



Friday, 30 September 1960,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 9:

General debate (continued)

Statement by the representative of Czechoslovakia	277
Speech by Mr. Sukarno (President of the Republic of Indonesia)	278
Statement by the Prime Minister of India	290
Speech by Mr. Turbay Ayala (Colombia)	290
Statement by the representative of Cuba	294
Speech by Mr. Schaus (Luxembourg)	295
Speech by Mr. Wigny (Belgium)	297

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

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: Before we resume the general debate I give the floor to the representative of Czechoslovakia in exercise of his right of reply.
2. Dr. DAVID (Czechoslovakia) (translated from Russian): On behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation, I feel I must reply to that part of the United Kingdom representative's statement [877th meeting] in which he was trying to defend West German militarism and "revanchism". The Czechoslovak delegation notes that, in spite of all his eloquence, the United Kingdom representative did not succeed in refuting any of the facts which the Chairman of our delegation, the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Mr. Antonin Novotny, put forward in his statement [871st meeting].
3. We are frankly amazed that the United Kingdom representative so stubbornly refuses to learn the lessons of history. He conceded that the aggression by the German militarists had also caused the people of his country grievous losses. We know that the British people has not forgotten Coventry, just as we cannot forget Lidice. But we do not agree with what the United Kingdom representative went on to say, namely, that we must forget all this and look to the future.
4. We must always remember it. It is not difficult to understand why he finds it unpleasant to look back. The past is not only Hitler, Nazism and its crimes; the past is the Munich policy of the United Kingdom, and not only of United Kingdom ruling circles, though these bear a share of the blame for the fact that these crimes were committed. Although the policy of the United Kingdom, like that of other Western Powers, pursued different aims and sought to direct German aggression towards the East, events did not take that course, as we all well know. It was thanks to the vic-

tors at Stalingrad and Berlin that the Nazis were unable to carry out their plans for world domination in which the destruction of the United Kingdom was an important element.

5. Mr. Macmillan's attitude to German militarism reminds us of the attitude of one of his predecessors, Neville Chamberlain, whose name will always be linked with the shameful settlements imposed at Munich under which Czechoslovakia was sacrificed to Hitler. Chamberlain also took German militarism and "revanchism" under his protection. When he returned home from Munich, he assured the British people that they could sleep safely and that there would be "peace in our time".

6. Within a year, the German militarists had unleashed the Second World War. Lord Home, the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, who was at Munich throughout this period, could tell us more about this. I do not know if the experience Lord Home gained at the time of Munich was one of the reasons why he was appointed principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom.

7. It is surprising that, in his statement, the representative of the United Kingdom should have found so much good to say of the forces which had in the past set up the Nazi Wehrmacht and are now organizing the Bundeswehr. Mr. Macmillan could not counter our irrefutable arguments regarding the danger of a revival of German militarism and "revanchism" with anything more than a reference to the declaration made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on 3 October 1954. But we have made it clear in this Assembly that that declaration is today a mere scrap of paper. We judge a Government not by words but by deeds.

8. The policy of the West German Government is clearly aimed at preparations for a new war and at new attempts by German imperialism to achieve its aggressive purposes. I would recommend the United Kingdom representative to make a closer study of the statements made by leading statesmen of the Federal Republic of Germany in recent years. Then let him look, for instance, at the textbooks intended for the young people of West Germany which shamelessly sing the praises of the Nazi era and make propaganda for "revanchism". Let him also carefully peruse what is being written on this subject in the United Kingdom Press.

9. In any case, these facts are not indicative of pacific intentions on the part of the Bonn Government, as the representative of the United Kingdom tried to convince the General Assembly. Or perhaps Mr. Macmillan, who asserted here that our arguments are reactionary and out of date, thinks that evidence of progressive and peace-loving intentions on the part of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is to be found in the statements made by Foreign Minister

von Brentano on 25 September 1960 at Mainz that the Bonn Government has no intention of talking about peaceful coexistence.

10. The Czechoslovak delegation would again reiterate that our people have no feelings of hatred towards the German people; we wish to live in peace and friendship with them. We must defend ourselves against Mr. Macmillan's reproach that we are lacking in a spirit of reconciliation.

11. Experience and the recent past have convincingly demonstrated that a policy of reconciliation with German militarism and "revanchism" would lead to new aggressive acts. We must set up a strong barrier to German militarism, bring about general and complete disarmament and conclude a peace treaty with Germany.

12. Mr. Macmillan spoke of mutual trust as a necessary condition for peaceful understanding. We agree with this. But the first part of his statement, in which he defended West German militarism and "revanchism" at some length, rendered a disservice to the idea of mutual understanding. Events in West Germany today and the pronouncements of the Federal Chancellor and his Ministers not only fail to produce a sense of confidence, but, in the light of bitter and painful experience in the past, they produce a deep sense of mistrust and force us to be vigilant. We indignantly reject his defence of West German militarism and "revanchism" and we still adhere completely to what we have previously said here on the subject.

13. Mr. SUKARNO (President of the Republic of Indonesia): Today, in addressing this session of the United Nations General Assembly, I feel oppressed by a great sense of responsibility. I feel a humility in speaking to this august gathering of wise and experienced statesmen from east and west, from the north and from the south, from old nations and from young nations and from nations newly reawakened from a long sleep. I have prayed to the Almighty that my tongue will find those words which are adequate to express the feelings of my heart, and I have prayed also that these words will bring an echo from the hearts of those who listen.

14. It is my great pleasure to congratulate the President upon his appointment to his high and constructive office. It is also my great pleasure on behalf of my nation to offer a most heartfelt welcome to the sixteen new Members of the United Nations.

15. The Holy Book of Islam has a word for us today. The Koran says in my language:

"Hai, sekalian manusia, sesungguhnya Aku telah menjadikan kamu sekalian dari seorang lelaki dan seorang perempuan, sehingga kamu berbangsa bangsa dan bersuku-suku, agar kamu sekalian kenal-mengenal satu sama lain. Bahwasanya jang lebih mulja diantara kamu sekalian ialah, siapa jang lebih takwa kepadaku."

I might translate that as:

"O mankind, I, Allah, made you from a male and a female, and divided you into nations and tribes so that you should come to know one another. In truth, those who are most noble before Allah are those who most are in awe of Allah and do good works towards Allah." (Surah 49, verse 14.)

And the Bible, too, has a word for us:

"Glory to God in the highest: and on earth peace to men of good will." (Luke 2.14.)

16. I am deeply moved indeed as I survey this Assembly. Here is the proof that generations of struggle have been justified. Here is the proof that sacrifice and suffering have achieved their end. Here is the proof that justice has begun to prevail, and that some great evils have already been banished.

17. Furthermore, as I survey this Assembly, my heart is filled with a great and fierce joy. I see clearly that a new day has dawned, and that the sun of freedom and emancipation, that sun of which we have dreamed so long, is already risen over Africa and Asia.

18. Now, today I address the leaders of nations and the builders of nations. But, indirectly, I speak also to those you represent, to those who have sent you here, to those who have entrusted their future to your hands. I greatly desire that my words shall strike an echo also in those hearts, in the deep heart of humanity, in that great heart from which has been brought so many shouts of joy, so many cries of sorrow and despair, and so much love and laughter.

19. Today, it is President Sukarno who addresses you. But more than that, though, it is a man, Sukarno, an Indonesian, a husband, a father, a member of the human family. I speak to you on behalf of my people, those ninety-two million people of a distant and wide archipelago, those ninety-two million people who have lived a life of struggle and sacrifice, those ninety-two million people who have built a State upon the ruins of an empire.

20. They, and the people of Asia and Africa, of the American continent and the European continent and the people of the Australian continent, are watching and listening, and hoping. They see in this Organization of the United Nations a hope for the future and a prospect for the present.

21. The decision to attend this session of the General Assembly was not an easy one for me to take. My own nation faces many problems, and time to solve those problems is always short. However, this is perhaps the most important Assembly yet held, and all of us have a responsibility to the rest of the world as well as to our own nations. None of us can escape this responsibility, and surely none wish to. I am very sure that the leaders of the younger and the reborn nations can make a very positive contribution to the solution of the many problems facing this Organization and the world at large. Indeed, I am confident that men may once again say: The new world is called to redress the balance of the old.

22. It is clear today that all major problems of our world are inter-connected. Colonialism is connected to security; security is connected to the question of peace and disarmament; disarmament is connected to the peaceful progress of the under-developed countries. Yes, all are connected and inter-connected. If we succeed in finally solving one problem, then the way to the solution of all the others will be open. If we succeed in solving, for example, the problem of disarmament, then the necessary funds will be available to assist those nations which so urgently need assistance.

23. But it is essential that all these problems should be solved by the application of agreed principles. Any attempt to solve them by the use of power, or the threat of power, or by the possession of power, will certainly fail, and will in turn produce worse problems. Very briefly, the principle which must be followed is that of equal sovereignty of all nations, which is, of course, no more and no less than the application of basic human and national rights. There must be one principle for all nations, and all nations must accept that principle, both for their own protection and for the good of mankind.

24. If I may say so, we of Indonesia have a very special interest in the United Nations. We have a very special desire to see this Organization flourish and be successful. By the actions of this Organization, our own struggle for independence and national life was shortened. I say in full confidence that our struggle would in any case have been successful, but the actions of the United Nations shortened that struggle and saved both us and our opponents many sacrifices and much sorrow and destruction.

25. Why am I confident that our struggle would have been successful, with or without the activity of the United Nations? I am confident of that for two reasons. First, I know my people: I know their unquenchable thirst for national freedom, and I know their determination. Secondly, I am confident of that because of the movement of history.

26. We live, all of us, and everywhere in the world, in the time of the building of nations and the breaking of empires. This is the era of emerging nations and the turbulence of nationalism. To close the eyes to this fact is to become blind to history, to ignore destiny and to reject reality. We live, I say again, in the time of the building of nations.

27. This process is inevitable and certain; sometimes slow and inevitable, like the movement of molten rock down the side of an Indonesian volcano; sometimes swift and inevitable, like the bursting of floodwaters from behind an ill-conceived dam. Slow and inevitable, or swift and inevitable, the victory of national struggle is a certainty.

28. When that march to liberty is complete the whole world over, then our world will be a better place; it will be a cleaner place and a much more healthy place. We must not cease from struggle at this moment, when victory is in sight, but instead we must redouble our efforts. We have a pledge to the future and that pledge must be fulfilled. In this, we do not struggle for ourselves alone, but we struggle for all mankind, yes, our struggle is even for those against whom we struggle.

29. Five years ago, twenty-nine nations of Asia and Africa sent their representatives to the Indonesian city of Bandung.^{1/} Twenty-nine nations of Asia and Africa. Today, how many free peoples are there? I will not count them, but look around this Chamber now! Then tell me whether I am right or not when I say that this is the time of the building of nations, and the time of the emergence of nations. Yesterday, Asia, and that is a process not yet completed. Today, Africa, and that, too, is a process not yet completed.

30. Furthermore, not all the nations of Asia and Africa are yet represented here. This Organization of nations is weakened in so far as it rejects the representation of any nation, and especially of a nation which is old and wise and powerful.

31. I speak of China. I speak of what is often called Communist China, which is for us the only real China. This Organization is greatly weakened precisely because it rejects the membership of the biggest nation in the world.

32. Every year we support the admission of China to the United Nations. We will continue doing that. We do not give our support merely because we have good relations with that country. And certainly we do not do so from any partisan motive. No, our position on this question is guided by political realism. By short-sightedness excluding a vast nation, a nation great and powerful in terms of numbers, culture, the attributes of an ancient civilization, a nation full of strength and economic power, by excluding that nation we make this international Organization much weaker and so much further from our requirements and our ideal.

33. We are determined to make the United Nations strong and universal and able to fulfil its proper function. That is why we consistently support the representation of China in our number. Furthermore, disarmament is a pressing need of our world. This most vital of all questions should be discussed and solved within the framework of this Organization. Yet how can there be a realistic agreement on disarmament if China, one of the most powerful nations in the world, is excluded from the deliberations?

34. Representation of China in the United Nations would involve that nation in constructive world affairs and would thus immensely strengthen this body.

35. In this year of 1960, the General Assembly again comes together in its annual gathering. But this General Assembly must not be seen merely as another routine meeting, and if it is so regarded, if it is regarded as a routine meeting, then this whole international Organization may well be threatened with dissolution.

36. Mark my words well, I implore you. Do not treat the problems you will discuss as routine problems. If you do, then this Organization which has afforded us a hope for the future, a prospect of international conciliation, will perhaps be disrupted. It will perhaps disappear slowly beneath the waves of conflict, as its predecessor did.

37. If that happens, then humanity as a whole will suffer, and a great dream, a great ideal, will have been shattered. Remember: you do not deal only with words. You do not deal with pawns upon a chessboard. You deal with men, and with the dreams of men, and with the ideals of men, and with the future of all men.

38. In all seriousness I tell you: we of the newly independent nations intend to fight for the United Nations. We intend to struggle for its success and to make it effective. It can be made effective, and it will be made effective, but only in so far as all its Members recognize the inevitabilities of history. It will be effective only in so far as this body follows the course of history and does not attempt to dam or divert or delay that course.

^{1/}Asian-African Conference, held at Bandung from 18-24 April 1955.

39. I have said that this is the time for the building of nations and the building of empires. That is most profoundly true. How many nations have achieved their freedom since the Charter of the United Nations was written? How many peoples have thrown off their chains of oppression? How many empires, built upon the oppression of peoples, have crumbled into dust? We, who were voiceless in the past, are voiceless no more. We, who were silent in the misery of imperialism, are silent no more. We, whose struggle for life was cloaked under the mantle of colonialism, are hidden no more.

40. The world is changed since that historic day in 1945, and it is changed for the better. Out of this era of nation-building has come the possibility—yes, the necessity—of a world free from fear, free from want, free from national oppressions. Today, this very day, at this General Assembly, we could prepare ourselves for a projection into that future world, the world of which we have thought and dreamed and made visions. We can do that, but only if we do not treat this meeting as routine. We must recognize that the United Nations faces a big accumulation of problems, each of them pressing, each of them a possible threat to peace and peaceful progress.

41. We are determined that the fate of the world, which is our world, will not be decided above our heads or over our bodies. It will be decided with our participation and co-operation. Decisions vital to the peace and future of the world can be decided here and now. Here are Heads of State and Heads of Government gathered in one place. There is the framework of our Organization. I very sincerely hope that no questions of rigid protocol, and no narrow feelings of hurt personal or national feelings, will prevent this opportunity from being used fully. A chance like this does not come often. It should be fully exploited. We have a unique opportunity now for combining private and public diplomacy. Let us grasp that opportunity. It may not come again.

