

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FOURTEENTH SESSION

Official Records


**820th
PLENARY MEETING**

 Monday, 5 October 1959
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

General debate (*continued*)

Speech by Mr. Upadhyay (Nepal)	347
Speech by Mr. Fawzi (United Arab Republic)	349
Statement by the representative of Israel	353
Speech by Mr. Thors (Iceland)	354
Speech by Mr. Sik (Hungary)	359

President: Mr. Víctor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal): Let me first of all express the heartfelt condolences of all members of my delegation to our Ceylonese friends on the irreparable loss they have sustained in the death of their great Prime Minister, Mr. Bandaru Naik.

2. We were also extremely sorry to hear about the heavy loss of life and property in Japan caused by the recent typhoon there. We extend our deepest sympathy to our Japanese friends.

3. Mr. President, I should now like to extend to you the warm felicitations of His Majesty's Government of Nepal and my own congratulations on your election as President of the fourteenth session of the General Assembly. We have no doubt that, with your long and distinguished record of service in the United Nations and in international conferences generally, you will discharge the heavy responsibilities of this high office with distinction.

4. At the same time, I should fail in my duty if I did not take this opportunity to express my Government's deep appreciation of the work of Mr. Charles Malik of Lebanon, who guided the deliberations of the Assembly in difficult times last year.

5. We have been in the United Nations for a little more than three years, and during these three eventful years we have sought to work to the best of our ability, both nationally and internationally, for those principles and practices which in our opinion would strengthen world peace and security.

6. In the domestic field we have believed that political, economic and social progress within our country is in itself an important contribution to world peace. In other words, we are firmly convinced that if we want to really serve the cause of world peace we must direct our energies towards the political and economic progress of the people even more than to the problems of the world outside. And, actuated by this belief, we have set up for the first time in our history a liberal government freely elected on the basis of

universal adult franchise responsible to the people and responsive to their aspirations. His Majesty King Mahendra has happily associated himself with this great experiment in democratic evolution. In this new political set-up, our Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, Mr. B. P. Koirala, would personally have liked to come and participate in the work of the United Nations, but pressing work at home, especially because our Government has been just recently installed, has prevented him from doing so.

7. For the past three years we have expressed on different occasions our point of view on many international questions. We have not only declared our faith, our unqualified faith, in the aims and purposes of the United Nations Charter, but we have actually tried hard to work and live in reality in accordance with the spirit of the Charter. Our faith in the United Nations, and as a matter of fact, the faith of all the smaller countries in this world Organization, has been strengthened by the fact that in times of great crisis the United Nations has not satisfied itself with the mere passing of pious resolutions, but has actually taken actions which have often proved adequate to meet the situation, as for example in Suez, Laos, and other areas. Thus, on different occasions, the United Nations has succeeded in saving the world from the imminent threat of war.

8. We have taken an unequivocal stand against imperialism or colonialism in any shape or form and have maintained that every step toward the independence and freedom of dependent countries is a step toward progress and peace. We have, therefore, watched with special interest, sympathy and even pride the growth of nationalism in Asia and Africa, and have been happy to welcome from year to year many new Members into the United Nations, as a result of their attaining full statehood. We welcomed the Federation of Malaya last year and we are happy to welcome the Republic of Guinea this year. We hope and believe that we will have the opportunity to welcome many more Members into this august world body in the future.

9. The growth of nationalism and of movements of resurgence in Asia and Africa is a great creative process. The United Nations has reflected in positive terms, as in a mirror, this great creative work of building a new world order that is going on around us in the form of a search for new values, new attitudes and new centres of gravity and interest, but it has unfortunately reflected also the negative and destructive aspects of this great process. On the negative side there are still many countries which have yet to become free. The bitter struggle for national independence that is going on in Algeria and other parts of Africa comes to mind, and we appeal to the colonial powers to respond more adequately to the nationalist aspirations of these countries.

10. We believe that the policy of non-alignment which we have pursued in relation to rival international power groups is a policy dictated by the acceptance of present international reality. The two Power groups, in our view, are a reality and it is also a fact that they have been coexisting for almost a decade and a half in peace though it has been a kind of uneasy peace. Besides, there have been, in the course of the last fourteen years, certain periods when one or the other group has appeared to possess an over-all military superiority over another, and has yet refrained from actually plunging the world into war. This being the case, we hold the view that in the present world situation, which is likely to continue for quite a long time, total war does not appear to us to be probable and we still put trust in the basic wisdom of the world's statesmen.

11. Therefore, when we say that we follow the policy of non-alignment, we mean that there are two groups of Powers in the world today, and that their existence is a reality which we cannot ignore. To act as if one or the other group does not exist or exists only to be militarily conquered is, in our opinion, extremely dangerous because it ignores, in the event of military conflict between the two Power groups which that concept implies, the certain prospect of annihilation that humanity faces. The policy of non-alignment is, therefore, nothing but a recognition of existing international realities and has nothing to do with the concept of neutralism which is often ridiculed in interested quarters and which implies a lack of response to basic questions of international life. Therefore, the policy of non-alignment does not, as we have repeatedly made clear, mean that we are neutral on many international questions, and neutral towards different ideologies that prevail in the world. It means that we decide each issue on its own merits, and do not commit ourselves beforehand to the position of either of the two Power blocs by joining either group of military alliances in the form of military pacts, and that we retain our freedom of judgement.

12. Coming to the question of United Nations membership, we believe that, if the United Nations is to be made into an effective instrument of peace, it is necessary to ensure universality of membership. It is for this reason that we have felt happy at the addition of each new Member, and the expansion of the United Nations membership from fifty-one to eighty-two has been a matter of deep satisfaction for us. We have, however, been disappointed when the question of the representation of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China is postponed year after year, because this postponement has not only deprived the United Nations of universality, but also made it a less efficacious instrument of peace. If, unfortunately, it becomes established that all important international conferences having a vital bearing on world peace have to take place outside the United Nations, as has been the increasing tendency so far, the United Nations may go the same way which the League of Nations did. We believe that all will agree when we say we must prevent this from happening. Political maturity, in our opinion, requires the acceptance of such a great reality as China, not escape from, nor evasion of, such a reality. We have, therefore, pleaded on previous occasions and during the present session of the General Assembly [800th meeting], for the restoration of the real China to her legitimate place in the comity of nations.

13. It may not be out of place here to refer to the events that have occurred in our part of the world involving the People's Republic of China, and which have disturbed people in different parts of the world. What is our attitude—and our reaction—to these developments? Our attitude is as follows: We have tried to foster and develop the best of relations and friendship on the basis of the Pancha Shila, with the People's Republic of China for the past so many years; and as far as we are concerned, we intend to continue to pursue this policy. Again, it is well known that we have had long, intimate historical, economic, religious and cultural ties with Tibet, and our religious and cultural ties have been particularly profound. The recent developments in our immediate neighbourhood have made us very worried and anxious. For this reason, we deeply regret the unhappy events in Tibet which have led the Dalai Lama to leave his own country and which have led to some misunderstanding being developed between India and China, our two great neighbours. We sincerely hope that the border dispute between India and China, if it arises, will be solved in the way in which it was said at the 1955 Bandung Conference that such disputes would be solved, by negotiation, not by force.

14. In so far as Laos is concerned, His Majesty's Government in Nepal welcomes the decision of the Security Council [S/4216] and hopes that the report of its Sub-Committee^{1/} will prove useful for suggesting measures for the restoration of peace in that area.

15. I think that the keynote of the international political situation for the coming year was struck in this Assembly by the representatives of three great Powers. All these three statesmen—Mr. Khrushchev [799th meeting], Mr. Herter [797th meeting] and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd [798th meeting]—have laid special emphasis on the need for disarmament. We believe—and we have made this clear on previous occasions—that the Soviet and Western points of view have many common elements among them, and we welcome any progress in the direction of disarmament, whether this progress takes place within or without the United Nations.

16. Since we met here a year ago at the thirteenth session of the General Assembly, there have been certain developments which have resulted in international tension being considerably reduced. We welcome these developments, though most of them have taken place outside the United Nations. We are glad to know that progress is being made in Geneva regarding the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. Then again, we welcomed the Four-Power Foreign Ministers Conference convened at Geneva to meet the worsening Berlin crisis, which was part of a wider, constructive diplomatic activity in which the statesmen of the world have been seriously engaged for some time, and which we hope may well culminate in real understanding between two power groups. Moreover, mutual exchange of visits between Western and Eastern statesmen, concrete proposals for disarmament, and a meeting or meetings of the Heads of Governments may lead, we hope, to a welcome permanent relaxation of tension in the international field.

17. The United Nations has before it the report of the Secretary-General on the question of the con-

^{1/} Subsequently distributed as document S/4236.

tinuation of the United Nations Emergency Force [A/4210]. Now, UNEF was created in 1956 at the time of the Suez crisis, when the shadow of a third world war seemed to loom very large indeed. At that crucial moment in the history of the Middle East, UNEF played a most worthy role in keeping and supervising peace along the Arab-Israel border, and has continued to do so until today. It is difficult to pay a really adequate tribute to UNEF, in view of the excellent work it has done. Again, the United Nations Observer Group in Lebanon, to which my own country made some humble contribution of its own, did a really wonderful job along the Syria-Lebanon border last year, and thus not only arrested the worsening of the situation in the area, but was also responsible for restoring the normal situation that obtains there today. In the light of experience, during the fourteen years of the United Nations existence, it may be claimed that there has been a need for such a force on various occasions, for meeting a sudden and unexpected threat to peace. Therefore, His Majesty's Government in Nepal, in taking up the report of the Secretary-General, reiterates the stand which it took at the thirteenth session of the General Assembly [745th meeting] that a small force, even if to be used merely for non-combatant purposes, should be available to the United Nations, and this force should be maintained by Member States to be employed at the behest of the United Nations. It has been amply proved by our experience that a small but efficient United Nations force will be necessary on a permanent basis if the United Nations is to fulfill its great responsibility of keeping peace in the world.

