

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**885th
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 4 October 1960,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

General debate (continued)

Speech by Mr. Podgorny (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)	373
Statement by the representative of the United Arab Republic	380
Speech by Mr. Salaam (Lebanon).	380
Speech by Mr. Averoff-Tossizza (Greece).	383

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

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. PODGORNYY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic):^{1/} The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic as a founding Member of the United Nations, has always believed that this international Organization should be the centre for co-ordination of the actions of the peoples in achieving the common aims and principles enunciated in the Charter. This is especially true of the development of friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination, respect for human rights and for freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

2. The processes going on in the changing world move to the fore the problems which are agitating the whole of humanity. Nobody invented these problems, but life itself has posed them and they coincide with the tasks of the United Nations. The fifteenth session of the General Assembly is called upon to display a great awareness of its extremely important role in settling the most urgent and acute problems of today. The importance of this session is emphasized by the fact that it is faced with the task of deeper and more responsible consideration of the proposal on general and complete disarmament [A/4505], the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [A/4502 and Corr.1] and elimination of causes which have led to the deterioration of the international situation.

3. The extremely great importance of the fifteenth session is especially stressed by the fact that many Heads of States and Governments and many statesmen enjoying the full confidence of their peoples are taking part in it. In this connexion the Ukrainian delegation, in the name of its Government and people, expresses its deep gratitude to the Government of the Soviet Union, and personally to its Head, Nikita S. Khrushchev, for the initiative of holding this session with

^{1/} Mr. Podgorny spoke in Ukrainian. The English text of his speech was supplied by the delegation.

participation by the most responsible statesmen in order to settle the most important problems concerning the destinies of the world.

4. We are heartily glad to greet the Heads of States, Governments and outstanding statesmen who responded to Nikita S. Khrushchev's appeal and headed their delegations to this international forum with the aim of constructive and business-like participation in the work of the Assembly.

5. Already we may note with satisfaction that personal participation by the Head of the Soviet Government, Nikita S. Khrushchev, and the heads of other peace-loving countries in the work of the session and their statements in the general debate were truly inspiring. They submitted very valuable proposals directed to strengthening the cause of universal peace, the liquidation of colonialism and strengthening of the authority of the United Nations.

6. The beginning of the work of this session of the Assembly was marked by the admission to United Nations membership of new States of Africa and the Mediterranean. This event once again reminds us that the disintegration of the colonial system and liberation of peoples is an irresistible and irrepressible process, the sign of the twentieth century. I take this pleasant opportunity to convey the congratulations of the Ukrainian people to the new States admitted to the United Nations and wish their peoples happiness and prosperity in conditions of complete independence.

7. There is complete unity in realization of the fact that disarmament is the most important, most acute and most urgent problem nowadays. The future of humanity will depend on its settlement: either humanity will take the path of peaceful development, or it will always fear that world disaster may start. Armed peace is always no more than a shaky armed armistice fraught with the danger of outbreak of war. The unrestrained armaments race becomes extremely dangerous, and at the same time senseless, because of the disastrous consequences which the use of modern weapons may have for the fate of humanity.

8. It is not accidental that millions of peoples the world over welcomed the proposals on general and complete disarmament submitted by the Head of the Soviet Government at the fourteenth session of the General Assembly [799th meeting] as a great act of love for peace and humanism. The General Assembly unanimously endorsed the resolution [1378 (XIV)] approving the idea of general and complete disarmament. I remind you that, in this resolution, the General Assembly considered that the question of general and complete disarmament was the most important one facing the world today, called upon Governments to make every effort to achieve a solution of this problem, and also expressed the hope that measures leading to general and complete disarmament under effective international control would be worked out in detail in

the shortest possible time. Thus the resolution, in fact, outlined a programme of actions and direction of the future disarmament negotiations.

9. Unfortunately, the year which has elapsed since the fourteenth session approved this resolution has not fulfilled the expectations of the peoples of the world. Five members of the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament, namely: the United States of America, United Kingdom, France, Canada and Italy have turned the Committee from a body for constructive negotiations and the working out of an acceptable agreement, into a body for futile talks, into a screen which they use to cover up their policy that is as far from disarmament as the sky is from the earth. The Government of the Ukraine followed the negotiations in the Ten-Nation Committee very attentively and it could not help concluding that in the course of the Geneva negotiations two principal lines were clearly revealed: the first, that of the Soviet Union and the other socialist States, was aimed at the implementation of the General Assembly resolution; the second, that of the United States of America and other Western Powers, was aimed at substituting control over armaments for disarmament and at bringing the negotiations back to the time when there was no resolution of the fourteenth session on general and complete disarmament. The United States and her partners in the Ten-Nation Committee did their utmost to bring the settlement of the disarmament problem to an impasse.

