

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FIFTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



879th
PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 30 September 1960,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

General debate (continued)

Statement by the representative of Poland. . .	261
Speech by Mr. Abte Wold (Ethiopia).	262
Speech by Mr. Shukairy (Saudi Arabia). . . .	266

President: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: The 879th plenary meeting of the General Assembly is called to order. The Chairman of the delegation of Poland has asked for the floor in exercise of his right of reply and I now call on him.
2. Mr. GOMULKA (Poland):^{1/} Yesterday [877th meeting], the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Macmillan, referring to my address made in the general debate [874th meeting], raised his voice in defence of the policy conducted by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany. Not a single one of the several facts quoted in my statement pointing to the clearly militaristic and revanchist character of the policy of the West German Government were denied by him. For indeed these facts are absolutely undeniable.
3. Mr. Macmillan spoke as if he was not aware of the revisionist and aggressive statements by Chancellor Adenauer, Vice-Chancellor Erhard, President Luebke, Ministers Strauss and Seehofer, not to mention numerous other representatives of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany. Those statements met with strong reaction and protest on the part of European public opinion, including that of Britain.
4. But surely Mr. Macmillan should know the statement by Chancellor Adenauer of 10 July 1960, addressed to the so-called Prussians of the East, in which Adenauer expressed the hope that claims to the Polish lands would be satisfied if "we as firmly and faithfully stand at the side of our allies, as they do at ours." To this statement the Polish Government drew the attention of the United Kingdom Government in its note of July 1960.
5. How in the light of these facts and these aggressive pronouncements can we view Mr. Macmillan's assurances of the peaceful character of the German policy? Mr. Macmillan reminds us of the Federal Republic of Germany's membership in NATO and of the fact that: "... it—Western Germany—has been willing and anxious to organize its defence forces entirely in the framework of an integrated Western alliance and to accept strict limitations as to the character of its

weapons and the deployment of its forces" [877th meeting, para. 111].

6. If evidence is needed on the readiness of Western Germany to accept these "strict limitations", why not recall the memorandum of the General Staff of the Bundeswehr in which the German Federal Government had already categorically demanded the elimination of such limitations and that the West German Army be equipped with nuclear weapons on the basis of equality with other NATO Powers?

7. What Chancellor Adenauer thinks about those who take seriously German obligations on the arms limitations, he indicated only a few days ago—and I shall quote from a statement of the Christian Democratic Party's spokesman of 27 September 1960: "He who would want to deprive West German armed forces of the tactical atomic weapons is stupid or even more than that." Thus Western Germany asks again for equality in armaments, and, I submit, its present Western allies yield step by step to those demands.

8. It was Winston Churchill who said on 23 March 1933 in the House of Commons, when the Third Reich opened its drive towards rearmament:

"The Germans demand equality in weapons and equality in the organization of armies and fleets, and we have been told: 'You cannot keep so great a nation in an inferior position. What others have, they must have'. I have never agreed. It is a most dangerous demand to make. Nothing in life is eternal, but as surely as Germany acquires full military equality with her neighbours ... so surely should we see ourselves within a measurable distance of the renewal of general European war".

Today, in spite of the renewed threat on the part of German militarism, similar warnings are treated as communist propaganda.

9. Prime Minister Macmillan seems to rely on the declaration of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1954 that it would never attempt to effect any change in its present frontiers by the use of force.

10. The Polish Government and its allies have stressed repeatedly and categorically the final character of Poland's frontiers and that there can be no discussion on this subject. In this situation, advancing territorial claims against Poland is tantamount to war propaganda. Prime Minister Macmillan should realize this as well as we do. Yet he was waving German obligations at us from this rostrum as Neville Chamberlain once did with Hitler's undertakings brought back from Godesberg. By defending the militarist and revanchist policy of the Federal Republic of Germany Mr. Macmillan did seem to treat Poland as an exchange coin offered to Chancellor Adenauer for his support of British interests with regard to the European Common Market.

^{1/} Mr. Gomulka spoke in Polish. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

11. The security of Poland and of its frontiers fortunately does not depend on any manoeuvring between the NATO Powers. Gone for ever are the days when imperialist Powers could treat Poland as an object in international deals.

12. Our frontiers are protected and guarded not only by the entire nation but also by all the countries of the Warsaw Treaty. I wish to state clearly: the attitude towards Polish frontiers and towards German revisionism is for us a test by which we judge the policy of others towards Poland.

13. Mr. Macmillan reproaches us for lacking a spirit of conciliation towards the Federal Republic of Germany and the German people, insinuating that we drew up an indictment against the whole German nation. This was contrary to the evident wording of my statement.

14. We harbour no ill intentions towards the German people. The principle of collective responsibility is basically alien to us. As to who used to apply it in practice, this could be explained by peoples whose representatives Mr. Macmillan could not point out in this hall, such as for instance, the people of Kenya and Oman.

15. We have expressed hope that the time will come when the whole Polish people will be able to live in peace and friendship with the whole German nation, as we do at present live in peace and friendship with that part of the German people which lives in the German Democratic Republic, a State free from chauvinism and militarism, which does not advance any territorial claims against its neighbours.

16. The accusation as to the lack of conciliatory spirit was wrongly addressed by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

17. It is Poland that has repeatedly expressed its readiness to establish diplomatic relations with the Federal Republic of Germany. This, as you know, was of no avail. It was Poland that put forward in 1957 the idea of establishing a denuclearized zone in Central Europe under a broad system of control. As a reply we got the Bundestag decision on the atomic armament of the West German army. It is Poland that, together with other socialist States, has been for years asking for the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany in order finally to close the chapter of the Second World War—again with no results so far. Three days ago [874th meeting] from this rostrum we put forward a proposal to conclude a non-aggression pact between the countries of Central Europe, including, of course, Germany.

18. I submit this is ample evidence of goodwill. But no one should expect us to display a spirit of conciliation towards German militarism and revisionism. As long as the Western Powers continue to help rearming the Bundeswehr, to protect revisionism and encourage German claims on our frontiers, so long will it be difficult to obtain positive results in the discussions on the relaxation of international tension.

19. Mr. ABTE WOLD (Ethiopia) (translated from French): The presence at this fifteenth session of the General Assembly of so many Heads of State and Prime Ministers eloquently demonstrates the exceptional importance of the phase through which the United Nations is now passing.

20. Unquestionably the whole world, like the United Nations, is at a crucial turning point in contemporary history. Our meeting here in fact follows closely upon the failure of the Paris Summit Conference, the recent collapse of the efforts pursued over many years to solve the disarmament problem, and the outbreak of disorders in the centre of the great continent of Africa, where nothing less than the very future of the United Nations is at stake.

21. On the other hand, we are meeting at a moment which may subsequently prove to be the most important and symbolic of our age, when no less than fifteen African countries—with others to follow—have finally attained independence and become Members of the United Nations. I think one might even say that the ceremony at which they were admitted here ten days ago marked the beginning of the end of centuries of exploitation and imperialism on the African continent. Thus, after fifteen years of growth, the United Nations can be said to face the severest tests of its existence as a consequence of the crucial problems I have just mentioned.

22. In this respect, there would seem to be a parallel with pre-war events. It was precisely because of problems in Africa and the resultant struggle waged in defence of the same principles and ideals as the African countries are today endeavouring to champion, that the predecessor of the United Nations, the League of Nations, also in the fifteenth year of its existence, was faced with its greatest crisis. Now the United Nations has in its turn reached the crossroads of history. The war is already half a generation behind us. In fact, only a handful of the original signatories of the United Nations Charter, of whom I am proud to be one, are present at this Assembly. Nevertheless, despite the parallel with the situation which prevailed fifteen years after the First World War and the close similarity of the problems and principles involved in Africa, there are good grounds even at this critical time for remaining optimistic.

23. In a world of crises and disorders, the United Nations has assumed a significance and an importance without parallel in history. It seems to be the only safeguard today, not only for small States which, like Ethiopia, have long striven to provide it with the necessary means of assuring peace and collective security, but also for the great Powers, which desire peace but have no other means of attaining it.

24. Obviously, in these circumstances, the problems with which the Organization is called upon to deal often seem beyond the means at its disposal. Its success in meeting the problems which have marked the course of its existence and the wisdom and devotion of its permanent staff, from the Secretary-General to the humblest official, seem to me to merit our warmest commendation.

25. Nevertheless, as the presence in this Assembly of so many world figures indicates, the United Nations is called upon to deal with problems of the greatest importance to world peace and universal in their effect. How can the Organization hope to find equitable, enduring and universal solutions if it is not itself universal? It is obvious, moreover, that this lack of universality weakens the Organization's claim to speak for mankind and to represent the conscience of the world. Speaking from a more practical standpoint, however, there is a further consideration which com-

pels us to give serious thought to this matter. How can we, as Members of the United Nations, expect non-member countries to agree willingly to collaborate with us and with the Organization in the great international task of establishing mutual understanding between nations, if they are not admitted to membership?