18. Although, because of the interlinked character of the modern world, we cannot quite ignore the events which take place in the international arena, we realize that we can do very little indeed to influence the course of world events. We are immensely interested in peace, but we know that there are forces beyond our control that actually decide the issues of war and peace. In these circumstances, we believe, as I have already indicated, that the forces of peace will be strengthened if, through proper political and economic progress, we are able to remove the stresses and tensions of poverty and under-development that exist within our own country.

19. We believe, therefore, that the activities of the United Nations should be oriented increasingly towards the economic rather than the political or military aspects of the problem of international peace. It has been almost universally admitted that world peace is no longer a closed military problem. Do we not see the military solutions in different parts of the world to keep either internal order or international peace proving inadequate? Hence, even more than a military problem, international peace is an economic problem. His Majesty's Government in Nepal welcomes the increased attention being paid by the United Nations to the economic development of under-developed countries but considers that what has been done so far is not enough.

20. We believe that the United Nations could provide a more effective leadership in this area, in which there is almost unlimited scope for creative and constructive work. It is for this reason that we have watched with special interest the role played by the various specialized agencies of the United Nations, including the International Bank for Reconstruction

and Development (IBRD) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in economic and technical development of various countries, and have welcomed the decision made at the thirteenth session [resolution 1240 (XIII)] to set up a Special Fund for the development of backward and under-developed countries. However, in the opinion of my Government, this Special Fund cannot take the place of the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, and we hope that the United Nations will take the necessary measures to bring SUNFED into being as soon as possible, in view of the great interest and enthusiasm shown in it by the smaller under-developed nations when the idea was first mooted.

21. During the past year, the Secretary-General made an extensive tour of several Asian countries, including Nepal, and at the conclusion of his tour, in a meeting [1085th meeting] of the Economic and Social Council, he made an appeal to the advanced countries to dedicate themselves even more vigorously than in the past to helping the development of the under-developed countries in Asia, Africa and South America. The Secretary-General is universally respected for his wisdom and imagination, and we hope that the United Nations will pay adequate attention to his words of wisdom in relation to the development of the under-developed countries.

22. Mr. FAWZI (United Arab Republic): Late though I am in taking part in this debate, I am happy and privileged to join in congratulating both the Assembly and yourself upon your election to preside over our deliberations. The high esteem and the affection which we all have for you, Mr. Belaúnde, together with our hearty wishes for your success and that of the Assembly will accompany you.

23. With the steady growth in the membership of this Organization, and the consequent prospect of four-score or more opening speeches, it has become almost an act of daring to venture forth to this rostrum during the general debate. I shall try to be brief. If I succeed, much of the credit for it will be due to the representatives who have spoken before me and spared me the need for saying what would be a mere recapitulation of what they have stated.

24. From Cairo we have been, as usual, looking at the world and watching closely the trends and the course of its affairs; and we assume that the world has been looking a little at us too. The prospects of world peace at present seem to be generally better. We welcome the recent meetings between many of the leaders of various States, including those between some of the leaders of the two main rival blocs. We shall value these and similar meetings still more if and when they prove actually to have inaugurated an era of closer consultations, increased mutual understanding, less mutual suspicion, and more righteousness and positiveness in relation to the building up of the structure of international peace.

25. We shall feel more convinced and reassured when armaments will be regulated, when the tests of nuclear and thermo-nuclear bombs will be excluded from the scene and when, among other things, the Government of France will forego its project, for so-called reasons of prestige and of position, to imitate some others by carrying out its own nuclear tests in the African Sahara. It is by now admitted as an indisputable fact that, once they are exploded, those bombs unleash

tremendous and uncontrollable forces of destruction within and without the borders of the State which is responsible for them.

26. We are not aware of there being, in the laws of nations or in the good norms of human behaviour, any warrant for actions of that nature. Nor is the International Law Commission or any other qualified body aware of the existence of such a warrant. What all are particularly aware of is the ever more intense feeling of resentment and of horror generated in this connexion throughout the world.

27. It is the considered opinion of my Government that the General Assembly should promptly make an injunction—we can call it a recommendation if we have to—against any further tests of nuclear or thermo-nuclear bombs, be it by France in the African Sahara or anywhere else by any other Power.

28. No short-sighted political opportunism, no devious legalistics should deter us from accomplishing this sacred duty. This Organization is not, and should never be, a helpless viewer of events. It can greatly help in shaping events. This Organization is not, either, a mere interpreter, or, worse still, a distorter of the laws. It can, in a sense, legislate, by common agreement and by the communion of its Members with high ideals and worthy objectives.

29. In San Francisco in 1945 the Members of the United Nations agreed that plans should be formulated for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments, in order, as it is stated in Article 26 of the Charter "to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources".

30. The final communiqué of the Asian-African Conference held at Bandung, in 1955, stated:

"2. The Asian-African Conference having considered the dangerous situation of international tension existing and the risks confronting the whole human race from the outbreak of global war in which the destructive power of all types of armaments, including nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, would be employed, invited the attention of all nations to the terrible consequences that would follow if such a war were to break out.

"The Conference considered that disarmament and the prohibition of the production, experimentation and use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons of war are imperative to save mankind and civilization from the fear and prospect of wholesale destruction. It considered that the nations of Asia and Africa assembled here have a duty towards humanity and civilization to proclaim their support for disarmament and for the prohibition of these weapons and to appeal to nations principally concerned and to world opinion, to bring about such disarmament and prohibition.

"The Conference considered that effective international control should be established and maintained to implement such prohibition and that speedy and determined efforts should be made to this end. Pending the total prohibition of the manufacture of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, the Conference appealed to all the powers concerned to reach agreement to suspend experiments with such weapons.

"The Conference declared that universal disarmament is an absolute necessity for the preservation of peace and requested the United Nations to continue its efforts and appealed to all concerned speedily to bring about the regulation, limitation, control and reduction of all armed forces and armaments, including the prohibition of the production, experimentation and use of all weapons of mass destruction, and to establish effective international control to this end."

Thus spoke in Bandung the representatives of nearly two-thirds of our human race.

31. The Conference of Independent African States, meeting in Accra from 15 to 20 April 1958 adopted the following text:

"The Conference ...

" ...

"1. Calls upon the great Powers to discontinue the production of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons and to suspend all such tests not only in the interest of world peace but as a symbol of their avowed devotion to the rights of man;

"2. Views with grave alarm and strongly condemns all atomic tests in any part of the world, and in particular the intention to carry out such tests in the Sahara;

"3. Appeals to the great Powers to use atomic, nuclear and thermo-nuclear energy exclusively for peaceful purposes;

"4. Affirms the view that the reduction of conventional armaments is essential in the interest of international peace and security and appeals to the great Powers to make every possible effort to reach a settlement of this important matter." 2/

32. The Conference of Independent African States, meeting at Monrovia, Liberia from 4 to 8 August 1959 adopted in its resolution II the following:

"Noting with deep concern the decision of the French Government to carry out nuclear tests in the Sahara,

"Recalling the resolution of the Accra Conference of Independent African States which viewed with grave alarm and strongly condemned all atomic tests in any part of the world and in particular the intention to carry out such tests in the Sahara,

" ...

"Considering the grave dangers these nuclear tests will hold for the people of Africa in general and in particular those living in the Sahara and the adjacent territories,

"1. Denounces vigorously and with profound indignation the decision of any Government to carry out nuclear tests in the Sahara or in any other part of Africa,

"2. Appeals to the conscience of the world to condemn this threat to the lives and security of the African people, and

2/ Conference of Independent African States, Declaration and Resolutions, 22 April 1958 (Accra (Ghana), Government Printer, 1958) resolution XII.

*3. **"Recommends to the Governments and peoples of Africa to protest in the most energetic and formal manner to the French Government to desist from carrying out the proposed tests in the Sahara."**

33. There is no reason why we should not, and every reason why we should, take at present as firm and clear a stand in this regard as those taken unanimously by the Conferences of San Francisco, Bandung, Accra and Monrovia; nay, the only stand which can today genuinely represent and express in relation to this vital matter the feelings, the convictions and the instinct of survival of mankind.

34. The Assembly will of course, and with due care, study the various relevant and important proposals which the Soviet Premier, Mr. Khrushchey [799th meeting], and several other distinguished leaders have presented to it and those they will present to it.

35. That the regulation of armaments and the reduction to a minimum of the appalling burden of military expenses is the objective has been agreed with virtual unanimity since the San Francisco Conference, or even before. But the obstacles besetting the road to the attainment of that objective have been and are still almost staggeringly big. This is one reason why we consider the key sentence in the explanatory memorandum [A/4218] accompanying the item presented by the delegation of the Soviet Union to be the one which "expresses the hope that the United Nations, and every Member State, will do its utmost to obtain a practical solution to the problem of general and complete disarmament". In point of fact the two words "practical solution" sum up the whole difficulty standing in the way of agreement on disarmament.

36. It has been said, and rightly, that no practical solution could be had as long as the crisis of confidence persists. But merely saying this does not help progress towards our goal. Further exploration must be made in order to find and establish and organize the elements of mutual confidence: in other words, to set up and activate the mechanics of a reliable system of fact-finding and of control. This is going to be extremely difficult; but we are not supposed to reach only for easy things.

37. Luckily, there is no other choice than to overcome whatever difficulties there might remain between us and our goal of disarmament and of diverting the world's human and economic resources to peaceful purposes; and luckily, too, the opinions of mankind are now so alerted regarding this matter, and so alive to its insuperably great implications, that no delay and no laxity in connexion with it will for long be tolerated.

38. We therefore commend the efforts made in this connexion by the United Nations as a whole, and by some of its Members. We wish success to their imminent meetings, resuming talks on the cessation of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests and on disarmament.

39. Another aspect of disarmament is one regarding which my delegation has submitted, on various previous occasions, my Government's views. It is the use, or rather abuse, by some Powers of their position as arms-producing countries to tempt, or to exert pressure on, other countries in need of arms.