42. I am very well aware that the presence here of so many Heads of State and Heads of Government meets the hopes of millions of people. They can take vital decisions on establishing a new look for our world, and consequently also a new look for the United Nations.

43. It is appropriate now to consider the position of the United Nations in relation to this era of nation building and new nationhoods.

44. I tell you this: for a newly born man or a newly reborn nation, the most precious possession is independence and sovereignty.

45. Perhaps it may be—I do not know, but perhaps it may be—that this sense of holding the precious jewel of sovereignty and independence is confined to the nations newly awakened. Perhaps, as generations pass, the sense of pride and achievement grows dim. It may be so, but I do not think so.

46. Even today, two hundred years later, is there any American who does not thrill at the words of the Declaration of Independence? Is there any Italian who does not today respond to the call of Mazzini? Is there any citizen of Latin America who does not still hear an echo from the voice of San Martín? Indeed, is there any citizen of the world who does not respond to that call and to those voices? We all thrill, we all respond, because those voices were universal in time and place.

They were the voice of suffering humanity; they were the voice of the future, and we hear them still, ringing down the ages.

47. No, I deeply believe that in sovereignty and national independence there is something which endures, something which is as hard and brilliant as a jewel, and far more precious. Many nations of this world have long possessed this jewel. They have grown accustomed to owning it, but I am convinced that they still hold it the most dear of their possessions and will die rather than give it up. Is it not so? Would your own nation ever give up its independence? Any nation worthy of the name will die first. Any worthy leader of any nation would die first. How much more precious, then, must it be to us, who once held that jewel of independence and national sovereignty, then felt it snatched from our fingers by well-armed brigands, and have now recovered it for ourselves!

48. The United Nations is an organization of nation States, each one of which holds that jewel tight and precious. We have all freely banded together as brothers and equals in this Organization—as brothers and as equals, for we all hold equal sovereignty and we all hold that equal sovereignty equally precious.

49. This is an international body. It is not yet either supranational or supranational. It is an organization of nation States and can function only in so far as it is the will of these nation States that it do so.

50. Have we unanimously agreed to surrender any part of our sovereignty to this body? No, we have not. We have accepted the Charter, and that Charter is signed by fully sovereign, fully equal, nation States.

51. It may well be that this body should consider whether its Members should surrender any part of their sovereignty to this international body. But if any such decision is made it must be made freely, unanimously and equally. It must be made by all nations equally—the ancient and the new, the emergent and the old established, the developed and the underdeveloped. This is not something which can be imposed on any nation.

52. Furthermore, the only possible basis for any body such as this is strict equality. The sovereignty of the newest nation or the smallest nation is just as precious, just as inviolable as the sovereignty of the largest nation or the oldest nation. And, again, any transgression against the sovereignty of any nation is a potential threat to the sovereignty of all nations.

53. It is within this world picture that we must regard the world today. Our one world is made up of nation States, each equally sovereign, each resolved to guard that sovereignty and each entitled to guard it. And again I say—I repeat this because it is basic to an understanding of the world today—that we live in an era of nation building. This fact is more important than the existence of nuclear weapons, more explosive than hydrogen bombs and of more potential value to the world than atomic fission.

54. The balance of the world has changed since that day in June fifteen years ago when the Charter was signed in the United States city of San Francisco, at a moment when humanity was emerging from the horror of war. The fate of humanity can no longer be decided by a few large and powerful nations. We, too, the younger nations, the burgeoning nations, the

smaller nations—we, too, have a word to say, and that word will surely echo down the years.

55. Yes, we are aware of our responsibility to the future of all nations, and we gladly accept that responsibility. My nation pledges itself to work for a better world, for a world free from strife and tension, for a world in which our children can grow proud and free, for a world in which justice and prosperity reign supreme for all men. Would any nation refuse such a pledge?

56. Some months ago, just before the leaders of the great Powers met so briefly in Paris, Mr. Khrushchev was our guest in Indonesia. I made it very clear to him that we welcomed the Summit Conference, that we hoped for its success, but that we were sceptical. Those four great Powers alone cannot decide the questions of war and peace. More precisely, perhaps, they have the power to disrupt the peace, but they have no moral right to attempt, singly or together, to settle the future of the world.

57. For fifteen years now the West has known peace—or at least the absence of war. Of course there have been tensions. Yes, there has been danger. But the fact remains that in the midst of a revolution engulfing three-quarters of the world the West has been at peace. Both great blocs, in fact, have successfully practised coexistence for all these years, thus contradicting those who deny the possibility of coexistence. We of Asia have not known peace. After peace came to Europe we endured atomic bombs. We endured our own national revolution in Indonesia. We endured the torment of Viet-Nam. We suffered the torture of Korea. We still suffer the agony of Algeria. Is it now to be the turn of our African brothers? Are they to be tortured while our wounds are still unhealed?

58. And yet the West is still at peace. Do you wonder that we now demand—yes, demand—respite from our torment? Do you wonder that my voice is now raised in protest? We who were once voiceless have demands and requirements; we have the right to be heard. We are not subjects of barter but living and virile nations with a role to play in this world and a contribution to make.

59. I use strong words, and I use them deliberately, because I am speaking for my nation and because I am speaking before the leaders of nations. Furthermore, I know that my Asian and African brothers feel equally strongly, although I do not venture to speak on their behalf.

60. This session of the General Assembly is to be seized of many important matters. No matter, though, can be more important than that of peace. In this respect I am not at this moment speaking of issues arising between the great Powers of the world. Such issues are of vital concern to us, and I shall return to them later. But look around this world of ours. There are tensions and sources of potential conflict in many places. Look closer at those places and you will discover that, almost without exception, imperialism and colonialism in one of their many manifestations is at the root of the tension, of the conflict. Imperialism and colonialism and the continued forcible division of nations—I stress those words—is at the root of almost all international and threatening evil in this world of ours. Until those evils of a hated past are ended, there can be no rest or peace in all this world.

61. Imperialism—and the struggle to maintain it—is the greatest evil of our world. Many of you in this hall have never known imperialism. Many of you were born free and will die free. Some of you are born of those nations which have inflicted imperialism on others, but you have never suffered it yourselves. However, my brothers of Asia and Africa have known the scourges of imperialism. They have suffered it. They know its dangers, its cunning, its tenacity.

62. We of Indonesia know, too. We are experts on the subject. Out of that knowledge and out of that experience, I tell you that continued imperialism in any of its forms is a great and continuing danger.

63. Imperialism is not yet dead. People sometimes say that imperialism and colonialism are dead. No, imperialism is not yet dead. It is dying, yes. The tide of history is washing over its battlements and undermining its foundations. Yes, the victory of independence and nationalism is certain. Still—and mark my words well—the dying imperialism is dangerous, as dangerous as the wounded tiger in a tropical jungle.

64. I tell you this—and I am conscious of speaking now for my Asian and African brothers—the struggle for independence is always justified and always just. Those who resist that irresistible onward march of national independence and self-determination are blind; those who seek to reverse what is irreversible are dangers to themselves and to the world.

65. Until these facts—and they are facts—are recognized, there will be no peace in this world, and no release of tension. I appeal to you: place the authority and the moral power of this organization of States behind those who struggle for freedom. Do that clearly. Do that decisively. Do that now. Do that, and you will gain the full and whole-hearted support of all men of good will. Do that now, and future generations will applaud you. I appeal to you, to all Members of the United Nations: move with the tide of history; do not try to stem that tide.

66. The United Nations has today the opportunity of building for itself a great reputation and prestige. Those who struggle for freedom will seek support and allies where they can: how much better that they should turn to this body and to our Charter rather than to any group or section of this body.

67. Remove the causes of war, and we shall be at peace. Remove the causes of tension, and we shall be at rest. Do not delay. Time is short. The danger is great.

68. Humanity the world over cries out for peace and rest, and those things are within our gift. Do not withhold them, lest this body be discredited and deserted. Our task is not to defend this world, but to build the world anew. The future—if there is to be a future—will judge us on the record of our success at this task.

69. Do not, I beg of you older established nations, underestimate the force of nationalism. If you doubt its force, look around this Chamber and compare it with San Francisco fifteen years ago. Nationalism—victorious, triumphant, nationalism—has wrought this change, and it is good. Today, the world is enriched and ennobled by the wisdom of leaders of sovereign nations newly established. To mention but six examples out of many, there is a Norodom Sihanouk, a Nasser, a Nehru, a Sekou Touré, a Mao Tse Tung in Peiping, and a Nkrumah. Is not the world a better

place that they should sit here instead of devoting all their lives and all their strength to the overthrow of the imperialism which bound them? And their nations, too, are free, and my nation is free, and many more nations are free. Is not the world thus a better and a richer place?

70. Indeed, I do not have to explain to you that we of Asia and Africa are opposed to colonialism and imperialism. More than that, who is there in the world today who will defend those things? They are universally condemned, and rightly so, and the old cynical arguments are no longer heard. Conflict now centres on when colonies are to be free, not on whether they are to be free.

71. However, I will stress this point: our opposition to colonialism and imperialism comes from both the heart and the head. We oppose it on humanitarian grounds, and we oppose it on the grounds that it presents a great and growing threat to peace.

72. Our disagreement with the colonial Powers centres on questions of timing and security, for they now pay at least lip service to the ideal of national freedom.

73. Think deeply, then, about nationalism and independence, about patriotism and about imperialism. Think deeply, I beg you, lest the tide of history wash over you.

74. Today, we hear and read much about disarmament. That word refers usually to nuclear and atomic disarmament. Forgive me, please. I am a simple man, and a man of peace. I cannot speak of the details of disarmament. I cannot pass judgement upon rival views concerning inspection, concerning underground testing, and concerning seismographic records.

75. Upon questions of imperialism and nationalism, I am an expert, after a lifetime of study and struggle, and upon those matters I speak with authority. But upon questions of nuclear warfare, I am just another man, perhaps like the man who lives next door to you, or like your brother or even your father. I share their horror; I share their fear.

76. I share that horror and that fear because I am part of this world. I have children, and their future is in danger. I am an Indonesian, and that nation is in danger.

77. Those who wield those weapons of mass destruction must today face their own conscience, and, finally, perhaps charred to radioactive dust, they must face their Maker. I do not envy them.

78. Those who are discussing nuclear disarmament must never forget that we, who in this have previously been inarticulate, are watching and are hoping.

79. We are watching and we are hoping, and yet we are filled with anxiety because, if nuclear warfare devastates our world, we, too, are the sufferers.

80. No human being has the right to usurp the prerogatives of God. No person has the right to use hydrogen bombs. No nation has the right to cause the probable destruction of all nations.

81. No political system, no economic organization, is worth the destruction of the world, including that system or organization itself. If the hydrogen-armed nations alone were involved in this issue, we of Asia and Africa would not care. We would only watch with detachment, filled with wonder that those nations from

which we have learned so much, and which we have admired so much, should today have sunk into such a morass of immorality. We could cry: "A curse upon you" and we could retire into our own more balanced and peaceful world.

82. But we cannot do that. Already we Asians have suffered atomic bombing. We Asians also are threatened again, and furthermore we feel a moral duty to help in any way we can. We are not the enemies of the East nor of the West. We are part of this world, and we wish to help.

83. This is a cry from the heart of Asia. Let us help you solve these problems. Perhaps you have looked at them too long, and no longer see them clearly. Let us help you, and in helping you, we will help ourselves, and all the future generations of the world.

84. It is obvious that the problem of disarmament is not only disagreement on narrow technical grounds. It is a question also of mutual trust. In fact, it is clear that on technical matters and on methods, the two blocs are not very far apart. The problem is rather one of mutual distrust. It is a problem open to solution by methods of discussion and diplomacy. Surely we of Asia and Africa, and the other non-aligned countries, can help in this. We are not short of experience and skill in negotiating. Perhaps our intermediation would be of value. Perhaps we could assist in finding a solution. Perhaps—who knows—we could show you the way to the only real disarmament, which is disarmament in the heart of man, the disarmament of man's mistrusts and hatreds.

85. Nothing could be more urgent than this. And this problem is of such vital importance for the whole of mankind that all of mankind should be involved in its solution. In fact, I think we may say now that only pressure and effort from the non-aligned nations will produce the results which the whole world needs. Genuine discussion of disarmament, within this body, and based upon a real desire for success, is essential now. I stress "within this body", for only this Assembly begins to approach a true reflection of the world in which we live.

86. Think, please, for a moment, of what would be possible if we could evolve a basis for genuine disarmament. Think of the vast funds which would be available for improving the world in which we live. Think of the tremendous impetus which could be given to the development of the under-developed, if even only a part of the defence budgets of the great Powers were diverted in that direction. Think of the vast increase in human happiness, human productivity and human welfare, if this were done.

87. I must add one word on this subject. If there is any greater immorality than the brandishing of hydrogen weapons, then it is the testing of those weapons. I know that there is scientific disagreement about the genetical effect of those tests. That disagreement, however, is in terms of the numbers affected. It is agreed that there are evil genetical effects. Have those who authorize the tests ever seen the results of what they do? Have they looked at their own children and thought about those results? At the present time, the testing of nuclear weapons is suspended—not, mark you well, forbidden, but only suspended. Let that fact serve as the beginning, then. Let that fact serve as a basis for prohibition of testing, and then for real disarmament.

88. Before leaving the subject of disarmament, I must make one more comment. To speak of disarmament is good. Seriously to attempt the making of a disarmament agreement would be better. Best of all would be the implementation of an agreement on disarmament. However, let us be realistic. Even the implementation of a disarmament agreement would not guarantee peace to this sore and troubled world. Peace will come only when the causes of tension and conflict are removed.

89. If there is a cause for conflict, then men will fight with pointed sticks, if they have no other weapon. I know, because my own nation did that very thing during our struggle for independence. We fought then with knives and pointed sticks. In order to make peace, we must remove the causes of tension and of conflict. That is why I spoke deep from my heart about the necessity of co-operation to bring about the final inglorious end of imperialism.

90. Where there is imperialism, and where there are simultaneously armed forces, then the position is a dangerous one indeed. Again, I speak from experience. That is the situation in West Irian. That is the situation in the one-fifth of our national territory which still labours under imperialism. There in West Irian we have imperialism and the armed forces of imperialism. Bordering that territory, our own troops stand guard by land and sea. Those two bodies of troops face each other, and I tell you that is an explosive situation. Very recently those young and misguided troops who were in West Irian defending an outmoded conception were reinforced by an aircraft carrier, the Karel Doorman, from their remote homeland. I tell you that then the situation became positively dangerous.

91. The Commander in Chief of the Indonesian Army sits in my delegation. There he is. His name is General Nasution. He is a professional soldier and an excellent one. Like the soldiers he leads, and like the nation they defend, he is first and foremost a man of peace. More than that, though, he and our soldiers and my nation are dedicated to the defence of our homeland.