10. After the work of the Ten-Nation Committee had been wrecked, Western propaganda raised a hullabaloo about the allegedly new United States proposals which, as was alleged, could not be discussed because the socialist countries had ceased to take part in the Committee's work. In fact, the United States, in submitting its proposals of 27 June 1960,^{2/} in no way strove for general and complete disarmament in keeping with the resolution of the fourteenth session of the General Assembly. Neither are they striving for it now at this session.

11. What was the essence of these "new proposals"? Did the United States plan envisage the disbandment of the armed forces of States? No, it did not. Did it envisage the destruction and prohibition of all stockpiles and the termination of production of armaments of all kinds? Did it envisage the destruction of all means of delivery of weapons of mass extermination to their targets, the dismantling of military bases of every kind? No, it did not. Did it envisage the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of other States and their disbandment? No, no, and once more, no.

12. What did that plan really envisage? It reflected "new United States efforts", which, as Secretary of State Herter said even before the Geneva negotiations started, supplemented the United States national military programme. One can imagine in what direction international relations would develop if the socialist States accepted the highly original viewpoint of the United States Government, that the aim of the disarmament talks should be the working out of measures supplementing the national military programmes of States, i.e., in fact adding to the armaments race.

13. The sense of the "new" United States plan boils down to avoiding, at all costs, genuine general and

complete disarmament, substituting for it "control over armaments". From this position the United States did not move an inch. The President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, speaking from this rostrum [868th meeting], once again stated that it is armament that should be controlled, and not disarmament. All those present here clearly realize that the "control over armaments" formula does not envisage disarmament, that there is a wide gap between "control over armaments" and "control over disarmament".

14. Representatives of many Member States emphasized—and quite reasonably—the special responsibility which rests on the great Powers due to historic development; the choice between disarmament or the armaments race depends to a large extent on the great Powers.

15. As is known, not all the great Powers speak against disarmament. Not all the great Powers see in the armaments race a source of enrichment and profits. On the other hand, not all the great Powers agree to destroy their armaments, atom and hydrogen bombs included. If the great and mighty Soviet Union is sincerely and passionately striving for the realization of general and complete disarmament to release humanity from the danger of annihilation once and for all, the Government of the United States, on the contrary, is basing its policy on retaining atomic and hydrogen weapons—the weapons of aggression.

16. At the same time, I cannot but stress the affinity between the United States policy and that of the Federal Republic of Germany as regards the disarmament question. The ruling circles of these countries regard disarmament as an evil that must be stayed off. The Bonn militarists and "revanchists" need the atmosphere of international tensions and arms race for the implementation of their new plans of unleashing war and enslaving peoples.

17. We are witnessing the repetition of the tragic history of the period between the two world wars, when, to the accompaniment of endless arguments in the halls of the Palais de Nations in Geneva, weapons were being forged at a feverish pace in the Ruhr arsenals. In our days, in the course of the disarmament talks, the Western Powers are opening for West German militarists the door to their arsenal of rockets and nuclear weapons. While in the course of the recent Geneva negotiations Western diplomacy was looking for arguments against disarmament, the Bonn "revanchists" issued the well-known memorandum in which they demanded with impudent frankness that the Bundeswehr be equipped as soon as possible with all kinds of atomic and rocket weapons and that universal military conscription be established in the country.

18. Day by day it is becoming more evident that Western Germany is following the same path as was followed by the Germany of the Kaiser and Hitler. The revival of German militarism has always led to war, that like a raging hurricane swept many countries, including the Ukrainian land, bringing innumerable calamities in its wake. During the years of the Second World War the fascist hordes caused to our Republic damage estimated at more than 70 billion dollars. Millions of sons and daughters of the Ukraine fell in action, perished in German concentration camps, gas chambers and crematoria. By sacrificing the blood and lives of many of its sons for the sake of freedom,

the Ukrainian people won the right to demand that an end be put to the criminal policy of the revival of German militarism that is being carried out by the Western Powers and the rulers of the Federal Republic of Germany.

19. Mr. Macmillan, defending the West German "revanchists", advised us here [877th meeting] not to look back, to forget the past. He may, of course, forget completely the recent past, when the United Kingdom was repelling the cruel air raids of Hitlerite aircraft. We are sure, however, that British people will never forget the tragedy of Coventry, the barbarous bombing of London, and the lives of their sons who died fighting against Hitlerite Germany. Peoples never forget the past; they cannot ignore the lessons of history. To turn to the past is sometimes very useful, at least in order not to allow it to repeat itself. Have we the right to close our ears today to the warlike speeches of Chancellor Adenauer, to the impudent demands of the "revanchists" who throw aside all restraints, to ultimatum statements by West German Bundeswehr generals? No, we have not.