40. The Conference meeting in Accra last year referred to this aspect in the following terms:

"The Conference ...

" ...

*5. Condemns the policy of using the sale of arms as a means of exerting pressure on Governments and interfering in the internal affairs of other countries." 3/

The re-channelling of the world's resources into determined endeavours for human advancement is admittedly overdue.

41. It is true that there have been, that there still are, factors and events distracting attention away from constructiveness. It is true too, however, that the urge and action for the rehabilitation of the peoples of the world are steadily and rapidly gaining momentum.

42. The area from which I come is an expressive illustration of the prospects and the difficulties accompanying the work of development and progress in many an area all over the globe. Besides the importance of its geographical position, its human and natural resources, its present and, infinitely more, its potential ability to contribute to international peace and security and to humanity's prosperity and happiness, are really immense.

43. Yet how can these advantages be fully and properly realized in the presence of such factors and events as the fighting and the sad happenings in Algeria, Buraimi, Oman, the southern parts of the Arabian peninsula, and as the tragic plight and unredeemed rights of the Arab nation of Palestine?

44. The document submitted by the Secretary-General dated 15 June 1959 [A/4121 and Corr.1] entitled "Proposals for the Continuation of United Nations Assistance to Palestine Refugees" has naturally been the subject of careful study and thought. The crux of it, especially as accurately measured by relevance, is a sentence of only six words in which the Secretary-General says, "I recommend the continuation of UNRWA". To this we readily agree, pending the definitive and equitable solution of the question of Palestine. We have all often agreed with Mr. Hammarskjöld. But when to some of us he seemed to cast, I am sure involuntarily, a shadow on the undimable and inalienable rights of the Palestinian Arab Nation, they could not help entertaining a feeling of concern. They have therefore especially welcomed the statements with which the Secretary-General made later and in which, as was to be expected, he reaffirmed his respect for the rights of the refugees and the resolutions of the United Nations regarding them. The concern which had been felt and expressed by some of us on this occasion was clearly a measure of the depth of the convictions and emotions in this respect embedded in every Arab mind and heart and in the minds and hearts of many others.

45. Similar convictions and emotions prevail in relation to several other big questions of our time, particularly the question of Algeria. Talk has recently been going around of a new French plan for resolving this question. On 16 September 1959 the President of the French Republic made a declaration outlining the plan. My Government has carefully examined this

declaration. It did so with all possible detachment and objectivity and it has at least its initial views concerning it. It will naturally be for the Algerians, and for them alone, to form their own opinion and make their own decisions.

46. We note and register the recognition by the Government of France of the right of the Algerians to self-determination; and we note and register the constructiveness and the sense of balance which permeate the statement made by the Provisional Government of Algeria of its position regarding the declaration announcing that recognition. We wish to trust that the proper atmosphere and adequate guarantees will be provided for the free exercise, by the Algerians, of self-determination—atmosphere and guarantees regarding which we are in full accord with our Algerian brothers. We wish to trust, furthermore, that the Government of France will not indefinitely entrench itself in the untenable position of not wanting to negotiate with the obvious and real representatives of the people, and that it will promptly discard the thought of dealing with those who are not leading, who are not fighting and who are not in possession of even as little as a toy gun.

47. The stand of my Government and people by the Government and people of Algeria in their struggle for independence, for the redressing and preservation of all their rights and for the territorial integrity of all of their country, shall be maintained, as steadfast and as determined as ever. Let us hope that, in spite of many discouraging factors, the moment is near when Algeria will cease to be so recklessly martyred and will take its well deserved place of dignity and of honour as an independent nation, willing and able to contribute generously to general prosperity and international peace.

48. What has been happening for years in, and in relation to, Algeria, is sadly typical of the distracting and disrupting factors and events which hamper or slow down the prevalence of peace and progress in many parts of the world. This becomes more painfully conspicuous every time we cast another look at the possibilities of good, of good for all, which can readily follow a new, a genuinely civilized and up-to-date approach to the problems which face us.

49. With peace and co-operation, oil has, in great profusion, flowed from our area into the industries, shipping and aviation of Europe and other parts of the world. With peace and co-operation, this oil of our area can be confidently expected to meet the steady increase in the need for it. Without peace and co-operation, its flow was hampered and interrupted in 1956, and the resulting damage to Europe and other parts is sorrowfully remembered until today. Without peace and co-operation, the Suez Canal was, in 1956, impeded from playing its great role, with results so harmful that many, when they think of them, still feel as they do when they remember a very bad dream. With the return of peaceful conditions and with co-operation, the Suez Canal has resumed completely its active position as a principal link of trade and of goodwill among the nations of the earth.

50. Referring to what he terms "questions raised by present policies regarding the Suez Canal", the Secretary-General, in his introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization, stated:

"The issue has important legal aspects which may be considered as meriting further clarification but it is also part of the general Palestine problem [A/4132/Add.1, p.5]."

We have, and we are entitled to have, our own views regarding this issue which is obviously of vital importance to us. In point of fact, this issue has arisen exclusively as an outgrowth and an extension of the question of Palestine. It could not conceivably exist were the rights of the Palestinian Arabs recognized fully and actually. It will not persist, but will, as a matter of course, melt away automatically and disappear as soon as such recognition takes place.

51. Some—shall we call them political Zionists or Zionizing politicians?—have tried recently to disfigure the splendid record of accomplishment and steady improvement which has been established by the Arab management of the Canal. They tried to manufacture a new situation where nothing was really new, and to force into it a heap of irrelevancies and artificialities regarding which we shall not be drawn into empty polemics. And, for example, when Mrs. Golda Meir and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd preach to us on the virtues of freedom of navigation, when they thus seem to forget the 1956 canal-wrecking misadventure of the three raving musketeers, we do not even bother to wonder whether we should commiserate with them for their loss of memory. Nor would we risk the hope that they will choose to remind the Assembly that the present practice regarding navigation in the Suez Canal is not new, and that the original sin is in the plunder of Palestine from the Arabs. We could hardly expect them, either, to put forth for our perusal the very long list of United Nations resolutions, warnings, rebukes and agreements, which Israel has ignored completely until today, including the General Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel, which is violated systematically and even pronounced dead by Israel, and on which was based the Security Council resolution of 1 September 1951 [558th meeting] that Israel tries, nevertheless, to separate from its context and to single out for implementation.

52. Least of all could we expect to hear from these quarters a single word or even a faint whisper about the martyrdom of the Arabs of Palestine, about their rights and the raw daylight robbery of which they have been the victims. No, of course, they would not even lightly touch upon these, to them, cumbersome topics. They would rather hasten to accuse others of imaginary aggressive intentions before others array again, for the Assembly to remember, the many real aggressions committed by Israel and recognized and deplored as such by the United Nations. And they would include in their accusation a synthetic problem exclusively made in Israel and presented as a problem of the freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal. I shall submit facts and figures demonstrating, at least in part, the immense contribution of the Canal, under Arab management, to international navigation and trade, a contribution far greater than any previously made. These facts and figures are self-explanatory. The traffic and progress they represent are not imaginary, but are as real as anything can be. Navigation in the Suez Canal is in perfect health. Let not world political Zionism fool anybody away from this reality; let it not sell to us, out of a clear sky, an artificial storm which does not exist. There are, God

knows, enough storms in the world beyond the little cups with which world political Zionism and Israel are playing.

53. Facts, not fiction, demonstrate how loyal we have been to the principles embedded in the 1888 Constantinople Convention which, as will be recalled, have been reaffirmed in a declaration made on 24 April 1957⁴ by my Government. This was followed, on 18 July 1957, by a further declaration that was communicated by the Foreign Minister of Egypt to the Secretary-General by which the Government of Egypt accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court.

54. The record of the Canal since the Arab management took over speaks for itself. In 1955, which was the last complete year before aggression, and in which the highest mark until then was reached, the number of transits through the Canal was less than 15,000, with a tonnage of less than 116 million. In 1958, which was the first complete post-aggression year, the number of transits was nearly 18,000, as compared to the less than 15,000 in 1955; and the tonnage was more than 154 million, as compared to the 1955 tonnage of less than 116 million. During the first nine months of 1959 the number of transits was well over 13,000 with a tonnage of nearly 121 millions; and it is reasonably expected that the total traffic of this year will be around 18,000 in number of transits and 160 millions in tonnage, which will mark an increase of about 33 per cent over and above the figures reached in the pre-aggression record year of 1955.

55. It gives me added pleasure to be able to point out at the same time the fact that the relations of co-operation and of mutual understanding between the Suez Canal Authority and all the shipping circles dealing with it are at their best. These circles are watching with admiration accompanied by enlightened self-interest the steadiness, the accuracy and the progressive spirit which mark all the aspects of the huge work done by the present management of the Canal. This admiration takes on even stronger tones when the tremendous difficulties are recalled, including outside sabotage, standing, especially at the beginning, in the way of the new management, which had, after all, very little experience, if any, in running such a canal. Improvements in the Canal and its services and facilities are carried out in bold and imaginative strokes, and the Canal Authority is looking forward to coping with a volume of trade which will be several times bigger than the present record.

56. We have promised that the Canal shall always be in good shape and adequate for the requirements of modern navigation, in full freedom and perfect goodwill. I submit that we are keeping and are determined to keep our word.

57. The huge and still expanding oil production in the Arab countries and the prosperous and rapidly growing navigation in the Suez Canal, for the good of all within and beyond the immediate area of these two great pillars of world peace and prosperity, are illustrations of what many areas will be able to do, much more than at present, for their own and humanity's happiness, peace and security, if only we are all given

a breathing spell in which constructiveness can have definitely the upper hand and in which common sense can finally prevail. Even if some feign to ignore it, we are all fully aware of the fact that for everybody's prosperity and honour it is far better that peaceful co-operation be the common denominator in international relationships rather than domination and exploitation. We are all equally aware that a sane and up-to-date approach to these relationships would not be one which recklessly divides nations into big, less big and small, in order to form an opinion as to who can destroy whom, but an approach solidly based on the wonderful and impelling realities of our times in which, fortunately, the only safe competition between us, if we are to survive, would be in terms of usefulness of each of us to himself and to the rest of the world.