92. We have tried to solve the problem of West Irian. We have tried seriously and with great patience and great tolerance and great hope. We have tried bilateral negotiations. We tried that seriously, and for years. We tried, and we persevered. We have tried using the machinery of the United Nations, and the strength of world opinion expressed here. We tried, and we persevered with that too. But hope evaporates; patience dries up; even tolerance reaches an end. They have all run out now, and the Netherlands has left us no alternative but to stiffen our attitude. If they fail correctly to estimate the current of history, we are not to blame. But the result of their failure is that there is a threat to peace, and that involves, once again, the United Nations.

93. West Irian is a colonial sword poised over Indonesia. It points at our heart, but it also threatens world peace.

94. Our present determined efforts to reach a solution by our own methods is part of our contribution towards securing the peace of this world. It is part of our effort to end this world problem of an obsolete evil. It is a determined surgical effort to remove the cancer of imperialism from the area of the world in which we have our life and being.

95. I tell you in all seriousness, the situation in West Irian is a dangerous situation, an explosive situation; it is a cause of tension and it is a threat to peace. General Nasution is not responsible for that. Our soldiers are not responsible for that. Sukarno is not responsible for that. Indonesia is not responsible for that. No! The threat to peace springs directly from the very existence of colonialism and imperialism.

96. Remove those checks to freedom and emancipation and the threat to peace disappears. Eradicate imperialism, and the world becomes, immediately and automatically, a cleaner place, a better place, a more secure place.

97. I know that when I say this, the minds of many will turn to the situation in the Congo. You may ask: has not imperialism been ejected from the Congo with the result that there is now strife and bloodshed? It is not so! The deplorable situation in the Congo is caused directly and immediately by imperialism, not by its ending. Imperialism sought to maintain its foothold in the Congo, sought to mutilate and cripple the new State. That is why the Congo is in flames.

98. Yes, there is agony in the Congo. But that agony is the birth pang of progress, and explosive progress always brings pain. Tearing up the deep roots of vested interests, national and international, always causes pain and dislocation. We know that. We know, too, from our own experience, that development itself creates turbulence. A turbulent nation needs leadership and guidance, and it will eventually produce its own leadership and guidance.

99. We Indonesians, we speak from bitter experience. The problem of the Congo, which is a problem of colonialism and imperialism, must be solved by application of those principles I have already mentioned. The Congo is a sovereign State. Let that sovereignty be respected. Remember: the sovereignty of the Congo is no less than the sovereignty of any nation represented in this Assembly, and it must be respected equally.

100. There must be no interference in the internal affairs of the Congo, and certainly no open or hidden support for disintegration.

101. Yes, of course, that nation will make mistakes. We all make mistakes, and we all learn from mistakes. Yes, there will be turbulence; but let that go on, too, for it is a sign of rapid growth and development. The extent of that turbulence is a question for the nation itself.

102. Let us, individually or collectively, assist there if we are requested to do so by the lawful Government of that nation. However, any such assistance must be clearly based upon the unquestioned sovereignty of the Congo.

103. Finally, have confidence in that nation. They are going through a time of great trial, and are suffering deeply. Have confidence in them as a newly liberated nation, and they will find their own way to their own solution of their own problems.

104. I will here utter a very serious warning. Many Members of this body and many servants of this body are perhaps not too well aware of the workings of imperialism and colonialism. They have never experienced it. They have never known its tenacity and its ruthlessness and its many faces and its evil. We

of Asia and Africa, we have. I tell you: do not act as the innocent tool of imperialism. If you do, then you will assuredly kill this Organization of the United Nations, and with it you will kill the hope of countless millions and perhaps you will make the future still-born.

105. Before leaving these questions, I wish to mention another great issue somewhat similar in nature. I refer to Algeria. Here is a sad picture in which both sides are being bled and ruined for lack of a solution. This is a tragedy! It is quite clear that the people of Algeria want independence. There can be no argument about that. If they had not, then this long and bitter and bloody struggle would have ended years ago. The thirst for independence and the determination to achieve that independence are the central factors in this situation.

106. What is not yet decided is just how close and harmonious should be the future co-operation with France. Very close and very harmonious co-operation should not be difficult to achieve even at this stage, although perhaps it gets more difficult as the days of struggle pass.

107. Then let a plebiscite be held under the United Nations in Algeria to determine the wishes of the people on just how close and harmonious those relations should be. The plebiscite should not—again, not—be concerned with the question of independence. That has been settled in blood and tears, and there certainly will be an independent Algeria. A plebiscite such as that I suggest would, if it is held soon, be the best guarantee that independent Algeria and France will have close and good co-operation for their mutual benefit. Again I speak from experience. Indonesia had no intention of disrupting close and harmonious relations with the Netherlands. However, it seems that even today, as generations ago, the Government of that nation insists upon giving too little and asking too much. Only when this became unbearable were those relations liquidated.

108. Permit me now to turn to the larger issue of war and peace in this world of ours. Very definitely, the new and the re-born nations do not present a threat to world peace. We do not have territorial ambitions; we do not have irreconcilable economic aims. The threat to peace does not come from us, but rather from the older countries, from those long established and stable.

109. Oh, yes, there is turbulence in our countries. In fact, turbulence almost seems to be a function of the first decade of independence. But is this surprising? Look here, let me take an example from United States history. In one generation we must undergo, as it were, the War of Independence and the War between the States. Furthermore, in that same generation, we must undergo the rise of militant trade-unionism—the period of the International Workers of the World, the Wobblies. We must have our drive to the West. We must have our Industrial Revolution and even, yes, our carpetbaggers. We must suffer our Benedict Arnolds. We are, as I have said very often, compressing many revolutions into one revolution and many generations into one generation.

110. Do you then wonder that there is turbulence amongst us? To us, it is normal, and we have grown accustomed to riding the whirlwind. I understand well that to the man outside often the picture must seem

one of chaos and disorder, of coup and counter-coup. Still, this turbulence is our own, and it presents no threat to anyone, although often it offers opportunities to interfere in our affairs.

111. The clashing interests of the big Powers, though, are a different matter. There, the issues are obscured by waving hydrogen bombs and by the reiteration of old and worn-out slogans. We cannot ignore them, for they threaten us. And yet, only too often, they seem unreal. I tell you frankly, and without hesitation, that we put our own future far above the wrangling of Europe.

112. Yes, we have learned much from Europe and America. We have studied your history and the lives of your great men. We have followed your example; we have even tried to surpass you. We speak your languages and we read your books. We have been inspired by Lincoln and by Lenin, by Cromwell, by Garibaldi; and, indeed, we have still much to learn from you in many fields. Today, though, the fields in which we have much to learn from you are those of technique and science, not those of ideas or of action dictated by ideology.

113. In Asia and Africa today, still living, still thinking, still acting, are those who have led their nations to independence, those who have evolved great liberating economic theories, those who have overthrown tyranny, those who have united their nations, and those who have defeated disruption of their nations.

114. Thus, and very properly, we of Asia and Africa are turning towards each other for guidance and inspiration, and we are looking inwardly towards the experience and the accumulated wisdom of our own people.

115. Do you not think that Asia and Africa perhaps—perhaps—have a message and a method for the whole world?

116. It was the great British philosopher, Bertrand Russell, who once said that mankind is now divided into two groups. One group follows the teachings of Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence. The other group follows the teachings of the Communist Manifesto.

117. But pardon me, Lord Russell—pardon me—I think you have forgotten something. I think you have forgotten about more than 1,000 million people, the people of Asia and Africa, and possibly also Latin America too, who follow neither the Communist Manifesto nor the Declaration of Independence. Mind you, we admire both, and we have learned much from both, and we have been inspired by both.

118. Who could fail to be inspired by the words and the spirit of the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

Who, deeply engaged in the struggle for national life and liberty, could fail to be inspired?

119. And again, who amongst us, struggling to establish a just and prosperous society upon the devastation of colonialism, would fail to be inspired by the vision of co-operation and economic emancipation evoked by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels?

120. Now, there is confrontation between those two outlooks; and this confrontation is dangerous, not only to those who confront each other but also to the rest of the world.

121. I cannot speak for the rest of Asia and Africa. I am not empowered to do so, and in any case, they are well able to express their own views. However, I am empowered—indeed, instructed—to speak for my own nation of ninety-two million people.

122. As I say, we have read and studied both of those seminal documents. We have taken much from each and have rejected what is not applicable to us, living in another continent and generations later. We have synthesized what we need from those two documents, and, in the light of experience and in the light of our own knowledge, we have refined and modified that synthesis.

123. Thus, with apologies to Lord Russell, whom I respect greatly, not all the world is divided into two camps, as he believes.

124. Although we have extracted from them and although we have sought to synthesize those two great documents, we are not guided only by them. We follow neither the liberal conception nor the communist conception. Why should we? Out of our own experience and out of our own history there has evolved something else, something much more applicable, something much more fitting for us.

125. The torrent of history shows clearly that all nations need some such conception and ideal. If they do not have it or if it becomes obscured and obsolete, then that nation is in danger. Our own Indonesian history shows that clearly, and so, indeed, does the history of the whole world.

126. We call this "something" Pancha Shila. "Pancha" is five; "shila" is principle. Yes, Pancha Shila, or the "five pillars" of our State. These five pillars do not spring directly from either the Communist Manifesto or the Declaration of Independence. Indeed, they are ideas and ideals which have, perhaps for centuries, been implicit amongst our people. It is, indeed, not surprising that concepts of great strength and virility should have arisen in our nation during the two thousand years of our civilization and during the centuries of strong nationhood before imperialism engulfed us in a moment of national weakness.

127. In speaking to you of Pancha Shila, I am expressing the essence of two thousand years of our civilization.

128. What, then, are those five pillars? They are quite simple: first, belief in God; secondly, nationalism; thirdly, internationalism; fourthly, democracy; and fifthly, social justice. Belief in God; nationalism; internationalism; democracy; social justice. Very simple. Permit me now to expand a little on those five points.

129. First, belief in God. My nation includes those who follow many different religions: there are Mohammedans, there are Christians, there are Buddhists in Indonesia, and there are men of no religion. However eighty-five per cent of the ninety-two million people of the Indonesian nation are followers of Islam. Springing from this fact, and in recognition of the unified diversity of our nation, we place belief in God at the forefront of our philosophy of life. Even those

who follow no God recognize, in their innate tolerance, that belief in the Almighty is characteristic of their nation and so accept this first Shila.

130. Secondly, nationalism. The burning force of nationalism and the desire for independence sustained us and gave us strength during the long colonial night and during the struggle for independence. Today that burning force is still within us and still sustains us. But our nationalism is most certainly not chauvinism. We most certainly do not regard ourselves as superior to other nations. We most certainly do not seek to impose ourselves on other nations. I know well that the word "nationalism" is suspect and even discredited in the West. That is because the West itself has prostituted and distorted nationalism. And yet true nationalism still burns bright in the West. If it had not, then the West would not have challenged with arms the aggressive chauvinism of Hitler.

131. Does not nationalism—call it, if you will, patriotism—does not that sustain all nations? Who dares deny the nation which bore him? Who dares turn away from the nation which made him? Nationalism is the great engine which drives and controls all our international activity; it is the great spring of liberty and the majestic inspiration for freedom.

132. Our nationalism in Asia and Africa is not the same as that of the Western State system. In the West, nationalism developed as an aggressive force, seeking national economic expansion and advantage. It was the grandparent of imperialism, whose father was capitalism. In Asia and Africa, and I believe in Latin America also, nationalism is a liberating movement, a movement of protest against imperialism and colonialism, and a response to the oppression of chauvinist nationalism springing from Europe. Asia and African nationalism, and that of Latin America, cannot be considered without reference to its social content.

133. In Indonesia, we refer to that social content as our drive towards justice and prosperity. Is that not a good aim which all can accept? I do not speak only of ourselves in Indonesia, nor only of my Asian and African and Latin American brothers; I speak of the whole world. A just and prosperous society can be the aim and the goal of all men.

134. Mahatma Gandhi once said: "I am a nationalist, but my nationalism is humanity." We say that too. We are nationalists, we love our nations, and all nations. We are nationalists because we believe that nations are essential to the world in the present day, and we will continue to be so for as far as the eye can see into the future. Because we are nationalists, we support and encourage nationalism wherever we find it.

135. Our third pillar is internationalism. There is no conflict or contradiction between nationalism and internationalism. Indeed, internationalism cannot grow and flourish except in the rich soil of nationalism. Is not this Organization clear evidence of that? Previously, there was the League of Nations; now there is the United Nations. The very names proclaim that neither could have existed without the existence of nations and nationalism. And yet the very existence of both shows that the nations desire and need an international body in which each is equal. Internationalism is most certainly not cosmopolitanism, which is a denial of nationalism, which is anti-national and, indeed, anti-reality.

136. Rather, true internationalism is an expression of true nationalism, in which each nation respects and guards the rights of all nations, big and small, old and new. True internationalism is a sign that the nation has become adult and responsible, forsaking childish ideas of national or racial superiority, forsaking the infantile disorders of chauvinism and cosmopolitanism.

137. Fourthly, there is democracy. Democracy is not the monopoly or the invention of the Western social orders. Rather, democracy seems to be the natural condition of man, although it is modified to fit particular social conditions.

138. During the millennia of our Indonesian civilization, we have evolved our own Indonesian democratic forms. It is our belief that these forms have an international relevance and significance. This is a question to which I shall return later.

139. Finally, the last Shila, the ultimate pillar, is social justice. With this we link social prosperity, for we regard the two as inseparable. Indeed, only a prosperous society can be a just society, although prosperity itself can reside in social injustice.

140. That, then, is our Pancha Shila: belief in God, nationalism, internationalism, democracy, social justice. Those are the principles which my nation fully accepts and uses as its guide to all political activity, economic activity and social activity.

141. It is no part of my task today to describe how, in our national life and affairs, we seek to apply and implement Pancha Shila. To do so would be to intrude upon the courtesy of this international body. However, it is my sincere belief that Pancha Shila has much more than a national significance. It has a universal significance and can be applied internationally.

142. No one will deny the element of truth in the view expressed by Bertrand Russell. Much of the world is so divided between those who accept the ideas and principles of the Declaration of Independence and those who accept the ideas and principles of the Communist Manifesto. Those who accept one reject the other, and there is conflict on both ideological and practical grounds.

143. We are all threatened by this conflict, and we are concerned by it. Is there nothing to be done about this threat? Must it continue still for generations, perhaps finally bursting into a flame which will engulf us all? Is there no way out?

