economic and social progress.

145. The proposed Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development meets precisely those objectives, inter alia.

146. We feel that the work of the regional economic commissions, which are more familiar than anyone else with the specific needs and problems of their respective regions, should be intensified.

147. Apart from the problems affecting large regions, particular groups of States have their own problems of neighbourly co-operation. Poland is especially interested in the Baltic region. One or more agreements concluded by the countries of the Baltic region on economic, cultural and scientific questions, might serve as a model for a system of regional arrangements based on vital common needs, and become a concrete illustration of peaceful constructive coexistence.

148. Peaceful coexistence, in its broadest sense, should be the kernel of all the work of the United Na-

tions. The term expresses the manner in which peoples must live together in this era if it is to be an era of unprecedented progress and not an era of disaster.

149. The principles of peaceful coexistence contained in the declarations of China and India, in other bilateral declarations, and then proclaimed at the historic Bandung Conference, have become crystallized generally in recommendations for mutual respect for territorial integrity, national sovereignty, non-aggression, non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, equality and peaceful coexistence. They are accepted today by thirty-seven countries of Europe, Asia and Africa. Their importance for proper international relations has also been recognized by Poland in a series of bilateral acts. Poland is gratified, therefore, that the item has been placed on the agenda of the current session.

150. It would be difficult to refrain from the bitter comment: that this session has rejected the proposal of India, one of the co-authors of the historic principles of peaceful coexistence, that the United Nations should recognize the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China, the other co-author of those principles.

151. I have presented Poland's views on the problems of international policy which are most important to it. The Polish people are watching the deliberations of the current session of the General Assembly very closely. I believe that all peoples will judge the results of our work by the same standard: whether or not this session will represent at least a small but definite step towards strengthening and stabilizing peace. It is the desire and hope of my delegation that its efforts towards achieving that end may anticipate those of other delegations.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.