58. With this understanding and in this spirit, and along with many other countries, the United Arab Republic is working hard and assiduously to improve the health, the education and the standard of living of its people. It is making the Suez Canal increasingly adequate for the requirements of modern navigation. It has already started to build the High Dam on the Nile, which is expected to add about one-third to the cultivable area in the southern region. It is redoubling its efforts towards a more effective use of rain and sub-soil water and a better harnessing of rivers, in order to further extend the cultivable area in the north, as well as in the south. It is expanding substantially its oil, mining and other industries. Thus it keeps a firm grip on itself, gains momentum for its progress, and, in all humility and steadfast resolve, it is, out of self-interest and realistic idealism, working for peace and for peace alone.

59. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I call on the representative of Israel so that he may exercise his right of reply.

60. Mr. LOURIE (Israel): Mr. President, permit me to take this opportunity first of all to express to you, and I am sure that I echo the sentiments of all of us here, our deep satisfaction and pleasure in seeing you restored to health after your brief indisposition and occupying again the Chair at our meetings.

61. In the course of the general debate, a number of Arab representatives have seen fit once again to use this forum for bellicose attacks on Israel and its existence. To many of the representatives, these verbal assaults are presumably familiar from past years. For others, however, less accustomed to them, it may be appropriate very briefly to offer a different perspective. It is perhaps unnecessary to remind this Assembly that the restoration of Israel as an independent State among the nations represents the fulfilment of thousands of years of history. Down the corridors of time, the Jews, scattered and uprooted, clung tenaciously to their identity as a people and to their hope for their national restoration in the land of Israel.

62. Forty years ago, after the First World War, the nations of the world accepted the principle of the self-determination of dependent peoples. The Peace Conference and the League of Nations, in recognizing the claims to emergent statehood of the Arab peoples of the Middle East within their vast territories, affirmed the right also of the Jewish people to their own national home in their own modest but historic land, Israel.

⁴/ Official Records of the Security Council, Supplement for April, May and June 1957, document S/3818.

Twenty-five years later, in 1947, the United Nations reaffirmed [resolution 181 (II)] this earlier decision of the international community and called for the partition of Palestine and the setting up there of separate Jewish and Arab States. Had the Arab countries accepted this compromise resolution of 29 November 1947, the history of our region may well have been one of constructive development, side by side and in mutual co-operation, for the benefit of both, of the two great branches of the Semitic peoples.

63. Instead, Israel's Arab neighbours chose the path of rejection and of war. Today, the Arab position has become a maze of contradictions. These same Arab delegations talk glibly of the right of self-determination, but they blandly deny that right to one people on earth, the Jewish people. They talk of compliance with United Nations resolutions, but refuse to contemplate for a moment their basic non-compliance which carried in its train all the succeeding disasters. As a direct result of their armed aggression, there arose the problem of the Arab refugees.

64. The Arab representatives appeal to the humanitarian instincts of mankind for sympathy for these refugees, a sympathy which everyone of us must feel. But they are silent in the face of the fact that in their own widespread and fertile territories they have the possibility, with the proffered aid of the international community, themselves to put an end to this human tragedy by integrating the victims of their own blind aggression as self-respecting, self-supporting citizens among their own people.

65. The Arab refugee problem is not the only refugee problem of the Middle East. Over 400,000 Jewish refugees, let me remind this Assembly, from the Arab-speaking countries have been absorbed in Israel.

66. Arab spokesmen talk of Israel as the pawn of colonialism, ignoring the fact that before Israel had had to fight for its life against Arab assault, it was obliged to carry on a long-drawn struggle for its independence against that very Power which the Arabs charge with having established Israel for its own ulterior purposes.

67. Certain Arab delegations have spoken of Israel's military action in October 1956. What they have chosen totally to forget or to obscure is that that action, taken in exercise of the inherent right of self-defence, was directly caused by acts of war carried on in Israel territory by specially organized military units operating under Egyptian orders and from Egyptian-controlled territory. On the one hand, these delegations speak of a world of peace and of the obligations of the Charter and, on the other, they seek the destruction of my country. Having failed on the field of battle, they now assert that they are entitled to maintain against us a one-sided state of war and that this alleged right, unilaterally declared, must be recognized by the international community. All this despite the fact that the Charter of our Organization, of which they as well as we are Members, emphatically rejects any such alleged right. Indeed they have not made the slightest effort to counter the argument set out in this connexion in the speech in this Assembly by Israel's Foreign Minister [806th meeting]; for there is no answer. Instead, the Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic seeks today to justify illegal discrimination in the Suez Canal on purely political grounds, connected with his

views on what he calls "the question of Palestine". There is no legal validity at all in this assertion but in any case, if the representative of the United Arab Republic wants to invoke the so-called Palestine question, I would put a simple question to him: Is his country willing to negotiate with us a settlement of these differences?

68. I can declare here in the name of my Government that we are prepared to enter into immediate negotiations for a full and final settlement of all outstanding Israel-Arab problems at any time and place the Arab leaders may wish and without any preconditions.

69. We have come to this General Assembly and have placed before it the facts of the recent initiative of the Government of the United Arab Republic in interfering with Israel's commerce bound for the Indian and Pacific Oceans. What is this state of war under which Egypt claims to operate? Is it entitled to obstruct our commerce and that of other nations, to throttle our communications and those of other nations, and then to come to the United Nations and seek sanction and cover for these actions? We reiterate that under the Charter no country is entitled to arrogate to itself so-called rights of war and claim that those rights or that state of war be recognized as such by the international community. The delegation of Israel is gratified that this debate has made abundantly clear that the interference by the Government of the United Arab Republic with the freedom of passage in the Suez Canal is overwhelmingly disapproved. More than twenty countries from various continents have expressed themselves in this sense. Significantly, not one single non-Arab country has come forward in support of the claims of the United Arab Republic.

70. The people of Israel bear the Arab peoples no grudge. Our sincerest desire is to live and to let live, to work with them and others for a better and happier world. Our profoundest hope still lies in the principles of equality and the brotherhood of man. Our hand remains outstretched in peace to our Arab neighbours. It is our hope that the time will not be long delayed when it will be grasped in peace for the benefit of our region and of all mankind.

71. Mr. THORS (Iceland): It has been only on rare occasions that my delegation has participated in the general debate ever since my country, Iceland, entered the United Nations in 1946. In many previous years, the general debate, at the commencement of each annual session, has primarily been dominated by the big Powers and this may even be considered natural since the greatest problems of our Organization and of our times in general, are for the big Powers to solve and settle. These serious problems are often caused by the greatest Powers, and they alone can and must find a solution to them. However, every nation represented in the United Nations has its responsibility and its duties to endeavour to enhance and serve the ideals and aims of our Charter. Thus in the general debate in 1956, the Icelandic delegation presented its worried views on the world situation, which was certainly very grave at that time.

72. At the thirteenth session of the General Assembly, our Foreign Minister, Mr. Gudmundur I. Gudmundsson, delivered a speech and then stated, "This year Iceland has an urgent need to make its voice heard ... during the general debate." [759th meeting, para. 137]

This same urgency, most unfortunately, still remains and I shall revert to that later.

73. The Icelandic delegation has during the past weeks listened with interest to the many speeches of all those who have had anything to offer toward the solution of any of our diversified world problems. Some speakers have also referred to the status of our Organization of the United Nations, and to its future prospects. Let me only mention the difficulties and embarrassment caused by the tardiness of many delegations to pay their annual and approved contributions to the Organization to enable it to run efficiently its detailed work on a financially sound basis. However, it is gratifying to note that we all seem agreed in our unflinching trust in our wise, well-advised and energetic Secretary-General and in our highest officials, including all the Under-Secretaries, as well as the members of the Secretariat in general and the staff. We have in fact to be thankful for all the information, statistical data, scholarly and even scientific reports with which the Secretariat treats us all the year round, although some of us are obliged to feel occasionally that we have more documents than there is time to read them. All these reports have great statistical and educational value, and our government offices could hardly function satisfactorily without these reports.

74. In the general debate we have also heard the voices of those delegations that have been obliged to report to us on their grievances and frictions with other Member nations, and the general debate from this forum, in the presence of the whole world, is the right place to launch our complaints in the hope that our adversary will be influenced by sound world opinion and guided by good intentions.

75. One of the most striking features of our Organization during the last few years has been the steadily increasing number of new Members, many of which are nations that have emerged as sovereign States from the rule of colonialism, often under the auspices of Governments seated in faraway lands, which did not always understand the problems of the people in the colonies, nor their fight for independence. My country, Iceland, has lived under colonialism, and we are with heart and mind on the side of those new nations who want their full freedom and sovereignty. It is, therefore, with gratification that we have recently seen more and more countries from Africa come here and take their seat amidst us. We have welcomed the new States of Ghana and Guinea to our Organization and we are happy that four other nations of Africa will in the next year or immediately thereafter emerge to full freedom and sovereignty. We must all admit that this is the evolution of the twentieth century. The days of colonialism are over and onward march the newly independent nations of the world.

76. There is one omen that forebodes danger and disruption in the fruitful, fair and realistic work of our Organization. It is the division and encirclement of delegations into blocs which vote together, act together, and jointly claim benefits, privileges and positions for their members. This has become an ever-increasing characteristic of our daily affairs and activities. These blocs, which in more polite but superficial language, are called groups, are known to us under various names such as the Commonwealth group, the Latin American group, the African-Asian

group, the NATO group, the Communist group and even the European group, which seems to be the vaguest one since Europe is strictly divided. The strengthening of these blocs bears a certain danger in itself. We must avoid letting them develop to the extent that all decisions here in our Organization are reached inside the blocs, but not by the nations individually. According to our Charter, we are here, each delegation, to represent the Government of our sovereign nation and act in that capacity guided by the ideals and principles of our Charter.