144. There must be a way out. If there is not, then all our deliberations, all our hopes, all our struggles, will be useless. We of Indonesia are not prepared to sit idly back while the world goes to ruin. We are not prepared to have the clear morning of our independence overshadowed by radioactive clouds. No nation of Asia or Africa is prepared to do this. We have a responsibility to the world, and we are ready to accept and fulfill that responsibility. If that means intervening in what have previously been the affairs of great Powers remote from us, then we are prepared to do it. No nation of Asia or Africa will shirk that task.

145. Is it not clear that conflict arises chiefly from inequalities? Within the nation, the existence of rich and poor, exploited and exploiters, causes conflict. Remove the exploitation, and the conflict disappears because the cause of conflict has gone. Between the

nations, if there are rich and poor, exploiters and exploited, there will also be conflict. Remove that cause of conflict, and the conflict will disappear. That holds good internationally as well as within the nation. The elimination of imperialism and colonialism removes such exploitation of nation by nation.

146. I believe that there is a way out of this confrontation of ideologies. I believe that the way out lies in the universal application of "Pancha Shila".

147. Who amongst you rejects Pancha Shila? Do the representatives of the great United States reject it? Do the representatives of the great USSR reject it? Or those of the United Kingdom, or Poland, or France or Czechoslovakia? Or, indeed, any of those who seem to have adopted static positions in this cold war of ideas and practices, who seek to remain rooted deep while the world is in flux?

148. Look at this delegation who support me and who are sitting here. This is not a delegation of civil servants or professional politicians; this is a delegation representing the Indonesian nation. There are soldiers. They accept Pancha Shila. There is a great scholar of Islam who is a pillar of his faith. He accepts Pancha Shila. There is the leader of the powerful Indonesian Communist Party. He accepts Pancha Shila. There are representatives from the Catholic group and from the Protestant group, from the Nationalist Party and from the organization of workers and peasants. There are women, there are intellectuals and administrators. All of them—yes, all of them—accept Pancha Shila. And they do not accept it merely as an ideological concept, but as a very practical guide to action. Those of my nation who seek to be leaders but reject Pancha Shila are in turn rejected by the nation.

149. What would be the international application of Pancha Shila? How could it work in practice? Let us take the five points one by one.

150. First, then, belief in God. No person who accepts the Declaration of Independence as a guide to life and action will deny that. And equally certainly, no follower of the Communist Manifesto would, in this international forum today deny the right to believe in the Almighty. For further elucidation about that, I refer to Mr. Aidit, the leader of the Indonesian Communist Party, who is sitting here in my delegation and who accepts whole-heartedly both the Communist Manifesto and the Pancha Shila.

151. Secondly, nationalism. We are all representatives of nations. How, then, can we reject nationalism? To do so would be to reject our own nations and to reject the sacrifices of generations. But I warn you: if you accept the principle of nationalism, then you must reject imperialism. But to that warning, I will add a reminder: if you reject imperialism, then automatically and immediately you remove from this troubled world a major cause of tension and conflict.

152. The third point is internationalism. Is it necessary to speak at length about internationalism in this international body? Surely not. If our nations were not internationally-minded, then those nations would not be Members of this Organization. However, true internationalism is not always found here. I regret the necessity of saying that, but it is a fact: true nationalism is not always found here. Only too often the United Nations is used as a forum for narrow national or sectional aims. Only too often the great purposes

and high ideals of our Charter are obscured by the search for national advantage or national prestige. True internationalism must be based upon the fact of national equality. True internationalism must be based upon equality of regard, equality of esteem, the practical application of the truth that all men are brothers. It must, to quote the Preamble of the Charter of the United Nations—that document which is so often forgotten—"... reaffirm faith ... in the equal rights of ... nations large and small". Finally and once more, internationalism would mean the ending of imperialism and colonialism, and thus it would mean the ending of many dangers and tensions.

153. Fourth, democracy. For us of Indonesia, democracy contains three essential elements. It contains first the principle of what we call "mufakat", that is unanimity; it contains secondly the principle of "perwakilar", that is, representation; finally, it contains for us the principle of "musjawarah", and that is deliberation among representatives. Yes, Indonesian democracy contains those three: unanimity, representation, and deliberation among representatives.

154. These principles of our democratic way of life are deeply enshrined within our people, and have been from time immemorial. They ruled our democratic way of life when wild and savage tribes still roamed over Europe. They guided us when feudalism established itself as a progressive, indeed revolutionary, force over Europe. They gave us strength when feudalism gave birth to capitalism and when capitalism fathered the imperialism which enslaved us. They sustained us during the long eclipse of colonial darkness and during the long slow years when other and different forms of democratic practice were slowly emerging in Europe and America.

155. Our democracy is old, but it is virile and strong—as virile and strong as the Indonesian people from which it sprang.

156. This organization of United Nations is an organization of States with equal sovereignty, equal independence, and equal pride in that sovereignty and independence. The only way in which it can function satisfactorily is by means of unanimity arising out of deliberation, or, to use the Indonesian terms, by "mufakat" arising from "musjawarah". Deliberations should be held in such a way that there is no contest between opposing points of view, no resolutions and counter-resolutions, no taking of sides, but only a persistent effort to find common ground in solving a problem. From such deliberation there arises a consensus, a unanimity, which is more powerful than a resolution perhaps not accepted, or perhaps resented, by the minority.

157. Am I talking idealistically? Am I dreaming of an ideal and romantic world? No, I am not. My feet are firmly planted on the ground. Yes, I look at the skies for inspiration, but my head is not in the clouds, I tell you that such methods of deliberation work. They work for us; they work in the Indonesian Parliament, they work in the Indonesian National Advisory Council, they work in the Indonesian Cabinet of Ministers. They work because the representatives of our nation desire to make them work. The Communists desire it, the Nationalists desire it, the Moslems desire it, the Christians desire it. The Army desires it, the man in the city and the man in the remote village both desire it; the intellectual desires it, the man just

striving to throw off illiteracy desires it. All desire it, because all desire the clear aim of Pancha Shila, and that clear aim is a just and prosperous society.

158. Perhaps you may say: "Yes, we will accept the word of President Sukarno and we will accept the evidence which we see in the composition of his delegation here today, but we are realists in a hard world. The only way to run an international meeting is the way we run the United Nations, with resolutions and amendments and votes of majorities and minorities."

159. Let me tell you something. We know from equally hard, practical, realistic experience that our methods of deliberation work also in international bodies, work also in the international field. They work there equally as well as on the national field.

160. Look, not so very long ago, as you know, representatives of twenty-nine nations of Asia and Africa met together in Bandung. Those leaders of their nations were no impractical dreamers. Far from it. They were hard, realistic leaders of men and of nations, most of them graduates of the struggle for national freedom, all of them well versed in the realities of political, as well as international, life and leadership.

161. They were of diverse political outlook, ranging from the extreme left to the extreme right.

162. Many in the West did not believe that such a conference could produce anything worthwhile. Many even believed that it would break up in confusion and mutual recrimination, torn apart on the rock of political differences.

163. But the Asian-African Conference succeeded; the Asian-African Conference was conducted by methods of "musjawarah", of deliberation.

164. There were no majorities, no minorities. There was no voting. There were only deliberations, and only the common desire to reach agreement. Out of that conference came a unanimous communiqué which is one of the most important achievements of this decade, and perhaps one of the most important documents of history.

165. Can you now still doubt the usefulness and the efficiency of deliberation by such methods?

166. I am convinced that the whole-hearted adoption of such methods of deliberation could ease the work of this international Organization. Yes, perhaps it would make possible the real work of this Organization. It would point the way to solutions of many problems which have accumulated over the years. It would permit the solution of problems which seem to be insoluble.

167. And remember please that history deals ruthlessly with those who fail. Who today remembers those who toiled in the League of Nations? We remember only those who wrecked that international body. But they wrecked an organization of States from one corner of the world only. We are not prepared to sit back idly and watch this Organization, which is our Organization, wrecked because it is inflexible or because it is slow to respond to changed world conditions.

168. Is it not worth trying? If you think that it is not, then you must be prepared to justify your decision before the bar of history.

169. Finally, in the Pancha Shila, there is social justice. To be applied in the international field, this

should perhaps be international social justice. Once again, to accept this principle would be to reject colonialism and imperialism.

170. Furthermore, the acceptance of social justice as an aim by these United Nations would mean the acceptance of certain responsibilities and duties. It would mean a determined, united effort to end many of the social evils which trouble our world. It would mean that aid to the technically under-developed and the less fortunate nations would be removed from the atmosphere of the cold war. It would also mean the practical recognition that all men are brothers and that all men have a responsibility to their brothers.

171. Is not that a noble aim? Does anyone dare deny the nobility and justice of that aim?

172. If there is any such, then let him face the reality. Let him face the hungry, let him face the illiterate, let him face the sick, and let him then justify his denial.

173. Let me now repeat once more those five principles: belief in God, nationalism, internationalism, democracy, social justice.

174. Let us inquire whether these things do in fact constitute a synthesis which all can accept. Let us ask ourselves whether the acceptance of these principles would provide a solution to the problems faced by this Organization.

175. Of course, the United Nations consists of more than the Charter of the United Nations. Nevertheless that historic document remains the guiding star and the inspiration of this Organization.

176. In many ways, the Charter reflects the political and power constellation of the time of its origin. In many ways that Charter does not reflect the realities of today.

177. Let us consider then whether the five principles I have enunciated would make our Charter stronger and better.

178. I believe, yes, I firmly believe that the adoption of those five principles and the writing of them into the Charter would greatly strengthen the United Nations. I believe it would bring the United Nations into line with the recent development of the world. I believe that it would make it possible for the United Nations to face the future refreshed and confident. Finally, I believe that the adoption of Pancha Shila as a foundation of the Charter would make the Charter more whole-heartedly acceptable to all Members, both old and new.

179. I will make one further point in this direction. It is a great honour to have the seat of the United Nations within one's country. We are all grateful indeed to the United States of America that it offered a permanent home to our Organization. However, it might well be questioned whether this is advisable.

180. With all respect, I submit that it might not be so. The fact that the seat of the United Nations is in the territory of one of the cold war protagonists has meant that the cold war has worked its way even into the work and the administration and household of our Organization. So much so, indeed, that the very attendance at this session of the leader of a great nation has become a cold war issue, a cold war weapon, and a means of sharpening that dangerous and futile way of life.

181. Let us inquire whether the seat of our Organization should not be removed from the atmosphere of the cold war. Let us inquire whether Asia or Africa or Geneva will offer a permanent home to us, remote from the cold war, uncommitted to either bloc, and where the representatives can move easily and freely where they will, and in doing so, perhaps gain a wider understanding of the world and its problems.

182. I am convinced that an Asian or African country, in its faith and belief, would gladly offer hospitality to the United Nations, perhaps setting aside a sufficient area wherein the Organization itself would be sovereign and in which the discussions vital to the vital work could take place in security and brotherhood.

183. The United Nations is no longer the same body as that which signed the Charter fifteen years ago. Nor is this world the same world. Those who laboured in wisdom to produce the Charter of this Organization could not have foreseen the shape which it has taken today. Of those wise and far-sighted men, but few realized that the end of imperialism was in sight and that if this Organization was to live it must provide for a great and overbearing and invigorating influx of new and reborn nations.

184. The purpose of the United Nations should be to solve problems. To use it as a mere debating platform or as a propaganda outlet, or as an extension of domestic politics is to pervert the high ideals which should imbue this body.

185. Colonial turbulence, the rapid development of the still technically under-developed areas, and the question of disarmament, are still suitable and urgent matters for our consideration and deliberation. However, it has become clear that these vital matters cannot satisfactorily be dealt with by the present Organization of the United Nations. The history of this body demonstrates sadly and clearly the truth of what I say.

186. It is certainly not surprising that this should be so. The fact is that our Organization reflects the world of 1945, not the world of today. This is so within all its bodies, except this single august Assembly and in all its agencies.

187. The organization and membership of the Security Council, that most important body, reflects the economic, military and power map of the world of 1945, when this Organization was born of a vast inspiration and vision. That is also true of most other agencies. They do not reflect the rise of the socialist countries, nor the rocketing of Asian and African independence.

188. In order to modernize and make efficient our Organization, perhaps even the Secretariat, under the leadership of its Secretary-General, may need to be revised. In saying this, I am not, most definitely not, in any way criticizing or denouncing the present Secretary-General who is striving to do a good job under outmoded conditions which must at times seem impossible.

189. How, then, can they be efficient? How can members of those two groups in the world—groups which are a reality and must be accepted—how can members of those two groups feel at ease in this Organization, and have the necessary utmost confidence in it?

190. Since the Second World War, we have witnessed three great permanent phenomena. First is the rise of the socialist countries. That was not foreseen in 1945. Second is the great wave of national liberation and economic emancipation which has swept over Asia and Africa and over our brothers in Latin America. I think that only we who were directly involved anticipated that. Third is the great scientific advance, which at first dealt in weapons and war, but which is turning now to the barriers and frontiers of space. Who could have prophesied this?

191. It is true that our Charter can be revised. I am aware that there exists a procedure for doing so, and a time when it can be done. But this question is urgent. It may be a matter of life and death for the United Nations. No narrow legalistic thinking should prevent this being done at once.

192. Equally it is essential that the distribution of seats in the Security Council and the other bodies and agencies should be revised. I am not thinking in this matter in terms of bloc votes, but I am thinking of the urgency that the Charter of the United Nations, of the United Nations bodies, and its Secretariat should all reflect the true position of our present world.

193. We of Indonesia regard this body with great hope and yet with great fear. We regard it with great hope because it was useful to us in our struggle for national life. We regard it with great hope because we believe that only some such organization as this can provide the framework for the sane and secure world we crave. We regard it with great fear, because we have presented one great national issue, the issue of West Irian, before this Assembly, and no solution has been found. We regard it with fear because great Powers of the world have introduced their dangerous cold war game into its halls. We regard it with fear lest it should fail, and go the way of its predecessor, and thus remove from the eyes of man a vision of a secure and united future.

194. Let us face the fact that this Organization, in its present methods and by its present form, is a product of the Western State system. Pardon me, but I cannot regard that system with reverence. I cannot even regard it with very much affection, although I do respect it greatly.

195. Imperialism and colonialism were offspring of that Western State system, and in common with the vast majority of this Organization, I hate imperialism, I detest colonialism, and I fear the consequences of their last bitter struggle for life. Twice within my own lifetime the Western State system has torn itself to shreds, and once almost destroyed the world, in bitter conflict.

196. Can you wonder that so many of us look at this Organization, which is also a product of the Western State system, with a question in our eyes? Please, do not misunderstand me. We respect and admire that system. We have been inspired by the words of Lincoln and of Lenin, by the deeds of Washington and by the deeds of Garibaldi. Even, perhaps, we look with envy upon some of the physical achievements of the West. But we are determined that our nations, and the world as a whole, shall not be the plaything of one small corner of the world.