26. Those are the considerations which will guide my delegation in any future discussions on this subject in the Committees and in the General Assembly.

27. Despite the existence of all these urgent and important problems, the progress achieved in fifteen years of struggle for the independence of African countries and peoples inspires us with optimism and offers an encouraging prospect.

28. For centuries Ethiopia remained the symbol of African independence and, almost alone in Africa, waged the struggle for the principle of independence and territorial integrity. As early as 1896 my country, through the courage of its leaders and patriots alone, beat back the forces of colonialism, while the outside world, already prepared to accept the extinction of Ethiopia, was suddenly made to recognize in Africa the irresistible force of the concepts of freedom and the inviolability of national territory. That day, sixty-four years ago, sounded a warning to colonialism for the first time in Africa, indeed anywhere in the world. In the same way, from 1906 onwards, when imperialist interests sought to divide my country among themselves, Ethiopia was able to hold its own in spite of everything and without material assistance from outside, while everywhere in Africa imperialism was already rampant. Finally in 1935, still alone and bombarded with counsels of appeasement, Ethiopia, under the leadership of my august sovereign Emperor Haile Selassie, unarmed and deprived of all outside assistance, did not hesitate to oppose vastly superior mechanized forces, thereby striking a blow also for the existence of all small countries, both in Africa and elsewhere, that cherish freedom and justice. It was for precisely this purpose that His Imperial Majesty made his solemn appeal at Geneva in 1936 stating that those who wanted peace at any price without justice would have neither peace nor justice; this was also a warning to other countries, that they might not suffer the fate of Ethiopia. If Ethiopia had abandoned the struggle when it was itself abandoned by the predecessor of the United Nations, present history would be entirely different.

29. Immediately after the end of the war, Ethiopia was obliged to resume the struggle against colonialism within the United Nations, where non-African interests opposed African solutions for those colonies which had been detached from the metropolitan countries as a result of the war. The present favourable climate did not yet prevail in the Organization at that time. Bitter struggles had still to be fought before the principles of independence, unity and territorial integrity came to be accepted by all the States Members of the United Nations.

30. Since then, the liberation movement was given strength by the admission to the Organization of Ethiopia's great friend and neighbour, the Republic of the Sudan, and gained further impetus with the admission of the Kingdom of Morocco and the Republics of Tunisia, Ghana and Guinea. If we have just witnessed the admission of no less than fifteen other African countries, to which must now be added Nigeria, due to

become independent tomorrow, it is because of this now irresistible movement for the independence, territorial integrity and unity of African countries. It is also due to the determination and devotion of the peoples of those countries, of their leaders and of their friends in other African States Members of the Organization. If, however, these countries have been able to take their places here without bloodshed, it must be acknowledged that this has been due in part also to the moderation and foresight of France, which recognized in time the irresistible force of the concepts of freedom and unity.

31. However, a great deal still remains to be done before the complete liberation of Africa becomes an accomplished fact. No less than 45 million Africans are still subject to colonial rule, which in some regions has lasted more than 400 years. It is where due recognition is not given to the irresistible force of the liberation movement that the legitimate aspirations of the African peoples will result in the sacrifice of human lives.

32. The gallant Algerian people must therefore be certain that nothing will oppose the attainment of their just aspirations, otherwise the bloodshed in Algeria, which the world so deeply deplores, will continue and perhaps even spread throughout the entire continent. There must be no delay in finding a just solution, according to those aspirations full recognition. It was with that end in view that the first resolution adopted by the Second Conference of Independent African States, held in June 1960 at Addis Ababa, declared that "the right of the Algerian people to self-determination and independence is a basis on which a final settlement could be achieved", and that "the conditions for the exercise of the Algerian people's right to self-determination must be made the subject of negotiation between the two parties concerned, namely France and the provisional government of the Algerian Republic".

33. It was also with this object in view that the same Conference appealed to all Governments of independent African States to canvass support by every means throughout the world for the cause of Algerian freedom. We believe that the liberal ideas and traditions which inspired France's policy towards the countries of the French Community should also prevail in the case of the noble Algerian people.

34. Unfortunately, however, all attempts at negotiation have failed, and it therefore seems necessary that a popular referendum, with all the requisite safeguards to ensure impartiality, should be carried out with all speed.

35. In the same way, the disorders which have occurred in Rhodesia and Nyasaland since the last session of the General Assembly have inevitably added to the tribulations of the African peoples. The selfish interests of the past must no longer prevent the peoples of those territories from realizing their aspirations. As the same Conference declared, the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland designed to uphold foreign and not African interests, must be dissolved, all political prisoners released and the people accorded at last freedom of expression and the right to vote.

36. That, however, is by no means the whole story of repression in Africa. The authorities of the Union of South Africa recently inscribed one of the blackest pages in modern history, plumbing new depths of infamy in the massacres provoked by racial hatred.

Racial discrimination is particularly humiliating for African States, first, because, in its most virulent form, it is directed against persons of African origin and, secondly, because the most flagrant example of racial discrimination in the world today is to be found on the African continent. We appreciate the difficulties that are being encountered in certain countries in abolishing racial discrimination and ensuring effective application of the principle of the equality of all men. We congratulate the States which have made sincere efforts in that direction. It is an entirely different matter, however, when a State, and particularly one which has assumed the sacred obligations enshrined in the United Nations Charter, gives legal sanction to racial discrimination and builds an entire political, social and economic edifice with the principle of racial discrimination as its very foundation. Every right-minded person is outraged by the present situation in South Africa. The practice of racial discrimination in South Africa not only violates and threatens to negate the decisions and recommendations in the matter adopted on numerous occasions by the United Nations, but is an insult to the world's conscience. The United Nations cannot permit a Member State to continue to ignore its recommendations without damaging its moral authority and prestige.

37. It was to demonstrate the solidarity of the Ethiopian people with their brothers in South Africa that His Imperial Majesty granted financial assistance and scholarships to the children orphaned by the Sharpeville massacres.

38. Meanwhile, in South West Africa foreign and entirely selfish interests are seeking to suppress the rights and the very identity of that Territory, whose peaceable inhabitants are being subjected to an oppressive régime already condemned throughout the world. Appeals to reason and reminders of the provisions of international agreements freely entered into and, indeed, sought by the Union of South Africa, have not made the slightest difference; they have not even given pause to a regime determined to suppress human rights throughout the southern regions of the continent.

39. That is why Ethiopia, supported by Liberia, took the initiative at the Second Conference of Independent African States of proposing that this question should be referred to the International Court of Justice, in accordance with the terms of the Mandate. The Liberian and Ethiopian Governments will accordingly submit this question to the Court in order to establish, before the world and before history, who is responsible. The Ethiopian delegation therefore welcomed the Report of the Committee on South West Africa, to the General Assembly at its fifteenth session, which says:

"The Committee recognizes the importance of the constructive intention expressed at the Second Conference of Independent African States held in Addis Ababa, which is in conformity with General Assembly resolution 1361 (XIV) dealing with the legal action open to Member States to institute judicial proceedings. The Committee wishes to commend this intention on the part of the Governments of Ethiopia and Liberia to the General Assembly as one of the practical approaches for the implementation of resolution 1361 (XIV)." [A/4464, para. 27.]

40. In recent months, the United Nations has engaged in certain activities which, if successful, may greatly enhance its prestige and authority, but which, if un-

successful, could threaten its very existence. I refer, of course, to the United Nations action in the Congo.

41. Ethiopia's policy on the Congo is clear. My country joined the other States Members of the United Nations in welcoming the Republic of the Congo (Leopoldville) to the community of nations as an independent and unitary State. This is still our policy.

42. Soon after the beginning of the crisis, Ethiopia answered the Security Council's appeal for assistance, which was then thought to be most urgently needed. It will certainly do so again in the future. The lessons of the past have too much meaning for us, and, at this point in history, our memories are too fresh for us to abandon the cause of collective security which His Imperial Majesty pleaded so eloquently before the League of Nations in 1936.

43. This principle, which has been upheld several times since then, is fundamental to the very existence of the United Nations, and Ethiopia will always be faithful to it. The Ethiopian soldiers under the United Nations flag are today the comrades-in-arms of other Member States in defence of this principle, and Ethiopia is ready to work tirelessly to ensure that it is respected.

44. The United Nations success in transporting in such a short time no less than 16,000 soldiers, mostly Africans, is certainly one of the most brilliant achievements in its history and provides encouraging evidence of its ability to face any problems which may arise in the future. The Security Council resolutions had clearly laid down the principles to be followed. The situation on the spot is confused and shifting, and the fact that this may have sometimes led to misdirection or errors of execution should occasion no surprise, since there is often a divergence between instructions or orders and the way in which the executive body carries them out on the spot. We should rather be surprised that it has been possible to avoid the outbreak of a conflict extending far beyond the frontiers of the Congo, and even beyond the coasts of Africa. The obvious lesson of this experience is that, in this age of cold war, the only hope is in our Organization, without which there would be nothing but chaos and destruction.