77. If this tendency should further develop, we might come to the conclusion that it would be sufficient to have one representative for each bloc attending the meetings here and the rest of us could pack up and go home. My delegation is not a member of any bloc and is not supported by any of them. Naturally, however, being one of the Western democracies, our course most frequently runs parallel with other democratic countries by reason of common ideals, common heritage and similar ways of thinking, similar desires and aspirations of our peoples, similar outlook on life and the same love for freedom. This is particularly the case in our relations with the other Nordic countries. It is to be avoided that the wrangling for positions and influence tie the delegations into tight blocs. The freedom of thought and action of each nation must be preserved. Then we may have the hope that the small nations also can have some mission inside the United Nations.

78. This is the fourteenth General Assembly in which Iceland participates. In our opinion, it commences in a more auspicious atmosphere than many of our previous sessions, and I shall revert to that later. This Assembly also promises to be an efficient one, and there are signs that our deliberations will not be unduly or hopelessly retarded. We must all feel relieved and satisfied that the question of Cyprus, which in previous years has taken up much of our time, has now been solved by the parties immediately concerned, and the present Greek and Turkish Governments are to be congratulated and praised for their statesmanship and wisdom in reaching an agreement on a basis of a compromise that was acceptable to the people of Cyprus. Let us all hope that the future of the people of that beautiful island will be blessed with progress and prosperity which has its roots in common efforts and brotherly, neighbourly feelings.

79. We hope that the difficult Algerian question now for the first time seems to offer the prospect of a fair solution. As yet, we are not fully aware of all the details by which to judge the outlook, but my delegation finds that the courageous speech by General de Gaulle, the President of the French Republic, which he delivered on 16 September 1959, was a great step forward, and we hope it may lead to the road of final settlement. We, the people of Iceland, finally attained our independence by exercising our right of self-determination. However, we waited for twenty-five years before we took the last step and decided to sever our political ties with Denmark with the result that the relations between Iceland and Denmark have never been as friendly and brotherly as now, when both nations can associate as independent brothers. If the Algerian people have to wait only four years to decide themselves whether they want full independence or federal autonomy, or integration into the French Republic, then certainly we are inclined to think that

they should have patience and calmly and peacefully prepare for the great decision. We most sincerely hope that an end can be brought to this tragic struggle so expensive in the loss of human life and so disturbing to peace in Africa and in the world in general.

80. I now come to the question of disarmament, which has been before us at all our previous sessions since 1946, when the ice-cold winds of the cold war began blowing. We have discussed this matter and debated for months, year after year, and an infinite number of resolutions have been passed, but none of them has led to any remarkable results. In the meantime, the armaments race has continued at an ever-increasing pace until now the armaments production seems to have reached the saturation point. The big Powers are actually in a position to annihilate, with one single bomb, the most populated places on earth anywhere on the globe and there is no spot in the world today inaccessible to nuclear and rocket weapons. We are told that the explosion of one hydrogen bomb releases a greater energy than all explosions set off by all countries in all wars in the history of mankind. We are also aware that over one hundred million people have been moved from their peaceful occupations and into the production of arms and military activities, and that the military expenditures of all States at the present time amount to more than \$100,000 million annually. Has not the time come to halt this diabolic and dangerous trend?

81. In our opinion, it was a happy day in the history of the United Nations when, on 10 September 1959, the Disarmament Commission, which is composed of all the Member States of the United Nations, was convened. We were then informed that the Foreign Ministers of France, the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union had all agreed to establish a committee of ten States to take up serious discussions about the disarmament problem and we ventured to hope that at long last a serious and definite effort was to be made. It was the intention that this ten-Power committee should convene in Geneva in January of 1960, and we were given to understand that a report might come before the Disarmament Commission as a whole before the convening of the General Assembly in September 1960. We will not relinquish this hope.

82. The Foreign Ministers of the United States [797th meeting], the United Kingdom [798th meeting] and France [814th meeting] have in their elaborate speeches here during the general debate outlined their proposals and offers for gradual disarmament stage by stage. And certainly we were all most interested to hear the extensive and eloquent speech by the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Mr. Nikita Khrushchev, on 18 September 1959 [799th meeting]. The offer of the Soviet Premier of general and complete disarmament in the course of four years might become an epoch-making statement. Although the statesmen of the world have been faced with similar offers of complete disarmament before, this suggestion is enormously more important today when the armaments race and war potentialities have reached such monstrous dimensions. It is gratifying to note that all responsible statesmen are anxious to give this proposal the most serious consideration. We can only hope that this grandiose suggestion can pave the way for an agreement, even if it has to come stage by stage. As Winston Churchill said in the

House of Commons in May 1953: "It would, I think, be a mistake to assume that nothing can be settled with Soviet Russia unless or until everything is settled."

83. My delegation trusts that, after balanced and moderate debate in our present General Assembly, the disarmament question as a whole will be referred to the ten-Power committee, from which we hope for a constructive report before our next Assembly. In the meantime, let the cannons remain silent all over the world and the dangerous bombs be carefully guarded in their arsenals, until the happy time has come to destroy them totally.

84. At the General Assembly in 1958, we had for the first time before us the question of the peaceful use of outer space by humanity. My delegation was pleased last year to vote for a resolution which stated that the General Assembly recognizes the common interest of mankind in outer space and that it is the common aim that outer space should be used for peaceful purposes only [resolution 1348 (XIII)]. Since man's penetration into outer space, it has become of utmost importance to secure international co-operation for peaceful uses of the cosmic space. The Icelandic delegation, therefore, endeavoured to the utmost at the last session to bring about full agreement on the composition of an ad hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. That was not obtained and it was regrettable that the delegations of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, India and the United Arab Republic did not find it possible to join in the work of this Committee. We hope that these delegations will see fit to co-operate in the future work for this purpose, and the ad hoc Committee is to be complimented for the most valuable spade work already done.

85. The situation in the Middle East, which was fraught with dangers and threatening clouds last year, has now, fortunately, somewhat calmed down, although not completely, as we have all heard this morning. There still remain many unsolved problems in that area. The whole question of the Middle East has to be treated on a broad basis, and it is to be hoped that the far-sighted and thorough suggestions by the Secretary-General regarding the Palestine refugees will receive adequate and deserved consideration. We also trust that we can see the freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal re-established in our opinion according to international law, and the 1888 Constantinople Convention which guaranteed that:

"The Suez Maritime Canal shall always be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to every vessel of commerce or of war, without distinction of flag.

"...

"The canal shall never be subjected to the exercise of the right of blockade."

86. This principle was confirmed by the resolution of the Security Council [743rd meeting] on 13 October 1956. It is our opinion that the problems of the Middle East will never be solved unless the Arab States themselves show their willingness to solve them together and agree to live together as good neighbours with all the countries in that region.

87. As a European nation, the Icelandic people feel greatly concerned about the future of the more than 2 million people who live in West Berlin and who have

shown great courage in expressing and maintaining their heartfelt desire to be allowed to continue to live as a free democracy. Any agreement about the problems of Central Europe, which we hope will be reached at some level, must safeguard the future of West Berlin and the freedom of the people.

88. Turning to the situation in the world in general, it is horrifying to note that more than 1,500 million people in our world society today live in hunger, want and even misery and ignorance. We can never expect to build up a lasting peace and security in the world unless we continue and greatly intensify our fight against poverty, malnutrition, illiteracy and disease in various areas of the globe. Any step in this direction we therefore welcome.

89. We have been happy to note the rich benefits which have accrued all over the world, to many nations, in numerous fields, from the technical assistance, which the United Nations has rendered jointly, as well as that which many nations have provided separately. It is a noble goal to raise the Special Fund to \$100 million, and the Expanded Programme to an equal amount. It is, however, needless to say that the contribution of a small nation like Iceland to these and other progressive and beneficial projects can only be on a minimal scale. But we want to do our little share and we have agreed to increase our subscriptions to IBRD and to IMF by 50 per cent. We also registered our approval of the establishment of an International Development Association, which was decided on at the meeting of the Governors of IBRD which was held in Washington on 30 September 1959. This organization should provide new means of financing more useful projects in less-developed countries. Furthermore, let us not forget UNICEF, which has done such marvelous work all around the world since its establishment in 1948. This magnanimous enterprise was received in Iceland with great enthusiasm in the beginning, and its work is cherished and heartily appreciated by my people.

90. As I remarked before, we feel that our present session is opening in a more auspicious and encouraging atmosphere than most sessions in the past. We all know the reason why we indulge in such hope and wishful thinking. The main reason is that the distance between Moscow and Washington has been shortened immensely and the Iron Curtain is no longer any hindrance, because even if it still exists today, it does not interfere with the take-off or flights of any planes whether their destination is Paris or London, New York or Washington, or vice versa. Besides, the minds and thoughts of men penetrate all curtains everywhere and distance makes no difference. We are hopeful that a meeting of the minds of people everywhere in the world is rapidly approaching and is being crystallized into one deep and sincere desire: peace.

91. The visit of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev, to the United States and his association with the United States people, and the most serious and frank discussions he had with the great leader of our Western world, Mr. Eisenhower, the President of the United States, is most welcome news and is a greatly encouraging feature all over the world. The world will follow the subsequent flight of the President of the United States to visit the great Soviet people and to renew and further formalize his talks with the leader

of the Communist world. These recently planned flights are borne on the wings of humanity's most heartfelt desire and we trust the result will mean an alleviation of the anxiety of our worried world. People everywhere are now beginning to hope that they will be freed from fear of war and annihilation, and at long last will be allowed to look with confidence and great expectations to the future of man everywhere and the happiness of the present and future generations. We are, however, aware that we cannot, overnight, expect a rigorous and distrustful world to be changed into a paradise of gentle wishes and brotherly co-existence.