197. We do not seek to defend the world we know: we seek to build a new, a better world! We seek to

build a world sane and secure. We seek to build a world in which all may live in peace. We seek to build a world of justice and prosperity for all men. We seek to build a world in which humanity can achieve its full stature.

198. It has been said that we live in the midst of a revolution of rising expectations. It is not so. We live in the midst of a revolution of rising demands! Those who were previously without freedom now demand freedom. Those who were previously without a voice now demand that their voices be heard. Those who were previously hungry now demand rice, plentifully and every day. Those who were previously unlettered now demand education.

199. This whole world is a vast powerhouse of revolution, a vast revolutionary ammunition dump. No less than three-quarters of humanity is involved in this revolution of rising demands, and this is the greatest revolution since man first walked erect in a virgin and pleasant world. The success or failure of this Organization will be judged by its relationship to that revolution of rising demands. Future generations will praise us or condemn us in the light of our response to this challenge.

200. We dare not fail. We dare not turn our backs on history. If we do, then we are lost indeed. My nation is determined that we shall not fail. I do not speak to you from weakness; I speak to you from strength. I bring to you the greetings of ninety-two million people, and I bring to you the demand of that nation. We have now the opportunity of building together a better world, a more secure world. That opportunity may not come again. Grasp it, then, hold it tight, use it.

201. No man of good will and integrity will disagree with the hopes and beliefs I have expressed, on behalf of my nation, and indeed on behalf of all men. Let us then seek, immediately and with no further delay, the means of translating those hopes into realities.

202. As a practical step in this direction, it is my honour and my duty to submit a draft resolution to this General Assembly. On behalf of the delegations of Ghana, India, the United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia and Indonesia, I hereby submit the following draft resolution:

"The General Assembly,

"Deeply concerned with the recent deterioration in international relations which threatens the world with grave consequences,

"Aware of the great expectancy of the world that this Assembly will assist in helping to prepare the way for the easing of world tension,

"Conscious of the grave and urgent responsibility that rests on the United Nations to initiate helpful efforts,

"Requests, as a first urgent step, the President of the United States of America and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to renew their contacts interrupted recently, so that their declared willingness to find solutions of the outstanding problems by negotiation may be progressively implemented."

203. May I request, on behalf of the delegations of the aforementioned five nations that this draft resolution receive your urgent consideration. A letter to

this effect, signed by the heads of the delegations of Ghana, India, the United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia and Indonesia, has already been sent to the Secretariat.

204. I submit that draft resolution on behalf of those five delegations and on behalf of the millions of people in those nations.

205. To accept this resolution is a possible and immediate step. Let this General Assembly accept this resolution as soon as possible. Let us take this practical step towards an easing of the dangerous tension in our world. Let us carry this resolution unanimously, so that the full force of the world's concern may be felt. Let us take this first step, and let us determine to continue our activity and pressure until our world becomes the better and more secure world we envisage.

206. Remember what has gone before. Remember the struggle and the sacrifice we newer Members of this Organization have undergone. Remember that our travail was caused and prolonged by rejection of the principles of the United Nations. We are determined that it shall not happen again.

207. Build the world anew. Build it solid and strong and sane. Build that world in which all nations exist in peace and brotherhood. Build the world fit for the dreams and the ideals of humanity. Break now with the past, for the day is at its dawning. Break now with the past, so that we can justify ourselves with the future.

208. I pray that God Almighty will bless and guide the deliberations of this Assembly.

209. The PRESIDENT: At this point I call on the Prime Minister of India, who has asked for the floor.

210. Mr. NEHRU (Prime Minister of India): Mr. President, I have come to this rostrum, at your bidding, for a purely formal purpose. I am not at present taking part in the general debate.

211. The Assembly has just heard the draft resolution contained in document A/4522, which my distinguished friend, President Sukarno of Indonesia, has read out. This draft resolution is sponsored by Ghana, India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia. I move this draft resolution formally so that the Assembly will be seized of it and it may be debated upon. As the Assembly is master of its own procedure, it will no doubt decide in due course, under your direction, Sir, as to when this draft resolution may be voted upon.

212. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has heard the suggestions just made by the Prime Minister of India. If no other representative desires to speak, I shall take it as an indication that the Assembly as a whole is prepared to proceed in accordance with the suggestions just made by the Prime Minister.

213. Mr. TURBAY AYALA (Colombia) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, you represent a country whose cultural traditions, desire for peace and political maturity we all admire. The task of conducting the debates of this world forum has thus fallen to expert, impartial and steady hands. I congratulate you, Mr. Boland, on the signal honour bestowed upon you by the Assembly, and I congratulate the Assembly on its wisdom in electing you to the Chair.

214. World opinion, which has always followed the progress of the Assembly's work with interest, is

understandably devoting the closest possible attention to the events that are taking place now in this hall which so many distinguished leaders are honouring with their presence.

215. Obviously, my country cannot share many of the views which have been expressed here and which have imparted an unnecessarily acrimonious note to the general debate. This does not, however, prevent me from greeting all those who come here as genuine representatives of their peoples with the same respect as I shall show when I am forced to dissent from many of their opinions.

216. I believe that I am not mistaken when I single out as the greatest advantage of the United Nations the permanent opportunity which it affords to all countries to make their views heard from this rostrum whose echoes are undeniably world-wide. The way in which the great Powers and the small nations follow each other as their turn comes to speak is a noble and encouraging example of democracy. It is also, of course, a valuable experience for countries to witness the simplicity with which the voice of reason usually speaks. There can be no doubt that the debates of this Assembly have an active and effective educational impact on world opinion. For my own part, I may say that I am now more than ever wary of all oratorical excess.

217. Mankind is entitled to trust in the sense of responsibility of those who can, if they will, guide the world along paths of peace and social well-being. It is well-nigh inconceivable that this Assembly, which is attended by the Heads of Government of the greatest Powers as well as other eminent statesmen and distinguished international leaders, should not decide to convey to all the peoples of the world a message of confidence in the present and faith in the future. It would be unfair to increase still further the world's burden of anxiety and to undermine its hope in the success of this meeting, which could hardly be at a higher level. May I be allowed to say that this is a real summit meeting, and that an agreement can be reached here on the healing formulae which we had all hoped would emerge from the Paris Summit Conference of May 1960.

218. We are convinced of the infinite danger which lies in the failure of the great Powers to agree on the question of disarmament. There can be no doubt that this is the key point on which many very vexatious problems to a great extent depend. The world's yearning for peace would be satisfied in large measure if, through a joint effort by all peoples of good will, the great Powers could succeed in agreeing to resume the negotiations on disarmament. To this end, my country makes a sincere appeal to the principal actors in the world drama to put forward formulae for agreement which will make it possible for mankind to live, as President Roosevelt proclaimed, in freedom from fear.

219. The armaments race has been consuming the energies of the Powers with the greatest technical and economic potentialities. In this respect, science has turned away from its worthiest goals in order to place itself at the service of tremendous experiments that can exert a destructive power capable of thrusting mankind back into the first darkness of creation. What was once regarded as the fantasy of a few dreamers is today indisputable reality. At the present mo-

ment, man possesses instruments of war which can increase his power of destruction still further, and, for peace of mind, and above all for survival, mankind must be assured that these diabolical weapons will remain unused.

220. Although the very power of nuclear weapons to destroy would seem to remove the likelihood of atomic war, it is by no means out of the question that man, whose rashness has been attested to in history by many examples, may, in a moment of pride or despair—the results of which would in this case be the same—light the fatal bonfire that will consume the world. We still have time to press the vital urgency of a resumption of negotiations on disarmament by the great Powers. My country does not, of course, claim to possess any magic formula that could ensure a happy solution of this complicated problem. Our attitude is not prompted by brash self-conceit but by a legitimate aspiration that mankind should be preserved and live on.

221. If progress is made towards disarmament, there will be no war, for unarmed peoples do not usually engage in armed conflict. On the day when nations have no power of intimidation, their disputes will be settled by peaceful means, and mankind will attain undreamed-of heights of progress. Similarly, disarmament will enable nations to live together in peace, and peaceful co-existence will emerge spontaneously and set the international tone. My country realizes that the world is living through one of the crucial moments in history and that here in this memorable Assembly the peoples have an opportunity of rebuilding the hopes that were frustrated by untoward events. I know full well that in an objective analysis of the world situation it is of no great importance when a country like mine, with only fifteen million inhabitants, proclaims its desire for concord and its decided preference for the methods of persuasion and understanding. Colombia can state with pride that it has never constituted a threat to its neighbours and that within its own limited possibilities it has never been a cause of international tension. My country, which like most Latin American countries has already celebrated 150 years of independence, has a long tradition of pacificism and a firm democratic discipline. We repudiate an armaments mentality in all its forms. We are a country ruled by law. We have confidence in our lawful authorities, and we have no need to arm our people in order to surround them with safeguards and serve their interests.

222. I have listened with particular interest to the speeches that have been made here and, despite the fiery tone of some of them, I must confess that my country continues to have faith in the possibility that the United States and the Soviet Union may find a reasonable common ground for the settlement of their differences. The speech of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Mr. N. S. Khrushchev, obviously contained much propaganda material, but despite its polemical tone it did finally recognize the need for an understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union. All of us, perhaps without exception, regard such an understanding as the primary requirement for strengthening world peace.

223. In the circumstances, everything calls upon us to be discreet and reminds us that our role is not to intensify disagreements but to encourage closer understanding among nations. That is why the voice of my

country is raised in this hall not to deliver insults but rather to staunch wounds. We wish at all times to keep our feet on the firm ground of reality and to work sensibly and dispassionately. Because of our restricted possibilities of action in the field of international conflict, we feel free of responsibility for submitting plans to this critical audience on the control of outer space and the use of nuclear energy. We are sure that the Assembly will forgive and understand our moderation and our determination not to play the part of a great Power when we are not one. We believe in our own simplicity, and our conduct in national and international matters is appropriate to our recognized limitations. It requires as much maturity to manage weakness as it does to know how to be strong.

224. We proclaim our democratic status with pride. We uphold all those values which ennoble and dignify existence, and we continue to regard freedom as the supreme good of all people. Our solidarity with the nations of the free world is well known, as is our zeal not to jeopardize that unity which we regard as essential for the defence of the democratic system, under whose banner we have always fought to achieve our goals of well-being and dignity.

225. It is obvious that mere political freedom cannot become the sole objective of nations, but it is no less certain that we can never renounce it on the pretext of safeguarding material welfare. The concepts of security and freedom must be combined so as to produce a constructive plan in which the development of nations can proceed within the framework of liberty.

226. There are, to be sure, two systems for achieving material progress, and both have given positive results. Both East and West have made admirable technological progress, and both sides can quote convincing statistics. The spokesmen of the East in this Assembly have told us, for example, how many kilowatts of power are produced per caput, but they have not told us, and I fear that they will never be able to tell us, the amount of freedom enjoyed per caput under their system.

227. Peace will necessarily be threatened as long as government does not serve the general interest and does not ensure the same respect for its own views and those of other systems. We believe in spiritual values and in intellectual controversy, and that is why we do not hesitate to disapprove and system which prohibits opposing views and regiments thought. Rebellion of the spirit is better measured by refusal to accept any type of imposition than by slavish obedience in putting into effect the slogans of foreign revolution.

228. Freedom, however, cannot be an end in itself; it must be a means for developing the creative energies of man and encouraging the people's constant dreams of improvement. A free people is not one which blindly follows the will of a single man but one whose conduct is governed by law, and, above all, one that finds in free elections the means and the opportunity of establishing a government in keeping with its desires and needs. A people is also free when it surrounds with safeguards the supreme dignity of the human person and respects the rights of the citizen.

229. At the Fifth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States, held at Santiago de Chile in August, 1959, and the Seventh Meeting, held at San José, Costa Rica in August, 1960,

the characteristics of American democracy were clearly and unmistakably defined.^{2/} I had the signal honour, at both meetings, of presiding over the General Committee, as the representative of Colombia, and I am thus particularly well acquainted with what took place.

230. In August 1959, the Foreign Ministers of the twenty-one American States met together in the Chilean capital and, after a detailed study of the causes of international tension in the Americas, concluded unanimously, or in other words without a single dissenting vote, that it was essential to stress that the conduct of the Governments of the hemisphere must conform strictly to the provisions of the Charter of Bogotá of 1948,^{3/} which is the basic instrument of our regional organization. Thus it was that, in furtherance of the basic principles of the inter-American system, we adopted the Declaration of Santiago de Chile^{4/} in which the political aspirations of our peoples are enumerated and summed up. In this Declaration we restated the democratic concept of the separation of powers and reaffirmed our conviction that the Governments of this continent should be the result of free elections. We condemned perpetuation in power. We proclaimed freedom of information and the unrestricted exercise of freedom of the Press, radio and television. We asked for respect for human rights and stressed the urgency of effectively combating economic underdevelopment in order to strengthen democratic institutions.

231. In August 1960, the American Foreign Ministers met again at San José, Costa Rica, where we had occasion to study the problems posed for the unity and solidarity of the hemisphere by Mr. Khrushchev's proposals to use his guided missiles to intervene in the dispute between two American States, and the acceptance in various forms, each more compromising than the last, which the Cuban Government gave to that offer.

232. America possesses a regional system that is older even than the United Nations and offers abundant resources for the peaceful settlement of any dispute. We have outlawed aggressive war in our hemisphere and have laid down that conquest confers no rights. An armed attack by any American State against any other American State shall be considered as an attack against all the other countries of the continent. In this way we have been able to check the arms race that was consuming a large part of the economic resources of the Latin American countries.

233. In the field of continental solidarity, we are bound by existing treaties which are surely a model of what a regional organization can do when it is established for defensive and not for aggressive purposes. We Latin American countries believe in the effectiveness of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of Rio de Janeiro of 1947,^{5/} which grants us specific rights and imposes upon us necessary responsibilities. That Treaty, which we regard as the highest achievement of inter-American co-operation, specifies that any extracontinental armed attack against

an American State is to be regarded as an armed attack against the whole continent. It is, of course, this Treaty—and not the Monroe doctrine, which we regard as definitely superseded—that enables us to mobilize the energies of all the American States to ensure the defence and solidarity of the hemisphere.

234. United States Secretary of State Herter was emphatic in declaring at San José, Costa Rica, that the United States has no intention of committing aggression against Cuba, and he confirmed the declarations previously made by Ambassador Cabot Lodge in the Security Council. All of us representing the other countries of America affirmed in clear and categorical terms that Cuba does not need the protection of the Soviet Union or of any other extracontinental Power, since its freedom of action is guaranteed by the principle of non-intervention which is the backbone of the inter-American system.