45. Many speakers here have said that this crisis is a danger to world peace. However, if there had been no foreign interference, clearly world peace would not be at stake. The presence of fraternal African contingents did nothing to bring about the crisis; quite the contrary. In keeping with the principles which have always guided African countries and peoples, the latter gave their assistance to strengthen the Central Government and the territorial unity of the Congo. Moreover, the African and Asian countries, meeting at the fourth emergency special session of the General Assembly, were alone able to point the way to a solution.

46. The Ethiopian delegation, which was one of the sponsors of the resolution [1474 (ES-IV)] unanimously adopted by the Assembly on 20 September 1960, considers that this resolution laid the foundations of a programme which could lead to a settlement of the problem. It says, *inter alia*:

"The General Assembly,

"Considering that, with a view to preserving the unity, territorial integrity and political independence

of the Congo, to protecting and advancing the welfare of its people, and to safeguarding international peace, it is essential for the United Nations to continue to assist the Central Government of the Congo,

"Requests the Secretary-General to continue to take vigorous action in accordance with the terms of the aforesaid resolutions and to assist the Central Government of the Congo in the restoration and maintenance of law and order throughout the territory of the Republic of the Congo and to safeguard its unity, territorial integrity and political independence in the interests of international peace and security."

We still hope, therefore, that this basic programme of work and this reaffirmation of the principle of national territorial integrity will bring peace back to the Congo, and that the brave Congolese people, united around a stable and independent Central Government, will then be able freely to follow the path of progress.

47. The events in the Congo have made clear the importance of consulting the independent African countries before giving any assistance or taking any international action in regions where foreign interests are trying to retain their hold. Otherwise the dangers of foreign interference might well jeopardize the application of the principle of independence.

48. The African countries have already established a tradition of consultation on all African affairs. This is clear from the many conferences between African States, of which the last two were held in June and August 1960, at Addis Ababa and Leopoldville respectively; there will be another at Tunis in 1962. This system is now so highly developed that, in my delegation's view, the United Nations should set up a permanent headquarters in Africa, on the lines of the Organization of American States, in place of the "informal machinery" which exists here at the United Nations. Moreover, the representatives of African peoples in the Assembly, forming today the largest group in the Organization, should give a powerful impetus to movements for peace within it.

49. The liberation of all African countries and peoples—and there is still a long way to go—will contribute greatly to the maintenance of world peace. Left to themselves, these countries, as brothers, seek only mutual support for the national and territorial unity and integrity of all, as demonstrated by the national contingents that Ethiopia and other African States have sent to maintain the integrity of the Government and territory of the Congo. It should be remembered that the African countries recently admitted to the Organization have all inherited territories defined during the colonial era. This has not prevented them from respecting the unity, the territorial integrity and the rights of their brothers and neighbours. Whatever their views on these subjects, they have respected these high principles, just as the countries of Latin America have generally respected the principle of *uti possidetis*.

50. Since the African Member States now make up the largest group within the United Nations, it is essential that this continent's representation in the Security Council, the Trusteeship Council and the Economic and Social Council should immediately be changed to take into account this fundamental expansion. It is unthinkable that Africa, which has the largest number of

Members in the whole Organization, should have the smallest representation in each of these organs.

51. If the liberation of the whole continent of Africa is an essential condition for the establishment of peace in this region, it is also the prerequisite for economic and social progress. This is clear from the events in the Congo. Before the independence movement gathered strength, the three African countries which were then independent had to make their way surrounded by colonial systems and subject to the threats and restrictions imposed by neighbouring colonial interests. Undoubtedly, however, as Marshal Tito, President of Yugoslavia, told the Assembly the other day: "It cannot, however, possibly be a mere coincidence that, as a rule, the countries that had until recently not been free are also the least developed ones" [868th meeting, para. 114].

52. The liberation of the African peoples is therefore the justification and the proper occasion for financial and technical assistance to the African countries. It is certainly not the fault of the African peoples if the Governments which oppressed them for centuries have deprived them of the benefits of education and technical progress. In the interests of peace, they must now be given the means to make up for lost time.

53. The problem, moreover, is so vast and so urgent that much wider assistance to African countries must be considered. Up to now, the assistance given by the Organization has proved to be inadequate and the aid programmes too varied and disparate. A special fund for Africa should be set up. In agreement with the Economic Commission for Africa, which has its permanent headquarters at Addis Ababa, the programme should be reorganized and consolidated to fill the needs of the African peoples. My delegation hopes that the General Assembly at its fifteenth session will be able to make progress in these important fields.

54. I come now to the important question of disarmament. My delegation believes that appreciable progress has been made in the past year with the introduction of the Soviet and United States plans. Ethiopia, like many States represented here, considers that both the Soviet and American plans were serious and praiseworthy attempts to reconcile complete disarmament with effective control. The unexpected failure of the Geneva Conference was deplorable, especially as considerable progress seemed to have been made towards a solution of the essential question of control. Since charges of spying and of violations of national territory have been exchanged, it is more important than ever to set up an impartial and international control system.

55. The small nations, for which the question of disarmament is just as vital as it is for the great Powers, but which are not able to accumulate atomic weapons—and have no interest in doing so—would seem, as several speakers have already pointed out, to be well qualified to deal with the question of control. After so many years' work and so many failures, the appalling alternative which hangs over our discussions will not allow us to remain passive. It is of the highest importance that the Assembly should make some progress on the problem of disarmament in this year of crisis.

56. The decisions we take here, and their implications, concern us all, however we may vote on these vital questions. None of us can escape, whatever the

population or the size of our countries. Nuclear fallout makes no distinction between belligerents and neutrals or between the innocent and the guilty. Modern war is a problem for all of us: it is the enemy of all mankind, since everywhere, whatever their moral or physical condition, all men must inevitably fall victim to nuclear weapons.

57. I think that I am right in saying that the question of disarmament has been on the General Assembly's agenda every year. I do not think that many of you would deny that, both in the short and in the long run, it is as important as any problem which the United Nations has discussed. It is regrettable that, in spite of the efforts of the countries most directly concerned, the results have been so small. But perhaps we should be glad that some progress, however slight, has been made.

58. My delegation does not think that the United Nations has satisfactorily discharged its responsibilities towards mankind in the matter of disarmament. Whenever this problem has been discussed, the Organization has unfortunately become a forum for debate and propaganda. The time when we could allow such a situation to continue has passed. The United Nations has been able in the past to take strong and effective action in other matters, which were just as vital to the fundamental right of mankind to continue to exist. As the Ethiopian representative pointed out in the First Committee [955th meeting] at the thirteenth session of the General Assembly, if in an earlier era, when the emerging international society had few ways of dealing with the dangers which threatened mankind, the world was able to agree on the prohibition of poison gas and other means of mass destruction, why then today, in the United Nations which has already proved itself many times, could we not follow the examples of the St. Petersburg (1868) and Geneva declarations, and of our own Organization's declarations on human rights and on genocide and adopt a declaration forbidding the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons pending that settlement of the disarmament question which seems never to be forthcoming? The Ethiopian delegation considers that the time has come to face this vital question bravely and honestly.

59. In my opening remarks, I said that, in spite of the atmosphere of crisis in which this fifteenth session has opened, there were reasons for optimism.

60. It is right that the United Nations should once again have assumed a supremely responsible role in the disarmament question, and that it should have placed on its agenda many questions which the General Assembly has hitherto never discussed. It is encouraging to see the forces of international peace and harmony strengthened by the admission of many new African States to the United Nations. It is also encouraging that so many Heads of State, Prime Ministers and Ministers for Foreign Affairs have been able to attend this fifteenth session.

61. On behalf of the Ethiopian delegation, may I express my belief that this fifteenth session of the General Assembly will go down in history as having marked in the life of the United Nations the great turning point on the difficult road to peace and harmony among the nations.

62. Mr. SHUKAIRY (Saudi Arabia): In the past fourteen years the General Assembly has been convened under many a political climate. We have assembled in

regular and in special emergency sessions. We have had sessions which were highly tense and timidly dull. We have experienced all sorts of weather, and we have encountered many a tempest. With contribution or no contribution, all of those sessions have left a deep imprint in the annals of the United Nations—indeed, in the history of mankind.

63. But the present session stands unique in our living memory. We come here, to meet in this fifteenth regular session, captured by wonder and enthralled by marvel.

64. It is true that we are assembled in the regular session, but what a session, what a drama we have come to witness on this international stage—a living drama that will decide the destiny of mankind for a long time to come. I say a living drama, for the characters are its actors, its very authors and, indeed, its living heroes.

65. That this session is such a wondrous event should cause no surprise. It is self-explanatory. The explanation lies in the very atmosphere of the session, an atmosphere charged with mixed feelings of hope and fear. It stems from the very exciting nature of the session and precisely from the singular composition of the delegations attending the session.

66. We rejoice that this session has attracted great figures of high eminence, stature and authority. They are not the heads of their respective Governments simply from the point of view of title. Many of them are great liberators of their countries, skilled organizers in the political and economic fields, and ardent inspirers of their peoples. If evidence were needed, we have in our midst, I rejoice to say, Mr. Nehru—not only Prime Minister of India, but a great leader of the peoples of Asia and Africa.