92. We beg of our great leaders that they change the atmosphere in international relations and step by step move onward to mutual understanding and increasing trust. Let us not ignore the fact that this calls for modifications, even radical changes, and one of the first wrongs that must be eliminated is the constant propaganda, abuse, and even the spread of hatred among nations, and inside national societies, in view of the political and ideological conquest of one or other special world system.

93. Each nation must be allowed to be free from foreign interference and to model their lives and future according to the desire of the people themselves. It strikes me that an ensuring and firm token of a better atmosphere in world affairs would be if the General Assembly were invited to hold its fifteenth session during 1960 in Moscow, where we would all be allowed to associate freely with the peace-loving and progressive people of Russia. It so happens that in the fall of 1960 there will be presidential and general elections here in the United States, and on previous occasions the Assembly has twice held its sessions in Paris, or special arrangements had to be made to postpone the regular session of the General Assembly, as it has not been found propitious to have this international forum operate here in New York while the political internal fight goes on all around us. In all humility, I venture to mention this idea for the consideration of those most concerned.

94. Before I leave the scene of world affairs, and the prospects for the future as we want to see it, allow me to quote encouraging statements from two of the most influential leaders of the world today.

95. On 16 April 1953, President Eisenhower said in Washington:

"No people on earth can be held, as a people, to be an enemy, for all humanity shares the common hunger for peace and fellowship and justice."

He further said:

"Every nation's right to a form of government and an economic system of its own choosing is inalienable ... Any nation's attempt to dictate to other nations their form of government is indefensible."

Finally, President Eisenhower stated:

"A nation's hope of lasting peace cannot be firmly based upon any race in armaments, but rather upon just relations and honest understanding with all other nations ... Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final

sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed."^{5/}

These are strong, eloquent, and noble words and we all know how frequently President Eisenhower has subsequently spoken in a similar vein and to the same effect.

96. The Soviet leader said in his message to this Assembly on 18 September 1959:

"Controversial problems in international affairs may be successfully solved if States concentrate on what brings them closer to one another rather than on what divides the present world" [799th meeting, para. 6.].

He also said:

"... There is every indication that the time has come to embark on a period of international negotiations, conferences and meetings of statesmen in order that, one after the other, urgent international problems may find a solution" [*ibid.*, para. 8.].

"It is our view that, if relations between States are to be based entirely on the principles of peaceful coexistence, an end must be put to the 'cold war'" [*ibid.*, para. 9].

Furthermore the Soviet leader said:

"The Soviet Union is convinced that the necessary conditions now exist for a radical improvement in international relations, and for the total abolition of the 'cold war' in the interests of all mankind" [*ibid.*, para. 22].

97. Moreover, at the National Press Club in Washington, on 16 September 1959, Mr. Khrushchev emphasized that he had come "with the best of intentions and with an open heart". He also stated that the barometer showed "fine".

98. We, the common people of the world, want to believe in these words and statements of the great leaders and we want to see them come true. We therefore hope that the barometer will remain on "fine" so that mankind may continue to expect and hope for a rich harvest in the field of international co-operation and march forward to a world of tranquility, mutual trust, peace and prosperity.

99. In this respect it was most encouraging to read in the joint United States-Soviet communiqué issued at the conclusion of the talks between President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev the following statement:

"It is hoped that their exchanges of views will contribute to a better understanding of the motives and position of each, and thus to the achievement of a just and lasting peace."^{6/}

So be it.

100. I now am compelled to revert to a situation in which a great wrong has been committed and tell you a sad story of the relationship between a nation that claims to be called great and my small nation, Iceland. I refer to the constant threats of attack by United Kingdom warships on our small coastguard

boats in the territorial waters off Iceland. As is well known to most of you from our debates during the last session of the General Assembly, my country found it of vital importance to the future of our economy and to the independence of our nation to take new measures for preserving our main source of national income, the fishery grounds around Iceland. Our economy is completely dependent on the output of the fisheries, and products derived from the fisheries constitute about 95 to 97 per cent of our exports to foreign countries. Ever since the end of the last century, the waters off our coast have been visited by swarms of United Kingdom trawlers that have scraped the bottom of the sea almost up to the doors of our poor fishermen's humble homes. However, we were supposed to have territorial waters up to three miles, and in 1952 we extended our fishery limits up to four miles, after our Norwegian brother nation had won its case about the four-mile limit before the International Court of Justice, which move the United Kingdom had challenged. The dominant circles of Hull and Grimsby then put a ban on the landing of Icelandic fish anywhere in the United Kingdom. This can only have been intended for the purpose of forcing us into submission, but the Icelanders are, I am proud to say, an independent and persevering people, and the United Kingdom finally had to give up the ban and their frustrated efforts after four years.

101. When the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, which was held in April 1958 at Geneva, did not succeed in deciding the breadth of the territorial sea and fishery limits, we again felt compelled to extend our fishery zone. We had declared years ago that our intention was to extend the fishery zone up to twelve miles. We again made that known in Geneva in the spring of 1958, but we waited until 1 September of that year to make this decision effective, in order to explain our urgent need to take such measures. We then had prolonged talks with many nations to that effect, but no agreement seemed possible.

102. A few nations protested against our action. We were told that the twelve-mile limit did not have support in international law. To that we replied that there is no international law prevailing regarding the breadth of the territorial sea, nor coastal jurisdiction. It is now commonly recognized that the three-mile rule is a dead letter, and there are actually more than twenty-five nations that maintain twelve-mile territorial waters or more. The International Law Commission had stated in its report of 1956^{7/} that international law does not permit an extension of the territorial sea beyond twelve miles.

103. At the Geneva Conference in 1958, a steadily increasing trend had become evident to establish the twelve-mile fishery zone. I want to emphasize here most clearly that Iceland has only extended its fishery zone, not its territorial limits—which, as we all know, is another question, and of much more far-reaching scope. In Geneva thirty-six nations had voted for a proposal by Canada for a maximum of six miles for territorial waters and twelve miles for fishery limits. The United States had suggested in

^{5/} The Department of State Bulletin (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office 1953) Vol. XXVIII, No. 722, p. 599 and 600.

^{6/} Statement published in *The New York Times*, 28 September 1959.

^{7/} *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Supplement No. 9.*

Geneva that in principle the twelve-mile fishery zone should prevail, but unfortunately the United States wanted to fix unacceptable limitations on the rights of the coastal State. During the last year more and more nations have come out in favour of the twelve-mile fishery zone.

104. We have been told: "You can not do this unilaterally." Why cannot we do that, since about thirty nations have up to the present extended their territorial waters unilaterally? The protests we received were presented in a diplomatic and courteous manner which can be expected from nations which respect each other's sovereignty. None of these nations deemed it necessary nor appropriate to resort to other measures with one exception, and only one exception. The United Kingdom again succumbed to behaviour which is not in conformity with our Charter, nor could such behaviour be expected from a country to which we are supposed to be allied. Now, for more than a year, since September 1, 1958, United Kingdom warships of the Royal Navy are aiming their guns at our small patrol boats in our waters off the coast of Iceland in violation of the principles of diplomacy and the rules of fair play. There have been about thirty-seven United Kingdom warships engaged in these ignoble and threatening tactics.

105. If the United Kingdom Government felt compelled to send their warships into Icelandic waters to maintain international law and order on the high seas, as they call it, why then, did they not send the Royal Navy into the 12-mile limit of the coasts of the Soviet Union? Why did the United Kingdom Government not move a single warship from the harbours of Hong Kong when the Peking Government extended their territorial waters on 4 September, 1958, to twelve miles? This happened right under the noses of the United Kingdom naval forces in their colony of Hong Kong. However, no action was taken. What is the reason for this double standard? Is it because we are a small nation and the Government of Peking rules over 640 million people? Where is the sense of fair play that has been the characteristic of the United Kingdom people, and what has become of the renown and the glory of the United Kingdom Navy? Must we not say, alas, *sic transit gloria mundi*?

106. Her Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain tried to seek refuge for their behaviour by offering to take the matter before the International Court of Justice. Why do they not ask other nations who have unilaterally extended their territorial waters to march together with them before the International Court of Justice? How can any reasonable man expect us to stand in the same courthouse with people who are aiming their guns at our countrymen? We can only hope that the United Kingdom Government, through the pressure of world opinion as well as through steadily increasing public opinion in the United Kingdom in favour of Iceland's position, will come to reason and withdraw their warships from our waters. This world opinion became most evident during the debates in the Sixth Committee [596th meeting] during the thirteenth session, when well over forty delegations directly expressed sympathy for my country and their understanding of our problems and our actions.

107. Since then we have received many messages of encouragement and many tokens of friendship from nations far and near. We, the former friends of the

United Kingdom in Iceland, and there used to be many of them, venture to believe that the United Kingdom will see fit to withdraw the warships before any serious incidents might occur and before any lives are lost.

108. I regret to report that only last week a serious incident happened. An Icelandic patrol boat caught a United Kingdom trawler illegally inside the old three-mile limit, the limit recognized by the United Kingdom. The boat was only 2.4 miles from our shore. When our coastguards tried to arrest the culprit, Her Majesty's warship interfered and protected the sailing of the offender homewards to the land of glory. Our Foreign Minister has strongly protested this violation to the Foreign Office in London. It gives me pleasure to remind the Assembly that Prime Minister Nehru of India recently refused to negotiate with the Chinese Communist Government while their soldiers remain on Indian soil. We in Iceland reject any talks with the United Kingdom while their warships remain in our waters. We will not accept any gunpoint diplomacy.

109. At the Conference of the Foreign Ministers of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, held in Reykjavik on 3 and 4 September 1959, this matter was discussed, and it was agreed, and I quote "to express the hope that at the forthcoming international conference in the spring of 1960, a solution to this dispute could be found". It was simultaneously agreed "to express the wish that in the hope of such a solution incidents would be avoided in these waters".