235. To the very best of our information and knowledge there does not exist any threat of aggression against Cuba on the part of the Government of the United States or of any other American State. We therefore consider all attempts by the Soviet Union at political and military intervention in American affairs to be unjustifiable and inadmissible.

236. America not only believes in the necessity of peaceful coexistence but also desires that mankind should be able not only to coexist but to live together in a civilized manner and to co-operate in planning for the benefit of all. Peaceful coexistence is not, however, helped, but is rather undermined, when countries violate or encourage the violation of the principle of non-intervention. The position which we American Foreign Ministers adopted at San José consisted in rejecting and condemning every such attempt at extracontinental intervention in the problems of America.

237. Within the framework of peaceful coexistence, peoples of the most varied political philosophies and the most incompatible systems of government can have diplomatic, commercial and cultural relations. Some nations of this continent have relations with the Socialist countries and even with the Soviet Union itself. We must, nevertheless, emphasize that under the guise or pretext of such relations, we American peoples are not prepared to accept any act of extracontinental intervention in our continent, even should such an attempt be accompanied by the threatened use of guided missiles.

238. At San José, Costa Rica, we reaffirmed the principle of non-intervention by any American State in the internal or external affairs of the other American States, and we reiterated that each State has the right to develop its cultural, political and economic life freely and naturally, respecting the rights of the individual and the principles of universal morality.

239. This example demonstrates that in rejecting extracontinental intervention, America is not applying to outside Powers a procedure different from that which it has applied to itself. We have the moral authority and the political authority to act in harmony with the proposals and the spirit of independence that were made evident at the Seventh Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs held at San José, Costa Rica.

240. We declared at San José, and we reaffirm today in the United Nations Assembly, that any attempt to intervene in the affairs of another State for the purpose of imposing upon it one's own ideologies or one's

^{2/}In the final Declaration of San José, Costa Rica.

^{3/}See: United Nations Treaty Series, vol. 119 (1952) pp. 48-96.

^{4/}Approved by the Fifth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States, held at Santiago de Chile in August 1959.

^{5/}See: United Nations Treaty Series, vol. 21. (1948) No. 324.

own political, economic or social principles is unlawful. We have no desire to be either the importers or exporters of revolutions. We wish to bring about the evolution of our peoples within an American framework, using methods and procedures which are in keeping with our civilization and our customs. We are not prepared to renounce our autonomy in order to prove that we are revolutionaries. We frankly cannot accept as a criterion the anarchic policy of renouncing the principle of non-intervention. In the sense of continuing to uphold the international rule of fair play, I am afraid I would not be wrong in affirming that all States are very conservative. Some States, however, tend to be more categorical in defending their own rights than in recognizing those of others.

241. Allow me to dwell further on the position adopted by the American Foreign Ministers at San José, Costa Rica, in order to underline the positive attitude which we followed there. We declared at that time, and we now affirm it once more, that Cuba, as well as every other American State, can be assured that its independence, integrity and sovereignty are fully guaranteed and protected by the safeguards which our regional organization provides. The heroic people of Cuba need not rely on the Soviet Union for protection which can never be more effective or more fitting than that which we, her American sisters, have offered her not once but many times.

242. Latin America need have no fear of advanced ideas or of social justice. We who today hold the reins of government in America are fully alive to our obligations to pursue vigorously the economic development of our nations. The era has gone in which it was possible to restrain the longing for social renewal which is to be found today in every land of the earth. Our rural masses need their own land and adequate tools, and we must therefore introduce just agrarian and technical reforms without delay. Our people require decent dwellings, and we must provide them with the means for building such dwellings. They also need schools and hospitals, and we cannot refuse them these. The time has come for the great social evolution which, as the English statesman said, will give to the people by peaceful processes all that it longs for and does not always attain through bloody revolution.

243. For many years we have been stressing the need for reinforcing all the means that can be used in the vital work of technical and economic assistance which the great Powers, in a free spirit of co-operation, must offer the under-developed nations. Where the United Nations has failed in its work of rehabilitation has undoubtedly been in the insufficiency of the economic aid which it has been meting out in tiny drops to the most needy countries.

244. Within the American system, we have long been calling for a more active participation by international institutions and by the Government of the United States. In this sphere we can say today that important advances have been made. Last year we founded the Inter-American Development Bank, which has already begun its activities and is destined to become the most effective of all instruments for continental assistance. At the beginning of this month, the representatives of twenty American States met at Bogotá⁵ to study, in

the framework of "Operation Pan America", the problems connected with the economic and social development of our peoples. I would be unjust not to state that that gathering constituted the most decisive step forward yet taken in the field of inter-American co-operation.

245. The economic Act of Bogotá of 1960 clearly reflects the determination of the nineteen signatory Governments to fight against under-development until victory is won. We committed ourselves to an ambitious programme of social measures which we considered of the most vital importance. Land reform, housing, education, health and small industry will now receive the benefit of external credits which were formerly reserved only for programmes certain to be profitable.

246. It would be a wrong interpretation of the Act of Bogotá to suppose that the needs of economic development were overlooked. On the contrary, we reaffirmed our conviction that the prime need of our peoples is the reinforcement of economic programmes. Yet it would be hardly fair to tell our people that until we have constructed all the hydroelectric plants and all the irrigation canals and all the railways and roads that are included in the Latin American development programmes, they have no right to own their land, or to live in decent dwellings, or to have adequate education or medical services. The programmes of economic and social development are complementary, and both constitute the natural basis for peace and well-being.

247. It is obvious that in the struggle against under-development, the peoples who live and produce under conditions of poverty must contribute the main effort themselves. We accept it as our task to devote to the work of recovery an indomitable will to act and an ordered planning of public expenditure. Since, however, the question at issue is the defence of democratic values, it is clear that peoples professing the same principles and having the same systems as we do ought to come to our aid, the cause of freedom being indivisible. These are the circumstances in which we have gratefully accepted the economic co-operation offered us by the United States, which many countries in other continents have long been receiving in abundance and which only now is beginning to reach Latin America in a systematic and sustained form.

248. In the Act of Bogotá we pointed out that the European countries which have now overcome their post-war economic difficulties would be well advised to co-operate more fully with the countries of America, which have given them so many proofs of their solidarity. Not only could they intensify their technical assistance and make larger investments in our continent, but they could also consume a greater volume of our products and eliminate many of the obstacles in the form of tariffs and taxes which today impede the access of our products to European markets. We feel sure that the countries of Western Europe will not be backward in making the contribution which they could today offer Latin America in every sphere. Just as for several years we declared the urgent necessity for a radical change of attitude towards our peoples on the part of the United States Government, we today make the same appeal to the European countries and express in anticipation the gratitude which we would all feel in Latin America for a change in their position with respect to the nations of this hemisphere.

⁵/Third meeting of the Special Committee to study the Formulation of New Measures for Economic Cooperation (Committee of Twenty-One) held in Bogotá, Colombia, 5-13 September 1960.

249. The United States has no need for any country to come to its defence, but in the name of justice I must express Colombia's appreciation for the way in which the United States representatives conducted themselves at the Bogotá economic conference. They gave ample proof there of their familiarity with Latin American problems and of their willingness to co-operate. We feel convinced that this is not a passing attitude but a permanent policy which the United States will not abandon until we have finally won the battle against poverty.

250. The United Nations was instituted in order to keep alive contacts between the representatives of Member States and thus to ensure that peoples would not adopt unilateral positions which might easily lead them into war. The effectiveness of this world Organization has been put to the most gruelling tests and has fortunately triumphed over them. The balance-sheet which the United Nations can present to the world is fully satisfactory and justifies the efforts of its founders and the trust placed in it by mankind.

251. The signatories to the San Francisco Charter were careful to endow the Organization with sufficient powers to act speedily and effectively in every situation in which peace might be endangered. My country considers that the world Organization can better fulfil its vital task when all Member States back up its authority and support its decisions. Colombia identifies itself wholly with the purposes of the United Nations and the Organization of American States and believes that the interests of peace would suffer great harm if, to the prejudice of all, the authority of these two bodies should decline. Any weakening of the world Organization would mean the destruction of the one barrier which has been effective in holding back war.

252. I would be most loath to conclude this speech without stressing the feeling of solidarity of our continent with the nations of Africa. Africa and America have many problems in common. Many of our experiences may be useful to them, and we are anxious to co-operate with them since, to a certain extent, their cause is one with ours. We might well meet frequently with the African representatives to agree on plans for mutual assistance and for defending the prices of our common products on the international market.

253. I am sure that I am speaking on behalf of all my colleagues from Latin America when I express to the peoples of Africa, through their illustrious representatives at this Assembly, our sentiments of esteem and solidarity. We are their allies in the fight against economic under-development and in the endeavour to ensure peace on foundations of liberty and well-being.

254. May I be allowed to emphasize the necessity of taking full advantage of the presence here of such authorized spokesmen of the great Powers as we have among us, to beg of them earnestly to agree at least on the bases of procedure for the resumption of disarmament negotiations. May I also once more remind Cuba that within the American system it will find all the peaceful processes necessary for resolving its differences with the United States of America, and the due protection of its integrity, independence and sovereignty. Let me also reiterate that harmony and good relations between States can only be achieved if the principle of non-intervention is rigorously observed and respected.

255. Let me likewise reaffirm our growing faith in the Organization of American States and in the United Nations.

256. I wish to thank the Assembly for the indulgent attention which it has given to my remarks. They reflect the views of a country which loves peace, extols the benefits of social justice, proclaims the values of liberty and respects the rule of law.

Mr. Illueca (Panama), Vice-President, took the Chair.

257. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The representative of Cuba wishes to exercise his right of reply.

258. Mr. BISBE (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): In the statement which the representative of Colombia has just made, he said:

"In August 1960, the American Foreign Ministers met again at San José, Costa Rica, where we had occasion to study the problems posed for the unity and solidarity of the hemisphere by Premier Khrushchev's proposals to use his guided missiles to intervene in the dispute between two American States, and the acceptance in various forms, each more compromising than the last, which the Cuban Government gave to that offer."

259. These are the exact words which the representative of Colombia has just used. The words do not, however, accurately reflect what happened. The Soviet Union stated what it was prepared to do in the event of United States aggression against Cuba. This declaration was conditional upon the existence of aggression. Our Government and people, at the most tragic and dangerous, but also the finest, moment in their history, could only accept this help with all gratitude.

260. Where there is a clear contradiction—which the Colombian representative has not tried to understand—is in the fact that the Foreign Ministers of Latin America, at San José, Costa Rica, were eager to denounce non-existent aggression from outside the continent but said nothing about aggression within the continent—the United States aggression against Cuba which does exist.

261. I shall not go into details, because the matter was exhaustively dealt with by Mr. Raúl Roa, our Minister of Foreign Affairs, when he brought Cuba's case before the Security Council, ^{7/} in his statement at the San José Conference and in the full speech Dr. Fidel Castro, our Prime Minister, made to the General Assembly [872nd meeting].

262. I do not propose to speak of all the ways in which this aggression has been committed, but I should like to refer to one very concrete example, of which all Latin Americans must be aware. I mean the economic aggression against my country. This type of aggression is expressly condemned by article 16 of the Charter of Bogotá of 1948. I ask you, is not the reduction of Cuba's sugar quota by more than 900,000 tons a case of real and obvious economic aggression? This is the extraordinary thing. Cuba has not committed aggression, but has been the victim of aggression. At the San José Conference there was no implied sanction against the aggressive Power, but there was sanction of a

^{7/}See: *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifteenth Year, 874th meeting.*

kind against the victim of aggression. I admit I can find no possible explanation for this contradiction.

263. There is another point which I must clarify. The Revolutionary Government of Cuba does not in any way underestimate regional action but it exercises its full rights under the Charter of the United Nations. We understand that there are two ways open to us: action under the Charter and regional action. First we had recourse to the Security Council, and we did so on the basis of Article 52, paragraph 4, which is quite explicit, and in particular Article 103 of the Charter.

[The speaker then reads Article 103.]

264. Otherwise we should have to recognize that we in the Latin American countries were in a position of *capitis diminutio*, that we could appeal only to the regional body and that we must give up all our rights under the United Nations Charter. This, of course, would be quite absurd.

265. I wish to conclude this brief intervention by affirming that for us the unfortunate Declaration of San José represents only the opinions of the Governments and not of the peoples of America. Against this Declaration of San José we set up the Declaration of Havana, which was accented and supported by the people of Cuba in a vast assembly of over a million persons. We hope that one day the Declaration of Havana, which is really the Declaration of the peoples of America, will be also the declaration of the Governments of our America, when we have freed ourselves from all imperialist influences.

266. Mr. SCHAUS (Luxembourg) (translated from French): On behalf of the Luxembourg delegation I should like first of all to associate myself with the warm congratulations which have been addressed to our President upon his election to the highest office in the United Nations General Assembly at its fifteenth session. The experience of the last few days has already shown that his election augurs well for the current session's work. The conduct of our proceedings could not have been put into the hands of a person of greater integrity, intelligence and courtesy than our President.

267. As I take the floor today before this august Assembly, it is not my intention to go into a detailed analysis of the grave problems now besetting humanity or even to express my Government's views on all these problems or on all the items on the agenda but rather to reaffirm above all, in a few brief words, the active and unshakable faith of a very small nation in the principles and goals of the United Nations and in the institution itself, whose ranks have happily been swelled by the recent admission of sixteen new Members.

268. We rejoice that the admission of these new nations, inspired as they all are by a great yearning for international peace and understanding, has made our Organization more nearly universal in character. My country, which in the thousand years of its existence has been the object of so much greed and the scene of so much deadly strife, and which was long a passive rather than an active political entity, understands and shares the joy of the countries which have just attained independence. Thus I am happy to convey to the fifteen new African Member States and to the Republic of Cyprus sincere congratulations, fraternal

greetings and best wishes of the people and Government of Luxembourg.

269. It is our fervent wish that our friends the nations which have just joined our ranks may be able to enjoy their independence and freedom to the full in peace and to maintain Governments based on the principles of democracy, justice, social progress and human dignity. These are among the purposes which the authors of the United Nations Charter made the cornerstone of their service to the cause of peace and to humanity, those which take precedence over all others. To put it another way, the peace of the world which all men of good will desire and towards which our highest aspirations are directed will be only an illusion unless it is accompanied by the emancipation of individuals from all restrictions on their personal freedom and by the disappearance of all régimes of oppression which subject their peoples to moral and social restraint.