20. It is not fear that makes us speak about the revival of militarism and "revanchism" in the Federal Republic of Germany. We are not afraid of the noise made by the tramping of the new Wehrmacht soldiers' heavy boots. The Soviet Union and all the socialist countries have all that is needed to crush any aggressor in its own den. But do the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and their NATO allies realize what responsibility they are taking upon themselves in rearing German militarism in our days? It is quite evident that the policy of the so-called canalization of German militarism against socialist countries completely outlived itself long ago. Should it ever be unleashed by the Bonn "revanchists", from the very first moments atomic war with all its fury would engulf the whole world and, in the first place, those countries whose rulers with their own hands are restoring militarist Germany. That is why it is in the interests of all countries and all peoples to do everything for the elimination of this most dangerous potential hot-bed of war in the heart of Europe.

21. The fight for complete and general disarmament is at the same time the fight against the revival of West German militarism and "revanchism", which is guilty of unleashing the First and Second World Wars and of the annihilation of millions of innocent people.

22. It has already been underlined that the disintegration of the colonial system, the rise of new independent States, the achievement of freedom by the erstwhile enslaved peoples, who won the right to determine on an equal footing with others the destiny of the world, is one of the most significant hallmarks of this century.

23. There is deep meaning in the words of the President of Ghana, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, who stated from this rostrum [869th meeting] that as long as a single foot of African soil remained under foreign domination the world would know no peace.

24. It is quite true. As long as the colonial régime, which has always existed with the help of bayonets, arbitrariness and deception, is not destroyed and buried once and for all, there cannot be reaffirmed everywhere faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal

rights of men and women, and of nations large and small.

25. More than forty years ago the founder of the Soviet State, the great champion of friendship and equality of nations, V. I. Lenin, prophetically declared that peoples of the East were awakening for practical action so that every nation could help to decide the destinies of all mankind.

26. Today, wave after wave of new, fresh strength representing a great part of mankind is flowing in a mighty stream, as it were, into the world comity of equal nations. Long-awaited freedom attained in hard struggle is coming to the peoples of Asia and Africa. The history of the so-called coloured continents is ceasing to be a matter of concern to several imperialist States, which divided those continents in the past into spheres of their domination and influence.

27. However, more than 100 million people continue to languish in colonial bondage. Blood is shed by the heroic Algerian people whose only guilt is that they do not want any longer to tolerate the yoke of French colonialists but want a free life in a free and independent Algerian State. That is a lawful right of every nation. That is why all honest people extend a helping hand to the oppressed peoples fighting for their independence. That is where their genuine humanism is manifested. There is no doubt that this assistance will steadily grow until not a single colonial and dependent country is left on our planet. The Ukrainian people know what colonial oppression means. They have helped and will continue to help peoples in their struggle against colonialism and for full independence.

28. It is time to accelerate and to complete the process of the collapse of the colonial system and the liberation of all the oppressed peoples. The Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, submitted by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR for consideration by the fifteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly, is directed to the achievement of this historical necessity. This Declaration is a genuine manifesto of peoples which are freeing themselves from colonial oppression. It demands that lofty and humane ideals of equality and self-determination should be realized with respect to all nations and all peoples. However, hardly was the declaration made public when the colonialists and their advocates attacked it with an avalanche of abuse and insinuations. They are ready to extend themselves in order to find in it alleged appeals to revolt in all the colonial territories.

29. The Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Herter, was the first who "discovered" intrigues and horrors allegedly concealed in the Declaration. He imagines he sees the flame of revolts in colonies kindled by the Declaration. One may think that peace and prosperity reign in the colonies, that slaves shackled in chains of colonialism are humbly waiting for the day when the colonialists will deign to grant them freedom. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, speaking before the Assembly [880th meeting], used all his eloquence to persuade people who do not believe fairy tales that all that the Belgian colonialists were doing was just seeking means of bringing benefit to the Congolese people and of leading them to freedom and independence. Yesterday [883rd meeting] the Belgian representative made a refutation of the criticism and denunciation of the Belgian colonialists'

actions in the Congo—this time in connexion with the statement made [882nd meeting] by the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru. But it proved impossible both for him and for his Minister for Foreign Affairs to refute anything, just as it is impossible to refute the long and dark history of colonial domination in the land of the Congolese people.