110. Such expressions have been repeated by the Foreign Ministers of Norway [807th meeting] and Denmark [809th meeting] here in the general debate, and we are thankful to our friends for their concern and support. My Government will be represented at the conference and the Icelandic people hope also, for the sake of the United Kingdom itself, that it will have withdrawn its warships from our waters long before the conference is convened.

111. We are all familiar with the fable about the man who had exceeding many flocks and herds and the poor man who had nothing save one ewe lamb. When a traveller came unto the rich man, he spared to take of his own flock and of his own herd, but slaughtered and dressed the poor man's only lamb. The United Kingdom have resources all over the world, and are fortunately a prosperous nation. At least, we hear that in the Press and in election campaigns. Fisheries are our small nation's only lamb. We pray that the fable of the Bible will not be repeated by the rich United Kingdom subjects in their relations with our nation. We know that the public opinion of the world is on our side. This is a bitter fight because all the people of Iceland feel we have been wronged.

112. This world of ours is a strange combination of encouraging facts and features and sad stories. Let us hope that in the relations of all our nations, justice and friendship and fairness may prevail in the times to come.

113. Mr. SIK (Hungary): Any comprehensive evaluation of the general debate in our General Assembly so far, and particularly the statements on the international situation made in the past few days, clearly show that a fresh breeze is blowing which is changing the international climate. Not only does the new atmosphere reflect the change in the general mood,

it also brings out in relief new and favourable facts. A decisive source and, at the same time, symptom, of this new atmosphere was the meeting of Premier Khrushchev and President Eisenhower. At the time of their meeting, and especially after the joint statement was issued, new signs appeared on the horizon of international life which indicate that we have come upon a new stage in post-war international developments.

114. In this new stage there are ample openings and a favourable constellation for peaceful competition among the two world systems by means of discussions and agreements among the peoples. The cold war atmosphere of distrust can be replaced by the atmosphere of at least a minimum of trust indispensable for co-operation in important fields. The period of threats of force can give place to the period of discussions diverse in character and composition. The period of the accelerating arms race can be superseded by the gradual elimination of the arms race, which would mean the release of inestimable material resources to promote human progress. The meeting of the two great statesmen, therefore, could mean the dawn of a new era for the whole of humankind, in which the banishment of war once and for all could be regarded as a realistic and feasible aim and the United Nations could play a decisive role in achieving this prophetic dream of the greatest human minds.

115. However, the birth of such a new era will not be easy; it will cost much labour and travail. Our Assembly is confronted with the indisputable possibility and task of acting as midwife to the birth and strengthening of this atmosphere, the heralds of which are already with us.

116. I believe that it is beyond any dispute that the most immediate harbinger and most vital single event was the meeting and joint statement of Premier Khrushchev and President Eisenhower, which paved the way for further meetings. Let us glance briefly at the difficulties against which the current change for the better is being projected.

117. It is generally known that when the Soviet Union first made public its proposal concerning West Berlin it was subjected to complete misrepresentation by western official and semi-official propaganda. It was presented as an attempt by the Soviet Union to force its will down the throat of the western partners; in other words, as if the Soviet Union's purpose had been the sharpening of tension around Berlin, as if the Soviet statement had been something of a "trigger-happy" ultimatum after which the guns would have their say. In the light of the results of the Khrushchev-Eisenhower meeting, if anyone today re-reads those Soviet proposals without prejudice, he cannot but admit that the essence of those proposals has always been an invitation to hold discussions. However, at that time the cold war agencies distorted the Soviet proposal with such hue and cry that even a great many well intentioned people were confused. After a few hours of conversation the two statesmen were able to clarify the misrepresentation, and already in Washington and Bonn the present position of West Berlin has officially been admitted as being abnormal.

118. This short recapitulation shows up quite clearly the vicissitudes that had to be overcome to bring about the new climate. Not only has the path traversed so far been paved with difficulties; further hurdles

will have to be taken to continue improving and maintaining the new climate. Even the kind of questions put to the Chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers and the President of the United States at their press conferences in Washington seemed to reflect the disappointment of the cold war diehards at this further lessening of tension. The questioners sought for excuses to maintain the cold war atmosphere. They went out of their way to discover any signs of retreat on either side during the personal talks of the two statesmen. Some of the questioners hoped to discover justification for their earlier cold war statements. There was some obvious disappointment among them when the two great statesmen expressed their mutual esteem and in their public announcements confirmed each other's statements. Everything seemed to indicate that such people would have welcomed their contradicting each other.

119. Still more characteristic is the following. It is common knowledge that, at the tenth anniversary celebrations of the Chinese People's Republic in Peking, Premier Khrushchev gave a positive evaluation of his visit to the United States and the talks with President Eisenhower. When this was reported in the United States Press, instead of rejoicing over this fact as a sign of the eclipse of the cold war, it indulged in day dreaming of a Soviet-Chinese antagonism and leaned over backwards to resurrect the cold war spirit.

120. One could brush this aside with the remark: that is only the Press, and not even the whole Press. And that is true. But instead of making it easier, such Press opinion only makes it harder for the President of the United States to apply to the foreign policy of the United States Government the principles contained in the joint statement.

121. Something else, besides the signs evident in the United States Press, should be mentioned here, which could not have escaped the notice of anyone who has been attending this Assembly. The United States Secretary of State made his contribution to the general debate [797th meeting] after the first meeting had taken place between the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union and the President of the United States and only one day prior to the address [799th meeting] by the Soviet Premier to the General Assembly. The United States Secretary of State spoke at such a time without in a single phrase expressing his felicitations or hope on the prospect of the historic meeting; he avoided every mention—good or bad—of the whole meeting.

122. Furthermore, the United States Secretary of State in the general debate, and more particularly the United States representative Mr. Robertson in the debate on the question of China's representation [800th meeting], discussed certain subjects here in such language as if we were still living through the most embittered cold war period.

123. All this goes to show that those who have become accustomed to the cold war climate need time to become acclimatized to the new atmosphere. In this transitional period of acclimatization we have to count on many disturbing moments caused by the residuum of the cold war, just as in the first days of spring the thaw may still be accompanied by snow-drifts and sleet.

124. I have sketched all this only to indicate the difficulties in the face of which we have to work for the development of the new climate. Here, at the General Assembly, it is the task of all representatives, whether they come from small or large countries, from socialist or capitalist countries, from colonial Powers or former colonies, to catch hold of every opportunity for co-operation that will foster the new atmosphere. In line with the principle of peaceful coexistence, the foreign policy of the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is destined towards this end, as reflected by this intervention and by the actions of the whole Hungarian delegation.

125. What is the essence of this new atmosphere? The carrying into practice of the principle of peaceful coexistence, the practice of the spirit of peaceful coexistence in all spheres of international contact. There are some who have an aversion to the expression "peaceful coexistence". There are some who are suspicious of the term and call it a propaganda slogan. Only a few days ago we were witness to a conspicuous instance of how deeply the idea of "peaceful coexistence" is either misunderstood or misinterpreted by some western politicians and journalists poisoned by the spirit of the cold war and the policy of strength. The day after the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union arrived back in Moscow, a New York daily paper wrote indignantly that the cold war was with us again because Mr. Khrushchev had again spoken about coexistence in Moscow. Albeit, the end of the cold war means the final prevailing of the principle of peaceful coexistence over the policy of strength principle.

126. Not only Mr. Khrushchev spoke about peaceful coexistence in Moscow. The Khrushchev-Eisenhower meeting as such and the communiqué issued on it were eloquent expressions of peaceful coexistence. What is the meaning of putting into practice the principle of peaceful coexistence in the context of settling international issues and solving international problems? First and foremost it means that controversial international issues can and must be solved by peaceful, direct negotiation.

127. How is "peaceful negotiation" to be interpreted? Acceptance of the principle of peaceful coexistence does not only mean the mere acceptance of the other's existence and right to exist. It also implies a certain esteem for the other, mutual respect, serious and unbiased consideration for the other's views and outlook. "Negotiations" between the partners committed to the principle of peaceful coexistence means not only an exchange of words instead of bullets, but also the examination and endeavour to solve given problems with due and mutual consideration for each other's viewpoints.

128. That is what has mostly been lacking so far in international practice, even in the United Nations itself. In general, the socialist countries propose discussion of controversial issues to give the involved or conflicting parties an opportunity to make themselves heard. In cases, however, when the United Nations has found itself in a stalemate on certain controversial issues, this has generally been the outcome of methods of discussion applied by the Western Powers as a means to vindicate their own one-sided will and exclude the opinions of the involved or con-

flicting parties. It seems worthwhile to examine some instances of this.

129. The General Assembly has been discussing the problem of the unification of Korea for ten years now. In all these ten years not once has the opinion of North Korea been heard on this subject by the General Assembly of the United Nations, its competent committee, or any of its agencies. All proposals made in favour of offering them an opportunity to speak have been turned down by the voting machine. A similar procedure has been used over and over again to carry resolutions that represented only the one-sided views of certain Western Powers.

130. Or, let us look at the debate on the representation of China at the beginning of the present session. The arbitrary acts of certain Western Powers even prevented the General Assembly from discussing its own views on the matter.

131. The latest of such gross arbitrary actions is the one to place the so-called question of Tibet on the agenda. The authors of such actions refuse to give the Chinese People's Republic its rightful place in this Organization, but they are anxious to vindicate their own one-sided views by means of the voting machine.

132. Incidentally, whatever the role of other countries in one or other of these actions, as now in the case of Ireland and Malaya, it is no secret that the representatives of the United States are the power behind all of them.

133. I shall cite another example. Immediately prior to the opening of the General Assembly, the Security Council was convened to discuss the so-called question of Laos, and it appointed a Sub-Committee in violation of the Charter. The convening of the Council and the resolution adopted [S/4216] bolstered the incorrect attitude of the ultra-reactionary leaders of the Kingdom of Laos and its western allies. But it is still more reprehensible that even before the fact-finding Sub-Committee makes its report,^{8/} certain representatives here are ready to accept the statements made by the Kingdom's representatives, who are not and never have been in control of their own country, as if they were verified facts. Furthermore, they are trying to use these statements here to rekindle the dying flames of the cold war.