67. The only retrogressive phenomena as far as this session is concerned have been felt in the matter of our environment. A number of heads of government who have come to the United States on this peace-making mission have been ill-received, to use perhaps an understatement.

68. In spite of the noble appeal of President Eisenhower for "calm and reasonable conduct", more than one incident has taken place against more than one head of government. We all recall the discourteous and outrageous incidents that took place in New York on the occasion of the visit of His Majesty, King Ibn Saud, to the United Nations. We bow in homage and respect to the worthy behaviour of the people of the United States. They are really distinguished hosts. But when it is staged in the capital of the United Nations, such a lack of courtesy is most deplorable and most regrettable.

69. We all recall that New York was chosen as the seat of the United Nations under heavy pressure from the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Stettinius, assisted by the great talents and gifts of Adlai Stevenson. At that time, Geneva was a strong candidate and had many supporters. Ultimately, through persuasion, lobbying and pressure, New York was chosen, and we had to accept, wait and see.

70. The experience—the bitter experience—has been discouraging and most painful. New York did not prove to be the ideal home of the United Nations. The United Nations has fallen victim to group pressure and has been subjected to a campaign of wilful misrepresentation.

tation. It is not my wish to weary the Assembly at this stage with the facts, deplorable and regrettable as they are. It is enough to know that many a cause, national or international, has either been unjustly magnified or unduly minimized. There has been an entire absence of fair play, and equal chances have not been afforded in all the media of information. There has been a total blackout for one side and an extensive accessibility for the other side.

71. The international community, I submit, cannot tolerate such a situation of bias, of prejudice, of distortion. Should such group pressure continue and, what is more grievous, should such a freedom of bias—and again we have such a freedom of bias, a freedom of distortion—should it continue, this Organization must look for a sanctuary that can afford to be free and fair.

72. We shall have to seek refuge somewhere, anywhere, where we can breathe freely—unmolested, undisturbed and, virtually and literally, unthreatened—where our thoughts are not misinterpreted and our speeches are neither suppressed nor mutilated. Geneva could be one such place and, with the lands of freedom expanding, the United Nations could find a peaceful haven in more than a few countries.

73. I should like to stress, however, that our grievance is not a matter of courtesy pure and simple. It is a matter that goes right down to the bedrock of our Organization. Distortion is damaging—and, I say, most damaging—to the prestige of the United Nations. Even this issue of distortion that I am speaking of at this moment can become a substance, a fibre, a subject for distortion—and I would not be surprised to find tomorrow that my complaint with regard to distortion may itself be distorted.

74. It may be alleged that, in raising this issue, I have followed the path of the Soviet Union. What a dreadful path, that can lead only to hell! But my complaint, I should like to assure the Assembly, springs from reasons entirely different from those offered by the Soviet Union. We follow none and we submit to none. It is the emergency Special session on the Congo, and the picture it was given, which aroused our grievance.

75. At the emergency special session, as we all recall, the question of the Congo was disposed of by a resolution [1474 (ES-IV)] submitted by African and Asian Powers. For us African and Asian nations it was a source of pride and satisfaction that the problem of the Congo was decided on the initiative taken by the African-Asian States. This initiative was taken, I should like to declare from this rostrum, entirely and solely in order to uphold the cause of the Congo and the national interests of the Congo—no more and no less. But our motives and objectives have been diametrically reversed in the Press and elsewhere. A campaign—I would say a malicious avalanche of misrepresentation—was unleashed, portraying the African-Asian resolution as a victory for the West and as a defeat for the East. All this was a glaring distortion. The African-Asian resolution on the Congo is neither a victory for the West nor a defeat for the East. If there is any victory at all—and we hoped there would be a victory—it must be one for the United Nations, one for liberty and for the peoples of the Congo. To say that it is a victory for this, or a defeat for that, is simply to fan agitation and tension and to drive the cold war right into the heart of the Congo.

76. The African-Asian countries, now the largest group in the United Nations, are here to defeat none and to bring victory to none. They strive for the triumph of the United Nations and the principles embedded in the Charter of the United Nations.

77. That is the type of environment that has surrounded the General Assembly at its present session. But, be that as it may, we can feel greatly relieved that humanity has at its full command this platform, this very platform of the United Nations, a platform which radiates our hopes and beams our yearnings not only to our close surroundings but to distant lands all over the world.

78. At this rostrum, great men from all corners of the globe have stood before the bar of history. These great men have brought to the Assembly the truth in its universality. They have mirrored the international situation in its totality and prescribed the remedy in its reality. After all, human affairs are not the monopoly of one man, no matter what a giant he may be; nor of a single nation, no matter how great and mighty it may be.

79. Indeed, our session has become a great congregation of great men of every creed and colour. In the past the word "colour" was simply figurative. Now it is representative. Men from every continent come to this rostrum.

80. In his statement [868th meeting] President Eisenhower, a distinguished soldier who became a great leader of peace, enriched the Assembly with principles and proposals furnishing the diagnosis and prescribing the treatment. President Eisenhower reiterated his belief in the concepts of freedom, self determination, peace with justice, principles which, if practiced as preached—and particularly by the Western Powers—would make life on this planet peaceful, secure and free from any domination or exploitation. I stand here to salute President Eisenhower for his constructive proposals, for his conciliatory tone, and for his ardent appeal for world peace and justice.

81. President Tito, hero of liberation and freedom, has stood before us as a symbol of independent thinking and free judgement. As one of the founders of a school of thought, of a political philosophy based on positive and active neutrality, President Tito enunciated in his speech [868th meeting] principles of peaceful coexistence and set out the measures for disarmament and the necessary steps in the field of economic development for the small nations.

82. President Tito was at his greatest as a man when he championed the cause of Algeria in its struggle for liberty and independence. President Tito has given the General Assembly a living example of how to be true to the United Nations and faithful to the cause of freedom. President Tito has proved himself ready to translate words into deeds, dreams into schemes and the principles of the Charter into actual implementation. He is worthy of the admiration of the United Nations.

83. Prime Minister Khrushchev, the other giant of the other side of the world, made his contribution too in his own way. Mr. Khrushchev, a great master in the arts of international affairs, whose humour is as instructive as his anger, has confronted the Assembly [869th meeting] not only with exciting problems, but also with surprising solutions. We need not be re-

minded that Mr. Khrushchev speaks here not only as the Head of a State. He is more than that. On earth he is the incarnation of a world social, political and economic system. In the outer universe he is the joyous man roaming in outer space. With the world as it is—and I stress, with the world as it is—the United Nations cannot rise fully to its responsibilities without meeting Mr. Khrushchev half way on the road to peace and international security.

84. Mr. Nkrumah, the President of Ghana, also made his contribution to the work of the General Assembly [869th meeting]. His vigorous stand for the Congo, for Algeria, and for the whole of Africa has sounded a siren to all corners of the world, a siren of warning to all to leave Africa to the Africans.

85. Mr. Fidel Castro, Head of the Cuban Government in his speech [872nd meeting], strongly pleaded his cause and voiced his grievances. And this is what we are here for in the United Nations. Whether one agrees with him or not, Mr. Castro has come to the United Nations not only in field uniform, but filled with zeal, patriotism and profound conviction. If this United Nations is the parliament of man, then Mr. Castro could be the typical man.

86. Then comes President Nasser. And what can I say of President Nasser? He is head and shoulders too high to need an introduction—a great national hero and a great international figure. Were I not head of an Arab delegation, I should be at liberty to praise his victories. From this rostrum President Nasser has placed before the Assembly [873rd meeting] the cause of Arab nationalism in its purity, in its simplicity and, I would say with all honesty, he has voiced with sincerity and candour the deep-seated yearnings of the Arab people for ultimate liberty and unity. President Nasser has given Arab nationalism, in its modern awakening, the whole of his mind and his soul. Ever since he rose to leadership he has been scoring victory after victory. In fact, Nasser is victory by name, but he is also a triumph by deeds—deeds already achieved and deeds that remain to be achieved.

87. In the days to come the United Nations will also be enriched by statements from other great leaders of their countries. This is what makes of this session of the General Assembly a United Nations summit, a session that is bound also to go into the records of history as the session of the continent of Africa. I say the "session of Africa" with full justification. Many of our past sessions have been named for their outstanding events; it is only fair and proper that this session should be called the "session of Africa". The giant continent of Africa, as President Eisenhower eloquently phrased it, deserves to have our session borrow its name. Africa has suffered long; it is now time for Africa to be honoured.

88. But the greatest honour that can be conferred on Africa is by answering the challenge which Africa presents to the commonwealth of nations. Everything in Africa is a challenge. And, as a giant continent, its challenge must be a giant one indeed.