270. My country turns with confidence to the United Nations, whose institutions, as provided for in the Charter, have given proof of their usefulness and efficacy, thanks in particular to the principle of impartiality which guides the Secretariat in its activities. Thus the interests of the Organization and of our peoples counsel that we should not tamper with those institutions, at least not in the radical fashion which some speakers have seen fit to propose during the current debate. As the President of the United States so aptly stated a few days ago, it is primarily the smaller nations, exposed as they are to the danger of subversion and domination, which find a guarantee of their existence and their national independence in the realization of the ideal of the Charter and the effective functioning of the institutions of the United Nations.

271. I should like now to make some observations about the problem of the Congo. Although Belgium, which is a great friend of my own country, has of its own free will granted independence to the Congolese people, without reservations and without political conditions of any kind, and although it has complied with the Security Council's resolutions^{8/} in so far as it was physically possible to do so, it has, in my Government's view, been unjustly accused of imperialism, particularly by the Soviet Union. I believe that, once the present passions have abated, history, that impartial arbiter of the actions of men and nations will do justice to the work accomplished by Belgium in the Congo.

272. My Government wishes to take this opportunity of paying a tribute, of gratitude and admiration, to the Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjöld, and his staff, who have displayed the requisite qualities of foresight, energy, initiative and objectivity in carrying out the resolutions of the United Nations. Because they have been faithful both to the letter and to the spirit of the principles and decisions of our Organization they are today being criticized by those who, unilaterally and outside the framework of the United Nations, wish to impose their own rule on the Congo and, through it, on the world.

273. For my small country, which can itself survive only in a world where right prevails over might, the sole hope of surmounting the present crisis in the Congo lies in the United Nations Charter and the good

^{8/}Resolutions S/4387, S/4405, and S/4426 of the Security Council.

work which it has inspired our Organization to carry out.

274. I should like to conclude these brief reflections on the question of the Congo by expressing the fervent hope that under the influence of our Organization and with its aid the situation will rapidly return to normal so that we may soon welcome into our midst the qualified representatives of a young State capable of forging its destiny in sound and tranquil political, economic and social conditions which will enable its citizens to prosper and to enjoy the benefits of their democratic freedoms in an atmosphere of peace.

275. A few days ago the Prime Minister of the Republic of Cuba [872nd meeting], delivering an indictment which was violent in the extreme, accused the Government and people of the United States of the worst imaginable misdeeds. Among other things, he charged that they had always imposed or sought to impose their law, which he called the law of the mightiest, on other States, particularly States that were small and weak, thus keeping them under their political and economic domination. Far be it from me to become involved in the current dispute between the United States and Cuba. After hearing his dithyramb, however, I thought that as a matter of elementary justice and gratitude I should in this context draw attention to certain facts which I feel the Members of this Assembly should be reminded of.

276. I have already spoken of the great value which the people of Luxembourg attach to their independence and to their national and personal freedom. Let me only point out in this connexion that twice within the past thirty-three years the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, its international and national rights attacked and violated while it was naturally powerless to defend itself, has recovered its freedom and independence largely through the disinterested intervention of the United States, thanks to the supreme sacrifice made by thousands of the young men of that country who fought alongside the Allies and who rest, together with one of their most illustrious leaders, in the soil of Luxembourg, soaked as it is with the blood of its American liberators.

277. The Government and people of Luxembourg have accordingly contracted a debt of profound and unalterable gratitude to this powerful ally. Our debt is the greater because we realize that ever since the end of the Second World War the Government and people of the United States, by the granting of unconditional material and moral aid and particularly by their military presence in Europe, have been, and still are, preserving us from the dangers of imperialist domination to which we are exposed by the military and subversive forces of international Communism. If the people of Luxembourg have remained politically and economically independent, if they can think, write and speak freely, if they enjoy democratic rule, they owe it above all to the United States, that great nation whose friend and ally they have the privilege to be and the desire forever to remain, and which, far from imposing its rule on small countries, has consistently defended their sovereignty and guaranteed their independence.

278. With regard to the problem of disarmament I should like to make the following statement. No country is more attached than my own to the ideal of a world disarmed. Like all other States, it recoils in

horror at the prospect of an atomic war in which it would be but an innocent victim of forces over which it had no control. Even if its capabilities in this matter are limited, my country will do everything in its power to contribute to the solution of this crucial problem.

279. Disarmament would be likely to prove a snare and a delusion unless it was carried out in an atmosphere of good faith on both sides. That is why the Western Powers regard as meaningless any disarmament proposal, however comprehensive it may be, that is not accompanied by an adequate and effective system of control and by the parallel establishment of a system of collective security.

280. Conceptions differ profoundly between those of the Western world, which, imbued as it is with the spirit of world solidarity, has traditionally kept its doors open, and those of the hermetically sealed camp of Communism. I shall go even further and say that the problem of disarmament is not primarily a military problem. At bottom it is actually a political problem. It is illusory to speak sincerely of disarmament as long as we are confronted with an imperialism which aspires to world domination and must rely on a vast array of force to attain its ends.

281. My Government keenly regrets that at the moment when the West was about to submit new proposals which would have opened up encouraging prospects of an agreement between East and West, the Soviet Union and the other four Communist Powers should have brought the negotiations to an abrupt end.

282. The approaches to disarmament suggested last week by President Eisenhower [868th meeting] and yesterday by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom [877th meeting] in his speech are, in my delegation's opinion, of such a nature as to offer a sound and realistic basis for a durable solution of this major problem which is of equal interest to all the peoples of the world.

283. We hope that the Geneva negotiations which were interrupted and boycotted by the Communist countries may shortly be resumed.

284. As far as the present international situation is concerned, I should like to discuss briefly that aspect of it which I consider to be the most important, namely, relations between the West and the Communist world.

285. This is the problem which is our prime concern, this is the problem that casts its shadow over all other fields of international co-operation. The solution of this problem was to have been the main topic of discussion at the Summit Conference, on the success of which the millions of people who long for peace, justice and social progress had pinned their hopes.

286. The mere fact that the Soviet leaders had emerged from their isolation and expressed the desire to enter into conversations with the political leaders of the Western world had been greeted with immense relief. It seemed to be indicative of a relaxation of the policy of tension and constant threatening which until then had characterized relations between East and West. The disappointment occasioned by the failure to hold that Summit Conference was therefore all the greater. People began to wonder if there had in fact been a fundamental change in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and if the era of the supposed relaxation of tension, the era of peaceful coexistence, was to be

succeeded by another period of cold war, to be followed later on by a real, hot war. Personally, I am trying to convince myself that there has been no such radical change in the Communist position. But let us beware. While the current session may provide the occasion for the opening of the door to conversations between the two opposing worlds which might lead to the desired resumption of the East-West discussions, the behaviour of the Communist leaders over the past few months and the speeches which they have just made from this rostrum prove that we are still far from a real understanding and that peace as we conceive it is a long way off. The fact is that their behaviour, their statements, their proposals and suggestions all show that for the Soviet Union and the countries of the Communist world the idea of peaceful coexistence and relaxation of tension is closely linked to that of domination of the non-Communist world. Even granting that they will not seek to impose such domination by means of a war which might rebound upon the aggressors themselves, it is at all events to be feared that the Communist world will try to destroy our political, economic and social system by seemingly peaceful means. Thus it will be a struggle waged by other methods.

287. Furthermore, let there be no mistake about the nature of those methods, for politics and economics do not have the same meaning for Communism as they do for us. For us, politics means the free play of democratic concepts, while for Communism politics means controlled opinion, subversion and police control.

288. The same holds true of economics. For us, the essential meaning of economics is free enterprise and satisfaction of the manifold needs of human beings, while for Communism economics is a strategy serving the aims of an ideology and a policy. Intervention in world markets, trade relations, credit policy, aid to under-developed countries, all these are forged into a weapon used to undermine the economy of the West in preparation for a Communist take-over of the various parts of the globe. Thus the struggle between the Communist camp and the free world, without losing any of its ruthlessness and without either side in any way abandoning its ultimate objective, will henceforth take other forms. It has become more mobile and is adopting subtler methods. Its centre of gravity has also shifted. While the direct threat to us in Europe has not become any less acute, a vast penetrating movement is developing in Asia and Africa.

289. That is my view of the current situation. The political atmosphere of today is very threatening yet, for all that, I do not despair for the future of humanity. On the contrary, if we remain calm in face of the dangers which continue to hang over us and if we adopt a realistic attitude, we can be confident of preserving peace and saving Western civilization.

290. Before concluding I should like to state that my Government earnestly desires to co-operate with all the other Members of the United Nations in solving one of the most important problems now confronting the world, namely the need to expand our efforts to help the under-developed countries raise their level of living and to intensify collaboration between advanced countries and countries in process of development. Although many long-range bilateral and multilateral programmes aimed at raising the economic, cultural and social level in vast areas of the world have been

put into effect, much remains to be done within the framework of the United Nations. My Government is ready, in the future as in the past, to contribute to such programmes as much as its modest resources will allow.

291. Let me say finally that the world in which we are living, although an uncertain one, is also a world which offers immense possibilities. If the choice is between destruction and peaceful construction, there is no doubt which course the peoples wish to follow. The United Nations is the repository of a great hope and it must live up to the expectations of all humanity. If the supreme goal of peace and international co-operation is to be attained, the sincere, loyal and disinterested collaboration of all countries, great and small, within the framework and under the auspices of the United Nations, is more necessary than ever and will be the only means of averting developments which might lead to disaster.

Mr. Boland (Ireland) resumed the Chair.

292. Mr. WIGNY (Belgium) (translated from French): Having paid in its turn its tribute to the President and assured him of its co-operation, the Belgian delegation wishes to make a substantial though brief contribution to this debate. Perhaps the best way to achieve this result is by not repeating what has already been said.

293. At this exceptional session we have been privileged to see in our midst most of the world's leading figures, many of whom have already delivered their messages to us. We are replying to them because it is, after all, the fate of the medium-sized and the small Powers to play, so to speak, the part of the chorus in classical drama; no doubt, it is a modest part but if we sing in unison we can drown the voices of the protagonists. Even the biggest know that it is difficult to try something on their own; they need our approval in order to succeed.

294. We are at present faced with three principal topics which we cannot avoid in our debate. The first one, obviously, is the reorganization of the United Nations, whose structure, functioning, even vitality and, perhaps, very existence are being called in question.

295. The second one, quite clearly, is the question of relations between the Communist world and the Western world. This is a matter of peace or war, and it concerns us all.

296. Lastly, this twofold crisis has been exacerbated, at least partially, if I may say so, by the troubled continent of Africa and, particularly, by the Belgian Congo, which has now become the independent Congo in search of its destiny.

297. Let us deal first with the re-organization of the United Nations. Rarely has a question of this importance been introduced so dramatically at the very beginning of our session. To follow the sequence of events I shall quote first President Eisenhower, who said [868th meeting]:

"We believe that the right of every man to participate, through his or her vote, in self-government is as precious as the right of each nation here represented to vote its own convictions in this Assembly..."

"Thus we see, as our goal, not a super-State above nations, but a world community embracing them all,

rooted in law and justice and enhancing the potentialities and common purposes of all people."

298. A few hours later [869th meeting] Mr. Khrushchev put forward the contrasting argument which I shall now quote:

"The executive organ of the United Nations should reflect the real situation that obtains in the world today. The United Nations includes States which are members of the military blocs of the Western Powers, socialist States and neutralist countries. It would therefore be completely justified to take that situation into account, and we would be better safeguarded against the negative developments which have come to light in the work of the United Nations especially during the recent events in the Congo."

299. Things are therefore very clear. On the one hand we are shown a democratic world which this Assembly must reflect and express. Admittedly, all the nations are not of equal power; but it was precisely for the purpose of putting an end to the rule of force that we set up this Organization. Each people has the right to choose quite freely its way of life, its civilization and its destiny.

300. Mr. Khrushchev, on the other hand, has drawn for this Assembly the picture of a hierarchical world which, in his view, is the only realistic one. He envisages great blocs facing one another, each under the leadership of the major Powers. Just noting how faithfully the Soviet Union's arguments are being repeated and amplified by the USSR's attendant States is enough to make us realize the degree of discipline implied in the world "bloc".

301. To propose to us this reform which, in a way, would put the blocs on to an institutional footing seems to me to be the height of audacity. After all, most of the delegations in this hall represent small and medium-sized Powers. Were we to believe that we shall have to don once and for all the livery of one or other bloc, we would not be here wasting our time in discussion. It would be enough to inform us by letter of the decisions to be taken.

302. In actual fact, we do not belong to the United Nations in order to let ourselves be dragooned, but so that each one of us can defend his legitimate interests and contribute, on a footing of equality, to the creation of a better world for us all.

303. The small and the medium-sized Powers have everything to lose in a war and they are more attached to peace than any others. The small and the medium-sized nations cannot gather all the wealth and all the talent within their narrow frontiers and they therefore understand the virtue of solidarity better than any one else. The small and the medium-sized nations know that the world does not revolve around them, and they are trained to practise the virtue of tolerance and to understand the other's point of view. Lastly, the small and the medium-sized nations, being the most numerous, can assemble a sizeable force in support of a balanced judgement and a policy of moderation.

304. The policy of blocs is the very negation of the United Nations, which will not succeed unless everyone refuses to take any orders except those of his own conscience, and unless every one is capable of keeping in check all his passions except the passion for justice. We must all submit to the will of the

majority; Belgium has done so, and you are all doing it in your turn. If someone thought that he could depart from this rule, he would simply be imposing slavery on the many to the advantage of the few. In saying this, I am pleading the cause of the medium-sized Powers and, indeed, that of the United Nations itself against those who, with incredible effrontery, have thrown off the mask to reveal the real imperialism of the present day.

305. But the Soviet Union delegation went even beyond that. What it has proposed, in effect, is that these three blocs, the great Powers, should be represented within the Secretariat and that all decisions, even executive ones, should require the assent of these three heads.

306. If I have understood it correctly—and I have done so, because the necessary commentary has since been provided—it is the veto that is being introduced not only into the taking of decisions but also into their execution. The Soviet Union specializes in the veto. If I am not mistaken, on ninety occasions since the inception of the United Nations it has frustrated the will of the majority. And now what it wants is to impose a similar check on the execution of decisions, too.

307. As I have just said, the rule must be the same for all because otherwise it means the enslavement of those on whom it is imposed. Today, when the Organization numbers almost one hundred members, no one can say that the majority is that of a particular bloc. It is, and must be, the majority of the whole world.

308. It is painful indeed to hear this suggestion made precisely when new nations, proud of their independence, have taken their seats at our side and I greet them in my turn. They are here, full of confidence, fully intending to exercise their newly acquired power in the international community. They are more jealous of their sovereignty than others and they must tolerate no press-ganging. Together with us they must defend their freedom of judgement and the dignity of this Assembly.