134. The most characteristic case of all is that of Algeria. Here again the main obstacle to a proper solution is the failure to accept negotiation as the means to that end. For years now the forces supporting the independence of the Algerian people have been trying here to persuade the French Government to sit down and negotiate with the representatives of the independence movement, the Provisional Government of Algeria. It seems that at this General Assembly the representatives of the French Government and their allies are still seeking to avoid precisely such negotiations, because they are anxious to maintain some form of colonialism.

135. One of the major sources of the unfortunate attitude which led to this one-sided approach to international problems was the under-rating by the representatives of some Western Powers of certain countries. Today it is already evident to all that the disadvantage of under-rating the socialist countries

^{8/} See note 1.

was actually felt most of all by the capitalist countries themselves, and particularly by the leading capitalist countries. In point of fact, the lagging behind evident in the leading capitalist countries in certain fields, and perhaps most of all in the field of the technical sciences *vis-à-vis* the Soviet Union, can in part be traced to this underrating. To expedite the eclipse of the cold war period let there be mutual effort for mutual esteem.

136. But this again does not go quite smoothly. May I mention here that recently we have gained interesting experiences concerning Western newspapermen who came to Hungary. They already find it difficult to write badly and even to concoct bad reports about conditions in the Hungarian People's Republic. It can be stated that never in the course of their thousand-year-old history have the Hungarian people, when comparing all the changes that have occurred so far, lived in better conditions than today. In such circumstances, what can a journalist do whose ear is tuned to the cold war? He has to render an account of the good things but he has to think up bad theories to support it. I am going to tell you what happened to a journalist of some distinction who writes for a New York daily. Since he did not find anything bad to write about, he wrote the good things he saw and theorized like this: the present-day leaders of the Hungarian people are bad because they have created for the Hungarian people such good conditions as to make them forget that their leaders are bad.

137. After the bygone period of the policy of strength and the cold war, it is no easy task to write about one another in a good neighbourly fashion, even about bad things with goodwill, and not as occurred in the case I have mentioned in which even good things were written about with illwill.

138. The meeting between Premier Khrushchev and President Eisenhower has initiated a new tone, a new spirit, a new method of negotiating in line with the principle of peaceful coexistence. Premier Khrushchev's thirteen-day visit has much altered, as it were, the general feeling all the world over, the pronouncements of statesmen and the style of the Press in all the five continents. The talks have paved the way to further negotiations, and the change that has occurred is indicative of further changes.

139. One cannot help noticing that these talks and their results have much altered also the tone of speeches delivered here at the General Assembly. Such a spirit of negotiation is apt to improve the functioning of the United Nations itself. By correctly understanding the essence of the new method of negotiation—the willingness to listen to the opinion of the other party—the General Assembly could tackle controversial issues that have been deadlocked for years.

140. In the view of the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic the main features of the new international atmosphere, therefore, are a more consistent enforcement of peaceful coexistence, a higher esteem and increased respect for one another, and a spirit of negotiation aiming at mutual understanding. The enhancing of these features could be instrumental in further unfolding and preserving this new atmosphere. The Hungarian delegation is of the opinion that the best contribution by the General Assembly to this aim would be to concentrate its attention upon the present principal tasks of the United Nations.

141. It is easier now for the General Assembly to deal with the principal task of maintaining peace and security because the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR presented right here the proposal of the Soviet Union for general and complete disarmament. Lately discussions of problems of peace and security have begun to slip through the fingers of the United Nations to be discussed at the conference tables of other agencies. Here in the Assembly discussion of the most exciting problems of international peace was made difficult by the lack of a genuine spirit of negotiation, by conducting business through mechanized voting. Very serious reasons prompted the Soviet Premier to warn the United Nations of the fate of the League of Nations. Indeed, if the United Nations allows itself to be used for the selfish political purposes of a group of Member States, if instead of the proper questions of peace and security it deals with fictitious problems, and if instead of striving for relaxation of tension some endeavour to turn this Organization into an arena of the cold war, then it will inevitably share the fate of the League of Nations. In the present more favourable international atmosphere, the General Assembly can also find it easier to deal with its proper task. In fact we have here a whole series of questions related to disarmament, including that of averting the danger of nuclear explosions in the Sahara. Here are the problems of the countries now rising from colonial status. We have here the problem concerning assistance to economically under-developed countries. In the less strained atmosphere it seems possible to adopt on these matters more favourable resolutions this year than a year ago.

142. The United Nations has the important task of promoting final liquidation of the colonial system all over the world. We think it is very fortunate for the United Nations to have admitted to membership in the last few years a number of Asian and African countries, the last of which was Guinea, a country recently arisen from colonial status. On behalf of the Hungarian delegation I wish to take this opportunity to express our sympathy for the peoples struggling for their freedom and independence in Africa and on other continents.

143. Mankind has not only to cope with the task of liquidating the colonial system but also to promote the economic advancement of countries which were colonies in the past and whose development has been lagging behind that of the colonial Powers. We consider it one of the fundamental objectives of the United Nations to marshal all the forces inherent in international co-operation and to grasp every opportunity to accelerate the economic advancement of less developed countries, to secure their economic independence.

144. A decisive turning point also from this point of view would undoubtedly be the acceptance of the Soviet disarmament proposal, which would open up new vistas for the liquidation of economic backwardness all over the world.

145. The creation of a new atmosphere can be essentially promoted if the General Assembly devotes its attention to the immediate prime task: the discussion of the problem of disarmament. We all remember the never-ending debates on the constitution of the Disarmament Commission and the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, as well as the cold war

rigidity shown by the representatives of certain Western Powers in insisting upon their unjustly favourable share of seats in these commissions. Indicative of a slackening of the cold war since then has been the constitution of the ten-Power committee. But most instrumental in liquidating the cold war is the disarmament proposal submitted here by the Government of the Soviet Union [A/4219].

146. How deaf and blind is mistrust, and how stubborn the cold war fomenting mistrust, is shown also by the reception given here and there to the proposal. In his speech before this Assembly the representative of one of the Western great Powers went so far as to misconstrue the Soviet proposal to make it appear as if the Soviet Union wanted disarmament without control. Anyone who has read Mr. Khrushchev's speech and the Soviet declaration can clearly see that the Soviet Union proposes to ensure adequate control parallel with every stage of disarmament.

147. Another interesting symptom illustrating this very stubbornness is the following. The same politicians and columnists who are accusing the socialist countries of maintaining their system by force of arms, now want to arouse mistrust for the Soviet proposal concerning complete disarmament by presenting the frightening picture of Communism spreading all over the world in the wake of complete disarmament. All I would tell these gentlemen is that they should have a little more confidence in their own system, which still may have the courage to enter into competition with the socialist countries even without the support of arms. The Soviet Union on its part has made its proposal for complete disarmament, and the fourteenth session of the General Assembly will bear witness to how the representatives of the Western Powers are able to respond to it.

148. Another auspicious sign of a favourable international atmosphere is also the fact that none of the delegations has proposed inclusion in the agenda of the so-called Hungarian question. Such an attempt would also this year have been conducive to intensifying the cold war, and the absence of such an attempt can but deserve appreciation from the point of view both of the United Nations and of the peaceful, undisturbed development of the Hungarian people. We have heard, however, some statements on the fact that Sir Leslie Munro, who had been appointed United Nations Special Representative on the Question of Hungary by a resolution [1312 (XIII)] adopted last year in violation of the Charter, was not allowed to enter Hungary. Whoever approaches the current problems of international life in the spirit of negotiations as outlined earlier cannot but understand our position taken in this matter.

149. As we have already made clear on numerous occasions, this for us is a question of principle. What is called here the "Question of Hungary" constitutes an internal affair of the Hungarian People's Republic, in which interference, according to the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter, is inadmissible

for any foreign State or international organization. For this reason the Hungarian Government cannot, on principle, grant an entry permit to a person who wishes to go to Hungary with the intent of investigating there on behalf of an international organization and reporting on his work done. I should like to make it clear: my Government cannot do so on principle. Not that we have anything to hide from anybody. During the first nine months of this year, hundreds of politicians, authors, artists, scientists and journalists from other countries and tens of thousands of tourists and other visitors went to Hungary and could see with their own eyes that life in Hungary is consolidated and normal in every respect and that broad masses of the Hungarian people are living better than ever before.

150. To dissipate any doubts in the minds of representatives to the General Assembly, there is no obstacle to any one of the 800 representatives here—I reckon with a round 800 persons, for the ten representatives of Chiang Kai-shek cannot be taken into account—I can say there is no obstacle to any one of the 800 representatives going to Hungary immediately, or whenever he wishes to do so, and looking around there, provided that he undertakes this trip of his own accord and not as a mission on the basis of a resolution hostile to the Hungarian People's Republic. Any member of the General Assembly has but to apply to the Legation of the Hungarian People's Republic in Washington and he will obtain his visa at once.

151. We can say without exaggeration that the United Nations is at the crossroads. The international situation and the agenda item concerning disarmament give the General Assembly a chance to steer the ship of mankind towards peace and security and thus to fulfil the great hopes pinned to it. At the same time, any possible attempts to revive the cold war and the policy of strength will reopen the previous manoeuvres and may turn the United Nations into a new source of the cold war. In the full sense of the words, it is in the common interest of both socialist and capitalist countries, of both small and big Powers, that the present session of the General Assembly strengthen, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, the spirit of peaceful coexistence. The people of the Hungarian People's Republic, in unison with the great family of socialist peoples, are eager to endorse the principle of peaceful coexistence, because it complies with the interests of the Hungarian people. For this very reason the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic has instructed its delegations present here to promote, to the best of its modest possibilities, the strengthening of the atmosphere of mutual understanding. Accordingly, the work of the Hungarian delegation will be characterized by its endeavour, during the discussions on every one of the agenda items, to foster the principle of peaceful coexistence.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