89. Yet the cornerstone of any programme for Africa must be within the framework of the United Nations. We are particularly glad that President Eisenhower has underlined the role of the United Nations in this field. I say particularly glad, for the colonial Powers in Africa are still dreaming of Africa. They are still conceiving plans to maintain their economic domina-

tion. Some of these Powers have pushed Israel into the African scene. Israel thus undertook to penetrate into Africa under the guise of giving economic assistance to Africa. This explains the recent visit of Mr. Ben Gurion to France and Belgium just on the eve of the events in Africa, and goes to disclose the strategy and the tactics. But such conspiracies will not escape the attention of the African people. The people of Africa are not naive, not to be led into a trap by such naive machinations.

90. Israel's survival up to this moment is due mainly to economic assistance from abroad and it is inconceivable that Israel can lend a helping hand. He who survives only through outside assistance cannot afford to provide assistance to anyone.

91. The game is glaringly obvious. Imperialist Powers, unable to come face to face with the African peoples, find it more tactful to hide behind Israel. In fact, this is one of the reasons why Israel was established on the fringes of Asia and not far from Africa. When imperialism pulls out from the area, Israel is there, and is there to go ahead. But such tactics can deceive no one. Africa shall remain closed to imperialism and its manifestations, to all colonialism and to the satellites of imperialist and colonial Powers.

92. To ensure its success, the programme of President Eisenhower, we urge, must be all-African in planning, direction and execution. Africa knows best its own needs and feels most its own suffering. We must warn, however, that this operation of assistance—or any programme of economic, technical or educational assistance—should not be employed as a lever to interfere in the domestic affairs of Africa, nor should it influence policy-making. It must not infringe on the political independence of the African countries, nor should it pressurize them—and I use this term "pressurize" in its full meaning—into political groupings or military alliances. Such tendency is the most pernicious evil confronting the nations of Africa in their upsurge for freedom and liberty.

93. I emphasize the words "the most pernicious evil" with the testimony already in hand. I refer to the Congo. That wretched territory has become the axis of the present cold war, the hotbed of conflict and a battlefield for international intrigue, rivalry and conspiracy. The Congo, or rather its uranium, its mineral resources and its strategic position in the heart of Africa, have become a magnet of international rivalry. Had this land been plain desert with no treasures slumbering under its soil, the Congo would have aroused the appetite of none and would not have become an item—an explosive item—on the agenda of the General Assembly.

94. The barometer in the Congo, we must warn, is falling, and dangerously falling. It is the wind from outside, not the heat of Africa, which is behind the tempest. We have passed a resolution on the question of the Congo, but not even a pile of resolutions will remove the crisis if this tug-of-war between East and West over the Congo is not halted. The Congo could be destroyed and world peace endangered in spite of the United Nations presence and in spite of the still-fresh resolutions we have adopted on the question of the Congo.

95. The United Nations Command and the United Nations Force are a necessity in the Congo; they are

a "must" if we mean to help the Government of the Congo—the legitimate Government of the Congo—to maintain its independence and preserve its unity. But if we are to carry the cold war right into the United Nations Command, right into the rank-and-file of the United Nations forces in the Congo, then we had better pull the United Nations out of the Congo entirely. The Congo, assisted by the African States, would settle its own affairs, and the United Nations would be saved from becoming a contingent deployed in the cold war in the Congo. The African States can become a small United Nations in the Congo, assuming all the responsibilities of the Organization.

96. The Congo situation, however, with all its gravity and magnitude, cannot erase from the international arena the gravity of another problem in Africa—Algeria. This is the problem of all problems in Africa, the most crucial and the most flagrant.

97. The problem of Algeria is a novelty neither to the United Nations nor to world history. The United Nations has considered the problem of Algeria during the last five years; but in terms of world history, the problem of Algeria is 130 years old. This whole span of time has been one of heroic struggle on the part of the people of Algeria; on the part of France, it was a record of repression, destruction, bereavement and destitution.

98. The Algerian war has entered its sixth year, leaving no heart in the world unmoved and no conscience unperturbed. It is a war of liberation, a heroic war not free from many a paradox—many a tragic paradox, I would say. This paradox is manifold. The war is against France, which has given the world, through the French Revolution, the concepts of liberty, freedom and the principle of self-determination. It is a war fought by France against freedom and self-determination. Further, this war is being fought by the brave people of Algeria who have given the flower of their youth in two world wars in helping France to regain its freedom, maintain its unity and rise up from the abyss of defeat. And as the last of the paradoxes, the war is being fought at a time when France is led by President de Gaulle, that same General de Gaulle who led his country in the liberation movement that restored to France its freedom, its liberty and dignity.

99. Yet, this is not the end of the paradox. There are other aspects that should not escape our attention. First, this is not a war of equals. The Algerians have put into the field their bravery and their courage. The French have sent into the field a mighty army, one million strong, with modern weapons and with some divisions trained in atomic tactics. Second, France is being assisted militarily and economically by the NATO organization with its vast, unlimited resources. Algeria is supported by peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples with but the limited assistance that can be provided. Third—and this is the most abominable aspect—France is prosecuting this colonial war in violation of all the humane provisions of the Geneva Conventions. I would not wish at this stage to go into the details of the torture of civilians, the execution of prisoners, the abuse of the judicial system. It is enough to know that the free thinkers of France have condemned this colonial war, which, in their eloquent French they have described as "la sale guerre". Nothing is more condemning to France than condemnation by its free thinkers. Their verdict, "la sale guerre", will go on record in the annals of history.

100. However, we must remember that this adjective, "sale", is not confined to the field of military operations. It has penetrated into the political field as well. Let us see. It is now a historic fact that on 16 September 1959 President de Gaulle made his famous declaration offering the principle of self-determination to the people of Algeria. In spite of the many mines hidden in this declaration—and I use the word "mines" with all intention—planted skilfully by so skilful a soldier as General de Gaulle, this declaration on self-determination was hailed by all the world and the provisional government of the Algerian Republic was the first to accept its principles.

101. But no sooner had the declaration been made, than the Prime Minister of France, the Minister of Defence, the French Delegate-General and the Generals in Algeria pronounced in categorical terms that French Algeria would continue to be France, and that the French Army was there to keep France in Algeria for ever and ever.

102. In a radio broadcast on 29 January 1960, President de Gaulle, dressed in uniform—to give it the prestige of a military uniform, to give it the strength of a military operation—addressed to the settlers in Algeria a question in the following terms. And I invite the attention of members of the Assembly to this statement, the translation of which was furnished by the French delegation:

"Frenchmen of Algeria, how can you listen to the liars"—liars is the word of President de Gaulle. This is part of his statement, it is not my phraseology. This is what he says "... who tell you that in granting free choice to the Algerians, France... wants....to pull out of Algeria...?"

In support of this position, the Commander in Chief of the French Armed Forces in Algeria had proclaimed on 27 January 1960 that "the French Army... will continue to fight in Algeria in order that Algeria may permanently remain French soil". Thus the principles of self-determination and free choice have been thrown into the dirt, into the mud. These sacred principles have been made "la sale politique" in "la sale guerre".

103. At a later stage, in June, talks were held in Melun between France and Algeria to set out the preliminaries for "pourparlers" between the parties. What was the result? The talks have failed, not through the intransigence of the oppressed, which is their right—but through the intransigence of the oppressors which is their might. The Melun talks were no talks. France did not go to Melun to talk but to dictate. The envoys of Algeria were invited not to negotiate but to hear conditions—to receive instructions—and to abide by varieties of restrictions. They were treated simply as prisoners of war. When he set foot on France, Ferhat Abbas, the Head of the provisional government, of the Algerian Republic was to go in accordance with French protocol, into a cage of tranquillity and peace, talking to no one and meeting no one. He should not talk with this person, nor with that person. And with the French delegation, the Prime Minister of Algeria cannot talk, except—cease-fire and the surrender of arms and ammunition.

104. This is nothing except an ultimatum. This is no negotiation, it is capitulation, and by definition I would say it is surrender. No, the Algerians will fight for their liberty to the last breath of the last man and they

will not surrender. To be accepted by the provisional government of the Algerian Republic it would be self-dominion and not self-determination. The Melun episode has also proved to be a modern version of the *Merchant of Venice* where the genius of Shakespeare has made a comedy out of a tragedy and has made a tragedy out of a comedy. The "pourparlers" were again made by France "les sales pourparlers". Thus, the problem of Algeria in all its aspects has been "sale" in every respect "la sale guerre", la sale politique", and "les sales pourparlers".

105. And this is what has led to the inclusion of the problem in the agenda of this session. But this time the problem comes before you from an entirely different angle. By now, there is ample evidence that France is playing a game. France is determined to score a victory in Algeria by military or political strategy. We shall not allow France to gain that victory either in the military field or in the political field here in the United Nations. France is anxious to exploit every well, particularly the oil of Algeria. To stay in Algeria is the determination of France, which has been kept in the heart of France under different pretexts. In the past the guise was civilization; later the guise was pronounced to be pacification. Today, Paris went into another fashion: self-determination. If, however, it is self-determination, it is one that France is striving to implement, by France and for France.