309. I now turn to the second topic in my statement: East-West relations. They involve disarmament and that is a disappointing question. It occupied the League of Nations; the United Nations has been concerned with it ever since its inception and yet never before have armaments been heavier, more unbearable financially and more dangerous militarily. But we must believe in disarmament, we must will it. We must never throw up the sponge. How could we do so in the full knowledge that in a nuclear war there would be no victors but only vanquished?

310. In order to succeed we need a method of work and, first and foremost, a starting point. It seems to me that this was brought out in the remarkable opening statement made by Mr. Lafer, the Brazilian Minister for Foreign Affairs [868th meeting]. According to him this starting point should be everyone's readiness to recognize that the others may have a system of government and, more generally, an ideology different from what he would like for himself. This reminds me of what Bernard Shaw once wrote very irreverently: "Do not do unto others as you would they should do unto you. Their tastes may not be the same". This does not mean non-involvement. When it comes to its conception of man, the State, civilization and progress each people is entitled to believe in its own mission. I am not speaking of indifference but of tolerance.

Peaceful coexistence must mean exactly that: not struggle by all possible means—except force of arms—but tolerance and mutual assistance.

311. One can agree with Marshal Tito [868th meeting]—and I have told you that I am replying to the previous speakers—that the requisite progress cannot be reconciled with the perpetuation of the status quo. But it is also necessary that each people, secure from all interference, should choose freely not only its present régime but also its future path. I am not alone in fearing the indiscriminate proselytizing by those who proclaim that they have found the universal truth and constantly speak of bringing happiness unto others according to their own national prescription.

312. If we are all genuinely actuated by this spirit of tolerance, we can try disarming. After listening to so many delegations I think that it would perhaps be possible to work out a practical approach by differentiating between the final goal on the one hand and the first practical step and the method of work on the other.

313. The final goal is general, complete and multi-lateral disarmament at the earliest possible moment. On that we are all agreed. Is there any one who wishes to maintain armies, even of a limited size, beyond a certain period?

314. But is it reasonable to pursue a policy of "all or nothing"? Asking for the lot in order to concede nothing is rather a facile method. In French, when we want to calm down people in a hurry, we tell them that God took seven days to make the world. Complete disarmament would be a miracle for mankind and it cannot be achieved instantaneously. Not that the technical operations would necessarily take long. The weapons can be quickly disposed of and the men can be discharged at once. The real problem is to find a new basis for the nations' feeling of security, which today is based on their own arms. This takes time, a great deal of time. This feeling of security must be recreated in a new guise. International disputes will always be with us and those in danger of being unjustly despoiled must have a reliable means of obtaining justice. It should be noted that even control by itself is not enough to produce this feeling of security, because the large nations, by sheer weight of numbers and economic might, will always remain a perpetual danger to the others, unless something is done about it.

315. This brings me to my second point. If we are agreed on the goal of complete disarmament at the earliest possible moment, if we admit that this urgency must not be taken to mean almost instantaneous action, let us also reach agreement on a first step which can be taken immediately. We must advance step by step towards our goal. Let us take the first step in that direction; and the second will then be easier to take. Our momentum will carry us on.

316. Eminent representatives, such as President Eisenhower [868th meeting] and Mr. Diefenbaker [871st meeting], have put forward various attractive proposals from which we can make our choice. The cessation of nuclear weapon tests, the banning of armaments from outer space, the simultaneous closing-down of equal numbers of war plants in each of the two camps, are all concrete and practical ideas worthy of initiating disarmament. It is not enough to retort that they do not bring about disarmament, since we are

saying from the outset that they are but partial steps. Nor can one object on the grounds that they favour one or other of the parties, since these partial measures are limited in scope. Nor, for the same reason, can one cavil about petty details of control. From the soldiers' point of view these would no doubt be but small steps in terms of disarmament, but their importance from the politicians' point of view would be enormous because we would have dared to take the first step and begun to build up confidence.

317. Lastly, after the goal has been defined and the first practical step chosen, it will be necessary to determine the method of work. I listened very carefully to what Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, had to say [877th meeting]. He referred to an experiment which proved successful in the past. He suggests that experts, scientists, should be entrusted with the task of preparing practical and, therefore, non-diplomatic and non-political schemes. It might perhaps be possible in this way to find methods of disarmament and methods of control that could be applied by the two camps to these first measures.

318. We have reached a stage when we must be modest as well as realistic. The peoples we represent are disheartened by our mutual protestations in favour of disarmament which, though repeated, have led nowhere. They are demanding that our intentions, if they are indeed genuine, should be translated into action, even on a very limited scale, that would at least give them back hope.

319. In connexion with these military problems the Belgian delegation feels that it must define its position on one particular point, that is to say, the rearmament of Germany. Since the Federal Republic of Germany is not represented here, it has not been able to defend itself nor to exercise the right of reply. It is, however, associated with us in international organizations and in our view it would be dishonourable to leave unanswered the criticisms levelled against it.

320. I would remind you that our testimony has some value, seeing that we have twice been unjustifiably invaded and that we have spent nine years under military occupation. Incidentally I would remind the Soviet delegation that in 1917, while our country was still occupied, Russia made peace with Germany, and that in 1940, when we were invaded, Russia, having signed a treaty of friendship with Herr Hitler, broke off diplomatic relations with us. But what is to be gained by recriminations? Do you believe that we can build a future with memories, even of the recent past? We hope and believe that after two terrible ordeals a new Germany has arisen which, as we can bear witness, has proved itself a loyal associate. I believe it is unjust to attribute to it a desire for revenge. Its Government has solemnly affirmed in public statements—the only authentic ones—that it renounces the use of force to further its claims. It is not that Government which proposes unilaterally to alter the status of Berlin. Lastly I would emphasize that the whole of its armed forces are integrated in a defensive alliance whose policies are formulated and controlled by a group of Powers which includes such peaceful nations as the Benelux² countries.

321. In the concluding part of my speech I should like, in all simplicity, to give the Assembly some

²/Belgo-Netherlands-Luxembourg Rapprochement Committee.

information about the matter of the Congo. You will understand the feelings with which I mounted the rostrum following the violent attacks upon my country. I do not wish now to continue this controversy. Nevertheless it appears to me that for the sake of objectivity, for the honour of my country and for your information I must recall a number of facts which I realize are unknown or have been forgotten.

322. In 1958 the Belgian Government sent to the Congo a commission of political men. They interrogated all the Congolese leaders in order to ascertain their wishes. Following the publication of this commission's report, on 13 January 1959 the Belgian Government declared that independence would be granted. In January 1960 a Round Table Conference—an expression which immediately conjures up the idea of equality and freedom—consisting of Belgian and Congolese politicians met to formulate jointly the political structure of the independent Congo. I think the Congolese delegation was a good one; it included all those people who today figure in the world Press. Conclusions were unanimously or almost unanimously adopted.

323. Take good note of this. In 1960, throughout the entire Territory, free elections were held by secret ballot and with universal suffrage. I have not, and for good reason, heard the slightest criticism of the organization of these elections. Certain countries might well bear this in mind as a precedent for their metropolitan territories.

324. In June 1960 the King of the Belgians, constitutionally covered by the responsibility of his Ministers, who were themselves responsible to Parliament, set up a Congolese National Government which seemed likely to enjoy the confidence of the Congolese Parliament. Here again, no one has denied that the operation was absolutely correct and perfectly straightforward. Those who today criticize us most severely are the very ones who would like this first Congolese Government, appointed by the King of the Belgians, to be maintained in, or rather returned to, power. That fact shows how impartially and independently we acted. What these critics do not say is that they are now attacking not Belgium, since we are not responsible for the subsequent events, but the genuine representatives of the Congolese people itself.

325. Belgium has consistently and strictly refrained from interfering in the internal affairs of the Congo, whose independence it has recognized, or from showing any preference for one party or another. It distrusts the zeal with which certain delegations make their choice or support one candidate. Are they observing the wishes of the Congolese people or are they playing their own game? After all, Mr. Kasa-Vubu was appointed Head of State by the Congolese, not the Belgian, Parliament. All the countries which have relations with the independent Congo appointed Ambassadors who presented their credentials to him. It was he who by virtue of his constitutional powers exercised his right to dismiss the first Government and replace it by another. Under Congolese public law, as under that of any civilized country, Parliament has no power to recall a government which has been dismissed. It can express its confidence in a new government or refuse to do so; above all it cannot reach a decision when there is no quorum because a large number of deputies have fled and because Parliament is surrounded by soldiers and threatened by machine-guns.

326. Since it is impossible to criticize the procedure followed up to 30 June 1960—for I have never heard any criticism on that score—our intentions are called in question. That is a very easy thing to do. It is alleged that from 10 July on—I repeat, from 10 July on—moved by tardy regrets, we endeavoured to take back what we had granted on 30 June; that having set up a unitary State, we tried to divide it; that having held free elections by secret ballot with universal suffrage, we tried to dislodge those who had been elected. In a word it is stated that, after granting complete and unrestricted independence, we tried immediately afterwards to resume control, which it would have been so easy for us not to relinquish. Naturally never a grain of proof has been forthcoming.

327. Those are the facts as far as the political process is concerned. I would add the following: the Congo was well equipped to cut an impressive figure as an independent State. I shall not refer here and now to its economic and social development, which stood in high repute and with which a number of you, and particularly the African delegations, are familiar. But I must recall that this stage of advancement was reached not only because the soil is fertile and because the African people are industrious and intelligent—we know that and they will demonstrate it—but also on account of certain features of the policy we followed.

328. Are you aware that under our Constitution everything coming from the Congo belonged not to Belgium but to the Congo? Under the régime we established there were separate national patrimonies, separate currencies, separate gold and foreign exchange reserves; absolute freedom to buy and sell anywhere at the most advantageous prices, without any gain to Belgium; an entirely separate administration, independent of the metropolitan administration, so that officials had no hope of being able to continue their career in the other administration; no alienation of indigenous lands, the transfer of which was strictly forbidden by law, even against payment; lastly, the shares which concessionary companies were obliged to give free of charge to the public authorities were, and remained, the property of the Congolese State and not of the Belgian State. In these circumstances it is not surprising that development was rapid and that the credit of the then Belgian Congo was high.

329. We were amazed to read in a Soviet note that the Congo has hardly emerged from a state of illiteracy. Let me tell you, gentlemen, that in that country, which covers an area equal to one third of the United States and where the population numbers only 14 million, despite the difficulty of communications and the number of people living in the bush, more than half of the children were attending school; that situation is, and will remain, the foundation of truly democratic institutions. Furthermore, in 1952 and 1954 the secondary school system was rounded off by the establishment of two universities of the highest rank, in the European sense of the term, and on a footing of absolute equality with our own universities, since all the faculties were represented.

330. We are accused of having granted independence to these people without having provided them with an adequate "élite". It may be so! It might have been better to wait a few years until there were more university graduates to hold the reins of office. But just look at the political map of the region and the political

map of the Congo. The very people who today blame us for this lack of wisdom would have blamed us still more for what they would have described as "timidity". The fact is that the Congo had reached such a stage of economic and intellectual development that it would not have been right—that is how we saw it—to deny it emancipation at a time when all its neighbours were achieving political independence. You must not, however, believe that we took no precautions. We were well aware of the danger and we proposed solutions.

331. To fill the gap until the new Congolese universities could supply replacements we left in Africa at the disposal of the Congolese National Government, 10,000 experts, most of whom were university graduates. These doctors, teachers, administrators, magistrates and technicians of every kind, who had brought about the Congo's development, remained in the Congo and—be it noted—were paid, directed and given orders by the Congolese Government, whose officials they were. They were not Belgian officials but officials of the Congolese Government, from which they took orders, thus enabling that Government to carry out its work effectively from the outset. As far as financial assistance was concerned, Belgium proposed to grant \$100 million for the financial year 1960 alone. In other words, Belgium was doing all that the United Nations as a whole is asked to do for the year 1960, and it intended to continue that assistance in subsequent years under the terms of the Treaty of Friendship. This should give pause to those who say that we have bled the Congo white. Ten thousand experts and \$100 million in one year! Those figures should be borne in mind and measured against the largest scale, that of the United Nations.

332. What then are the causes of the present appalling crisis? Some of them arise from the internal situation in the Congo and I shall not discuss them now any more than I have done in the past, since, unlike some others, I do not intend to abandon the policy of non-interference which we have strictly observed from the beginning. As for the external causes, as I have already said, there are those who wish you to believe in Belgian machinations, of which there is no proof and which would be directly contrary to our policy—because to suppose that we could have changed our policy after ten days is tantamount to accusing us of insanity.

333. Unfortunately other countries have shown less discretion and it is disturbing to note that now that the Belgian troops who were there on a temporary mission cannot be indicted, criticism is turned against the United Nations. Passing circumstances, however, should not blind us to the main currents of history. No one can deprive us of the honour of having created the Congo, which before we arrived was a mere conglomeration of warring racial groups and tribes. It

was we who created it. It is the Congolese people, together with Belgian experts, and nobody else, who have bestowed upon this magnificent country its economic, social and human equipment. It is the Congolese people and the Belgian people, and nobody else, who on 30 June 1960 brought about the independence of the Congo. No crisis, however serious and tragic it may be, can conceal that fundamental fact. As soon as it has re-established order in its internal affairs, the Congo will become that for which its people, together with us, have been preparing for eighty years—a great African Power.

334. In conclusion I shall say the following: Belgium is distinguished by its attachment to the ideals of democracy. From the early Middle Ages our towns were among the first to establish government of the people by the people. Our national Constitution has been described as the most liberal in Europe. It has been copied in some ten other countries. We wished to endow the African territories with democratic institutions based in particular on general education and universal suffrage. In the international community my country was a founder member of the League of Nations and of the United Nations and has actively participated in the work of both.

335. We still believe that international problems can be solved only by general co-operation and under the influence of a majority. That is the role of the medium-sized Powers. That is why I began my statement by defending the position of the medium-sized and small Powers.

336. Moreover, we are convinced that those States which we represent are united by the same ideals; but in order to realize them they should give their support not to wordy and grandiose programmes but to specific, reasonable proposals, from whichever faction they may emanate. Thus in the second part of our statement we drew a distinction between the final goal of total disarmament and the first steps to be taken towards its achievement, which this Assembly should decide upon, according to the method of work advocated by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

337. Lastly and above all, our long experience has taught us that democracy must be based on reliable information, impartial judgement and tolerance. Hence in my statement on the question of the Congo I have spoken simply, eschewing, I believe, any controversial statements, which I wished to avoid from the start. The peace of the world should not depend on passion but on wisdom. If it can no longer be imposed by force it must be based on tolerance. It is in that spirit that Belgium will continue to support the United Nations in its endeavours.

The meeting rose at 7.25 p.m.