106. The free choice which France has offered cannot be free under France. The referendum and the elections that took place in Algeria two years ago, lead to the irresistible conclusion that with France in Algeria there cannot be a free choice for the people of Algeria. The very "raison d'être" of the war in Algeria is the presence of France in Algeria. Thus the United Nations should step in and a general plebiscite should be arranged under the United Nations. Nothing short of United Nations supervision would secure the freedom of choice for the people of Algeria. And that is the challenge to France—and a challenge to all the Western peoples, the Western delegations here seated in the Assembly. It is a challenge to France to prove that France is sincere and faithful to the principle of self-determination and that President de Gaulle is consistent with President de Gaulle.

107. It is a challenge to the Western World, and has become more challenging, I would say, after the admirable statement of President Eisenhower made from this rostrum in support of the principle of self-determination. The delegations of the United States and of the United Kingdom, whose Prime Minister spoke yesterday [877th meeting] so eloquently about the principle of self-determination from this rostrum, as did other Western Powers, are therefore called upon to act accordingly. We urge action this year for we suffered from a regrettable inaction last year.

108. That was the catch-word of the session in 1959—inaction. At the fourteenth session the United States, the United Kingdom and other Powers urged that the United Nations should take no action—to give France enough time to put into effect its declared policy of self-determination. We were not impressed by this argument coming from the States that claimed themselves to be the free world.

109. The outcome was no action. The Western Powers by hook or crook have succeeded in preventing the

United Nations from taking any action. But what do we see now? The war in Algeria is in full swing, with its devastation of property, loss of life—to French and Algerians alike. In the course of this year, France has not moved one single iota in the direction of the solution. France is still prosecuting the war and there is no evidence that France means to engage in negotiations—real and genuine negotiations. Thus we are left with the only alternative, the only peaceful alternative—a United Nations referendum.

110. President Eisenhower, speaking from this rostrum, has highlighted the principles of self-determination. Now is the time for the United States delegation and all the delegations of the West to apply these principles to Algeria—for Algeria is no exception and should not and could not be an exception. Should these delegations act in this manner, in accordance with the letter and spirit of Mr. Eisenhower's speech from the rostrum of the United Nations, as we have urged them to do, they would worthily honour the statement of Mr. Eisenhower, they would give it full meaning, they would practise what it preaches and, what is more important, they would not make of it simply a statement from the rostrum.

111. In his concluding words, the great President of the United States expressed a sublime hope, couched in these sublime and noble phrases:

"I should like to see a universal plebiscite in which every individual in the world would be given the opportunity freely and secretly to answer this question: 'Do you want this right?'" [868th meeting, para. 84.]

112. This is the question which President Eisenhower wished every citizen in the world to answer freely and secretly in a universal referendum. What an outstanding question, falling from the lips of an outstanding international figure. "Do you want this right?" is the question Algeria is clamouring to answer, freely and secretly; and the answer will be of far-reaching significance. Let us see whether the Western Powers can put this question to Algeria and whether France would abide by the answer. The answer, we are sure, would not only bring about a cease fire; it would stop war and, what is most human, it would grant a people their liberty, the most sacred possession on earth.

113. I have put the challenge before the Western Powers not because of any special position or feeling towards the West or the East. I am not here to offend the West nor to defend the East. We are here to decide each problem on its own merits, with respect for all and friendship to all. But it so happens that the East—and God only knows whether it is out of tactics, out of strategy, or out of conviction—has been in the past, is at present, and will be for the future, pledged to support the cause of Algeria. This is the position of the East. This fact adds challenge to the challenge. If the West is a free world, as it always claims; if the West is a world of democracy, as it always advocates; if it is in support of the United Nations, as has been the catchword at this session in discussion of the United Nations; then here it is invited to meet the challenge, in accordance with its own standards. The people of Algeria are urging a plebiscite, and the time has come for the West to say what President Eisenhower asked it to say, and to do what President Eisenhower asked it to do.

114. Three other problems, one in Africa and two in Asia, call for serious consideration by the Assembly.

115. The first is the problem of Mauritania. This item was included on the agenda at the request [see A/4445 and Add.1] of the Government of Morocco. We whole-heartedly support the position taken by Morocco on this matter. Mauritania, the territory and its people are part and parcel of the territory and people of Morocco. But France, as usual, is playing in Mauritania a game of independence—and independence has become, for France, so valuable and so sacred in Mauritania—thereby endeavouring to cause the territory to secede from the mother country. France should know better; we all know elementary history. Morocco, having fallen prey to power politics, has been partitioned. In the north a Spanish zone was established, while the south became a French zone. Mauritania fell under French rule, and Tangier was made an international zone. This is the history of Morocco in simple terms.

116. This picture exists no more. The international status of Tangier has been abolished, and the Spanish and the French zones have been re-united—all to make Morocco a fully independent and fully sovereign State represented here in the United Nations. What remains is the restoration of Mauritania to the fatherland, and that is the whole problem. It goes without saying that we shall spare no effort to defend the cause of Mauritania in its struggle to restore its existence as part and parcel of Morocco.

117. The second problem is the question of Oman which lies on the eastern fringes of the Arabian Peninsula. This problem has been on our minds for a number of years. Its inclusion on the agenda has been postponed one year after another through the intervention of friends. The people of Oman are fighting for their independence, and the British are sparing no effort to suppress this cause of liberty with guns, tanks and jet aircraft spitting fire on defenceless villages and towns. Should friendly intervention prove unable to persuade the British, we shall have no alternative but to invoke the intervention of the United Nations.

118. Yesterday, in his statement before the Assembly Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, was in the prime of eloquence, at the peak of oratory, for which there can be no equal, among the English-speaking delegations at least. In colourful terms and ringing and resounding phraseology, so rich in English style, Mr. Macmillan spoke of freedom and self-determination. But freedom is not a religious sermon; neither is this rostrum the Mount of the Beatitudes in the Holy Land. Freedom and self-determination are matters of deeds, and deeds only, that can be translated into actual facts and events in our international life. The question of Oman is the test case for the eloquence and oratory of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. It is for Mr. Macmillan to be faithful to Mr. Macmillan. In the last four years the people of Oman have been fighting the British for their liberty. Shall we believe Mr. Macmillan here on this rostrum or shall we believe the thunder of British guns on the land and people of Oman? Rather I would wish, at least out of sympathy and mercy, Mr. Macmillan would give the lie to events. We would wish him to silence the British guns before he speaks of freedom and the principle of self-determination from this rostrum. In all honesty and sincerity, we would wish him to dismantle the British

military bases in the area and leave the people of Oman to live in peace, quiet, sovereignty and liberty in their home.

119. The third problem is that of West Irian. Although this question has been considered by the General Assembly at previous sessions, it is not on the agenda of the present session. Some of the problems that are not included on our agenda are more explosive than those that are. And there lies the danger. West Irian, I submit, is one of those problems—and an explosive one indeed. West Irian is part and parcel of Indonesia, and no power on earth can separate that territory from its mother country. Recently the matter has been causing tension in the Far East. The tour of the Netherlands aircraft carrier would have led to a flare-up in the area had it not been for the wisdom of the Japanese Government in calling upon the Netherlands ship not to anchor in Japanese waters.

120. It is our ardent hope that the Dutch will surrender West Irian to Indonesia, to which it belongs. The Dutch would be best advised to come to an agreement with Indonesia on the matter. By so doing the people and the Government of the Netherlands can earn the friendship and co-operation not only of Indonesia but of all the African-Asian peoples, who stand here in the United Nations for every cause of liberty and freedom.

121. I should now like to turn to another cause of justice, another cause of self-determination. I refer to the problem of another people striving to restore their national life, to live in dignity in their homeland and to exercise their inherent right of self-determination. The homeland is Palestine, and the people are its lawful and legitimate nation.

122. This session of the Assembly offers a commanding, a demanding, occasion to state the Arab position on the question of Palestine fully, frankly and to the last point of finality. I propose to undertake this task for many reasons.

123. In the first place, this is a unique meeting of so many Heads of Governments; thus, in the interests of peace, the case of the people of Palestine should be presented in full. The Palestine case is still being misrepresented, and the Zionist forces never tire of distortion and misrepresentation.

124. In the second place, the admission of new Members has brought into this Organization new nations that have shaken off the shackles of colonialism. In a short while the United Nations will embrace 100 Member States, thus doubling its original membership. It will become a new United Nations, quite different from the United Nations of 1945 and even from the United Nations of 1947, which wrote into the annals of history that catastrophe of Palestine.

125. The third reason for the presentation of the Palestine problem here, apart from the fact that its tragedy continues, is to be found in the statement made from this rostrum by Mr. Nkrumah, the President of the Republic of Ghana [869th meeting]. This statement by President Nkrumah has made it imperative that the crucial issue of the Palestine question be placed squarely before the United Nations and before world public opinion. President Nkrumah is a great national hero, whose impressions about the Palestine question do call for a frank statement on the matter—a state-

ment of solid fact taking care of the merits, the justice and the equities of the whole case.

126. I shall not dig deep into the archives of the history of the problem. I do not propose to speak of the illegality of the Balfour Declaration of 1917, under which the British promised to offer the Jews a country which none of them owned and neither possessed. Likewise, it is not my desire to speak of the Palestine Mandate of 1922, which was intended by the League of Nations as a sacred trust of civilization to prepare the people of Palestine to become independent, like other Arab countries—Lebanon, Jordan, Syria and Iraq—which are now fully sovereign and independent and are worthily represented in the United Nations.

127. Similarly, I shall not attempt to put the United Nations and the Assembly in the dock. I shall not put this devastating question to Mr. Harold Macmillan: Where is the independent State of Palestine, whose creation was entrusted to the United Kingdom, as the Mandatory Power, by the League of Nations? I shall not put the question because Mr. Harold Macmillan will not answer it. He will not answer it because he has no answer to offer—at least no reasonable, logical and just answer. Neither shall I advance the irrefutable argument that the United Nations in 1947 had no right to partition a country against the will of its people, any more than the United Nations now has any authority to partition the territory of the Congo or, for that matter, the territory of any people now represented in the United Nations. I shall not refer to the seventy-five resolutions (what a large figure!) so far passed by the United Nations on various aspects of the Palestine question. Nor shall I invoke the numerous General Assembly resolutions urging the repatriation of the refugees—resolutions which Israel has resisted time and time again.

128. Neither shall I place before the Assembly a whole file of extracts from the reports of the United Nations Mediator, Count Bernadotte, of Mr. Bunche or of the Palestine Conciliation Commission—all of which disclose Israel's defiance and refusal to abide by the United Nations resolutions, a defiance attended by adamant ingratitude and rebellion.

129. All that is history. I shall discard it for the moment. I shall confine myself to one major fact which will dispose of the whole issue, a fact which I hope will commend itself to the mind and heart of President Nkrumah, a great hero of a great people. I stress "people", for "people" is not an expression; it is not a term: it is a concept of life, a concept of human existence; it is the highest, indeed the most sacred, embodiment of human society. Again, I stress "people" precisely because the Palestine case is the problem of a people, a whole people, clamouring to live in dignity in their homeland, just as the people of Ghana are living in dignity in their homeland and enjoying their pleasures at home, under the leadership of their hero, President Nkrumah.

130. Let us brush aside resolutions and records—although they do support our cause; let us set aside the Charter, although its principles are on our side; let us leave aside all the dictates of law, justice and democracy, although they all corroborate our cause. Leave all that, and let us speak in human terms—in terms that even a man in the street can easily understand, can fully comprehend, and can readily grasp.

131. Here is a case of a people who have lived in their land for generations and generations, since time immemorial. Palestine is their home, just as Ghana is the home of its people, and just as any homeland is the home of its people—adored in love, worshipped in affection and consecrated by sacrifice.

132. This people, the people of Palestine, have lived their lives in their homeland. They built their mosques, their churches and their synagogues—they established their towns and their villages. They have made great fortunes and accumulated treasured possessions. In their country, they have breathed their hopes and aspirations. They admired their glories, and they bewailed their defeats. They sang their joy; and to the graveyards they carried their fathers, their grandfathers and all those they had loved. In a word, they were making history when many a country was not on record in the annals of history.

133. These people of Palestine have now been living in exile for more than a decade, away from their homes, dispossessed of their properties; and, what is more, beholding thousands and thousands of Jewish immigrants occupy their houses, seize their farms, usurp their towns and villages, and lay hands on incalculable possessions—the toil, the sweat and the labour of generation after generation.

134. If we are to face the realities of the situation then, this is the real situation. This is the tragic situation which must capture our minds and our hearts. No one with a clear conscience and with a minimum of the feeling of human brotherhood can deny to the people of Palestine the right to repatriation, the right to go back to their homes, to live their lives in their homeland.

135. Many here present have been refugees, or political exiles away from their homeland, longing in agony, in anguish, to go back home. So they know what it means to be a refugee—to be in exile. It means nostalgia at its worst. It means despair at its peak. It means hate, and the right to human hate. It means war and the right to war—in defence of the fatherland and all that the fatherland stands for.

136. It is not a matter of seeking measures to guarantee that there will be no hostilities between the Arab States and Israel. This is not the problem; this is not the context of the problem, as suggested by President Nkrumah. In the main, the problem is one that belongs to the people of Palestine, not to the Arab States. It is true that the Arab States are one in their support of the cause of Palestine. It is their cause, their national cause; but the main party is the people of Palestine.

137. It is they who are to decide for themselves. The people of Palestine are not a flock of sheep that could be ignored so easily—neither could their existence as a nation be entirely dismissed. The people of Palestine, an ancient Arab nation, are with no little contributions to world civilization. As part of Arab awakening, they started their national movement long before many nations represented in this Organization had stood on their feet. They fought the British with bravery and chivalry, for a period of thirty years, to achieve their liberty and independence.

138. They sent their delegations to London and to Geneva in the days of the League of Nations to express their national aspirations. They have been represented

here in the United Nations. A number of resolutions on Palestine, adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, have been addressed to the people of Palestine. Their peoplehood has been recognized and their national existence has never been denied.

139. This is the case of the people of Palestine in its virgin simplicity and in its full reality. It is the cause of a people and their right to their homeland. Let no one dare from this rostrum to deny the people their existence as a people, their indestructible right, their right to their homeland. Let us not speak—and I urge this with all humility—if we cannot speak justice.

140. A proposal to guarantee non-attack between the Arab States and Israel is *prima facie* alluring and attractive; but only to those who do not know or those who are immune to knowing. Nevertheless, when they begin to know they will realize the magnitude of the problem; they will sound its depth and they will sense its stirrings and feel its agitations; and it is only when you feel it profoundly that you can judge, and that you can judge judiciously and equitably.

141. Let us take just one instance, without making a finding in respect of its merits. In his statement before the Assembly, President Eisenhower has referred in the most moving words to the imprisonment by the Soviet Union of two members of the crew of the American aircraft shot down last July. President Eisenhower referred to this episode—and I quote—as one of the problems "troubling" the United States and the nations of the world.

142. Well, this is a contrast for us to consider, for us to ponder. If the imprisonment of two members of an aircrew is of great concern and should so disturb the United States as to compel President Eisenhower to bring the matter before the notice of the United Nations from this rostrum, how much more perturbed, how much more inflamed and tormented must be the Arab feelings, to see a whole people of their kith and kin lead a life of exile in misery, in hardship, in distress and in isolation. And we come here to be told that we should face the political realities of the situation.

143. May I invite your attention to this point. Before we speak of non-attack, let us attack the problem down to the roots. Let us talk plainly; let us apply our minds properly; let us think conscientiously. We cannot simply be asked to recognize the political realities without scrutiny and without balanced evaluation. To recognize the political realities, I am afraid, is a colonial expression—rather, it is a colonial philosophy which has crept, regrettably, into our minds.

144. We should not be misled by such a maxim which does not take account of the justice of a cause. An aggression can be a political reality. A violation of the Charter, of human rights, and of the fundamental principles of freedom democracy and justice could be a political reality. Colonialism and imperialism, after gaining root, do give rise to political realities, and how often they did.

145. Should we, then, accept aggression; should we abide by violation; should we bow to colonialism as a political reality? We cannot accept a situation which is the culmination of injustice and aggression. We cannot accept a situation which is the fruit of aggression or a flagrant denial of inherent rights, God-given

rights. This is too dangerous a stand to accept or to defend.

146. We must warn all the small nations, from this rostrum, they must be on their guard, on the lookout, lest they fall victim to political realities. We, the small nations, survive not through our might, but through our right; we exist by justice, not by convenience or expedience. Let us not waver, let us not defeat the very principle that gave rise to our being. This is a world of wonders and surprises. A small nation, any nation represented here in this Organization, could fall victim to political realities. Its peace may be endangered, its territory may be threatened, its political independence usurped.

147. How should such a situation be resisted if we are called upon to recognize it as a political reality? Colonialism and imperialism have coined many phrases—and I say coined with full purpose—coined many phrases, many arguments to defend their position. "We must recognize the political realities," is one of their arguments, one of their defence lines. Colonial Powers are in the habit of falling back on such arguments. They take refuge behind such a slogan when it is not their pleasure to do justice or undo injustice. This has become the habit of the colonial Powers. Let us not develop their habits; let us not speak their language. We, the small nations, who are sworn to defend the cause of freedom, should not make justice a matter of just slogans.

148. Of similar danger, with reference to the Palestine question, are the statements uttered from another rostrum by Vice-President Nixon and Senator Kennedy, the two candidates for the United States presidential election. I shall not speak on the matter except in the context which reflects the policy of the United States on the question, so that I shall not be out of order.

149. Vice-President Nixon—and in view of his responsible authority I can refer to his statement—is not at variance with Mr. Kennedy on a number of matters of foreign policy, and they have both made public pledges to Israel in identical terms. The difference is only one of degree and one of tone. Hence, no matter who wins, we can take those pledges to be the cornerstone of United States policy with regard to the Palestine question. In fact, they reveal nothing basically new, except that the United States has not profited from its bitter experience in Palestine, a policy which has alienated the feelings of the Arab world, and which, if continued, is bound to lead to irreparable damage.

150. In substance, Vice-President Nixon and Senator Kennedy have declared that he who is elected to the White House will not hesitate to support Israel. They have stressed that the Suez Canal should be opened to Israel shipping. They have praised the efforts of Israel in every field of political and economic life. They have spoken of industry thriving, of agriculture progressing, of the desert blossoming, and the rest of the Zionist propaganda.

151. Hearing all this, one is led to think that Vice-President Nixon and Senator Kennedy are running for election in Israel, for the presidency of Israel, and not for the presidency of the United States. From these statements, it seems as if the whole world is Israel and Israel is the whole world.

152. The Arab peoples, 80 million, with their material and spiritual power, occupying as they do their str-

tegic sub-continent, mean nothing to the United States. To Vice-President Nixon, in his official capacity, not as far as elections are concerned, and his rival, Senator Kennedy, it was sufficient to declare that Israel was there to stay, and that is all—that is enough. They did not for a single moment deem it proper to declare that the people of Palestine also are there to stay and to stay in their homeland.

153. Yet we are bound to ask what is meant when the saying goes—and this is an American saying—when the saying goes that Israel is there to stay. Does it mean that Israel is there to stay, to usurp Arab lands and properties, to entice the millions of Jews of the world to migrate to a country which they have never known? Does it mean that Israel is there to stay, to commit aggression of all sorts and expansion in all directions? This is what it means for Israel to stay. Israel, with the Zionist programme inherent in its basic policy, running in its very veins and arteries, is dedicated to aggression, pledged to expansion. In fact, the very creation and establishment of Israel was the culmination of aggression and expansion.

154. Yet the question may be asked, what is the solution, what is the way out? This is a pertinent question that should be answered honestly and seriously. I say seriously, for the issue is one of peace or war, not only for the Middle East, but for the world at large. If there is any testimony required, let me recall the Israel war in 1956, which virtually placed the world right on the brink of war.

155. So what is the solution? If we are to take the present situation as a starting point, I have no solution to offer. Neither will there be any solution if we are to abide by the *de facto* situation as a starting point and let events drift to their destined fate, for that would be no solution or answer to the question. But if we are here to make peace with justice, as strongly suggested by President Eisenhower, then the solution will commend itself to the United Nations on its own merits.

156. The master key to the solution lies in repatriation. The refugees must go back to their homeland. This is their inherent unassailable right, which has been recognized and reaffirmed by all the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at each and every session.

157. On the other hand, we have to remember that thousands and thousands of Jews now in Israel have discovered that they have been deceived. They are not at home, for Palestine is not their homeland. Israel has proved to be, for them, a lamentable deception. The Jews in Israel are at last finding the truth themselves. By instinct and experience, the Jew in Israel has come to many conclusions. To him, this experiment of creating Israel, in spite of all colourful paintings, has proved to be a failure. Israel lacks viability; Israel cannot survive indefinitely through outside assistance. Politically, economically and socially, it is impossible for Israel to fit in within the pattern of the Middle East. Israel, a mass alien infiltration, is neither Asian nor African, any more than the aliens that set foot in Africa or Asia with the advent of colonialism.

158. The Arab States did not and will not recognize Israel. This is their sovereign right. Neither will they have any dealings with Israel in any manner.

159. The creation of Israel has multiplied many times the very evils which it sought to avoid. The whole experiment has failed. That is how the ordinary Jew in Israel is thinking. He is right, by all means. He has become eager to go home, outside Palestine. He, too, wants repatriation. Israel to him is a life of exile. These are his conclusions.

160. No less than 170,000 Jews—and this is the figure to which I invite your attention—170,000 Jews have left Israel in the last few years. If this proves anything, this Jewish migration from Israel does certainly prove that 170,000 Jews have reached those conclusions. The number is rising, all in the direction of migration, migration only if exit permits could be given by Mr. Ben Gurion to those wretched people, the victims of the greatest deception of our age.

161. With such an approach, conditions would be brought back to normal. The people of Palestine, the Arabs and Jews, determined to live in peace together, would establish the independent State of Palestine, worthy to occupy its seat in the United Nations—a State representing no aliens but all the legitimate citizens of the country, Moslems, Christians and Jews alike. The Holy Land, sacred to the three great religions, would again become the land of peace, the land that has given the world the message of peace.

162. Let me turn now, with all alertness, to the colossal problem which cuts through each and every international problem of any dimension. To say no more, it is the question of the general international situation, regarding which we have a proposal to make. I intended to deal with this problem at the end of my statement, because in this vicious circle, which is holding the international situation in a state of strangulation, the end and the beginning can be at any given point. You need only break through.

163. Without being unduly pessimistic, it may be said the present international situation seems to engender tension, suspicion and anxiety. This is the fifteenth year since the end of the Second World War, but the hopes and expectations for world peace have not been realized. It is true that we are not at war, but it is tragically true that we are not at peace. The world is simply held under the shadow of an armed armistice, broken in flames that flare up every once in a while.

164. On the question of the prohibition of atomic weapons and on the question of disarmament, no progress has been made, except for the voluminous literature of plans and counterplans, arguments and cross-arguments and acrimony versus acrimony.

165. Similarly, the explosive political problems of the world stand today as far from solution as ever. The questions of Germany and Berlin, the Far East and the Middle East are growing in magnitude and complexity. At present we have something more. Africa has been thrown into the cold war; and we have been told from this rostrum, in all frankness, of the danger of war by miscalculation.

166. This is a situation which is too intolerable for the peoples of the world. The United Nations, in spite of its success in some political, economic and cultural matters, has failed in the great issue of war and peace. The United Nations is torn in this East and West conflict. The issue of war or peace cannot be decided by votes—by a majority on one side or a minority on the other side. We have to look for another pattern within

another framework to find a solution to this burning issue.

167. Surely, a summit conference is the way out. But what summit is it? What kind of a summit? In the past we had a summit meeting which generated the "Geneva spirit", only to find that it had evaporated before the "Big Four" returned home. Again, the Camp David meetings between Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev were very cordial and pleasant, but subsequent events have proven that the warring David of the Bible did not leave Camp David in peace.

168. Again, the Paris Summit Conference, which had raised high hopes, was closed before it was opened. No purpose will be served by examining the causes. At the present moment, bygones are bygones; and if a condemnation is pronounced it will be futile.

169. Today, the idea of a summit conference is gaining ground, particularly so when many leaders have come to the United Nations. They are at hand here in New York. We stand for a summit conference—but what kind of a summit conference? I say in what manner, for it was the manner that was the major reason for the failure of the past summit conference. And this will be the reason for the failure of any future summit conference if we continue in the same manner.

170. So far, the summit conference is conceived in one shape, and one shape only: the participation of the "Big Four"—the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, the United States and France. Such a composition, with all due respect, is a failure. It has been a failure and will continue to be a failure. It will lead us nowhere. I venture to say that it will lead to a fiasco, in continuity and in perpetuity.

171. The "Big Four", being what they are, cannot agree. Three of them are on one side of the table as a majority, with a superiority complex, and the fourth is on the other side of the table, with an inferiority complex. How can we hope that the "Big Four" will agree? This is no time for miracles or magic-making. The "Big Four" cannot agree in their air-tight division.

172. The Western "Big Three" are, in fact, the United States, and the United States only. This is a vibrant reality, and it should not be denied. Neither the United

Kingdom nor France should be ashamed to admit it. With all due respect, the United Kingdom and France have little to say when the United States is at the summit conference. The two giants, the United States and the Soviet Union, can talk to each other with full authority, representing two diametrically opposed worlds.

173. But the two giants should not be left alone, since the chance for agreement is meagre—and meagre indeed. We have to look to another force. The vital issue of war or peace is not the monopoly of the mighty and the powerful. There are other nations whose contributions could be immeasurable and are highly necessary.

174. With Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev, there must be at the summit conference some other leaders who have distinguished themselves not only as national heroes but as international figures dedicated to the cause of peace and justice. We propose that the summit should include those leaders who have preached and practised the policy of positive neutrality, the policy of independent thinking and independent and free judgement. At the present moment, I shall not propose their names. They are too well known. At this stage we should concentrate our efforts on bringing the proposal home to the minds of the Assembly. Once that stage is reached, the Assembly will have no difficulty in making the choice. That will not be a problem.

175. With President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Khrushchev, the participation of the leaders of positive neutrality in the summit conference will not only bring a new approach, a new outlook, but will be a coordinating, stabilizing and mediating force, able to compose the differences of East and West in the best interests of peace—but peace with justice.

176. Such would be a balanced summit conference—the world, the whole world, in miniature. Such a summit, with such participation, will mark a new chapter in the history of international relations. Indeed, we could embark on a new era, an historic era which we pray will lead mankind on to a high road of peace—peace to those living and to those unborn—to the present generation and to all generations to come. God grant it may be so.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.