30. Colonial peoples can only laugh at such statements by colonialists. The peoples who were or still are in colonial bondage know from their own bitter experience what the "benefits" of their oppressors mean. If Mr. Herter and others are so perturbed by uprisings in colonies—in other words, by the struggle of the oppressed nations against their oppressors—the best way to put an end to these disturbances is to eliminate without delay inequality and enslavement.

31. One cannot fail to recall in this connexion a remarkable novel by the classic author of Ukrainian literature, Panas Mirny, who gave a moving description of the struggle of the Ukrainian peasantry in the second half of the nineteenth century against social injustice and oppression. Depicting this struggle full of drama he gave the following very apt title to his novel: "Do the oxen low when the mangers are full?" No, the oxen do not low when the mangers are full. Let us eliminate colonialism and then these gentlemen, the colonialists, will not be haunted by the fears of uprisings of the colonial peoples.

32. In making attempts to cover up the traces of their crimes against the colonial peoples, the colonialists bend every effort to present to the eyes of the world public as a great humane act on the part of the colonial Powers their forced concessions to the oppressed countries. They advertise their economic aid to under-developed countries as a fatherly concern for the peoples who have attained political independence. Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, who spoke here recently [877th meeting], gave some data which in his opinion should prove how much more humane towards the economically under-developed countries the capitalist countries are in comparison with the socialist countries. He said that the aid rendered to the under-developed countries by the United States of America, the United Kingdom and other capitalist countries is greater than that rendered by the socialist States.

33. First and foremost, it is necessary to stress that in the matter of granting economic aid one cannot put those who do not participate and who never participated in the exploitation of the colonial countries on the same level with those who continue without a twinge of conscience to extort the riches from the under-developed countries. It would be lawful and just, as has been said here, if foreign exploiters returned at least part of those riches which they accumulated from the exploitation of the oppressed peoples so that, returned to the under-developed countries in the form of aid, they could be used for the development of their economy and culture and for the raising of the standard of living of the people.

34. In order to understand how far from reality Mr. Macmillan's assertions are, it is necessary to look into the real meaning of the notion of "economic aid" of a capitalist State to an under-developed country. Mr. Macmillan painstakingly passes over in silence the undeniable fact that capitalist "benefactors", in granting aid to one or another country, are interested

in two things: on the one hand, in maximum profit from their investments, and, on the other hand, in how strongly this aid attaches the under-developed country to the capitalist chariot.

35. It is doubtful whether the most authoritative organs of statistics could count up all the incalculable wealth pumped by the colonial Powers out of the enslaved countries, and those countless resources which are being pumped out of the under-developed countries to this day. What fairy-tale ruler from the *Thousand and One Nights* could dare to compare his treasures with those riches which have been pumped out from dependent and under-developed countries by capitalist monopolies? What is called today by the United States of America, United Kingdom and other capitalist countries "economic aid to the under-developed countries" is actually only a miserable pittance in comparison with the profits received by them from the exploitation of those countries. And I make no mention of the grief, tears, and sweat of the colonial peoples, or of the terrible poverty inherited from colonial brigandage. I shall not dwell on the fact that the programme of economic aid, about which Mr. Eisenhower, Mr. Macmillan and some other representatives of the capitalist world spoke from this rostrum, does not envisage the creation in under-developed countries of a strong and independent national economy, whereas that precisely is the real basis of healthy and rapid prosperity of a country.

36. It is asserted that one of the effective means of assistance to under-developed countries is a stimulation of foreign capital investments. But is it so in reality? During the period 1950-1958 the United States increased private direct investments in economically under-developed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America by \$4.1 billion, but they imported from those countries in the form of profits \$11.3 billion. Thus in the course of some nine years the United States of America has received \$7.2 billion—a huge sum which is a net deduction from the national wealth of under-developed countries. Another example. According to the data of the Bank of England, capital investments of the United Kingdom in the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland at the end of 1956 totaled 130 million pounds sterling. For the year, the interests and dividends on these investments totaled 17.7 million pounds sterling. The nominal joint-stock capital alone of 44.8 million pounds sterling gave 14.8 million in dividends, which means that the rate of profit was 33 per cent; in some companies the rate of profit exceeds 50 per cent. Is that not robbery in broad daylight? If it is not, then what is it?

37. No. If the colonialists wish to be the benefactors of under-developed countries, let them return everything they have taken by robbery, or at least a part of those riches which they have squeezed and continue to squeeze out of them. Let them grant such aid as would promote the creation of economic independence of the peoples that have got rid of oppression. Let them cut the greedy tentacles of the monopolies stretching out toward the young bodies of the peoples striving for a free life. Otherwise the peoples would not believe either Mr. Eisenhower, or Mr. Macmillan, in spite of all the many honeyed speeches they may deliver here.

38. As to the socialist countries, they have always sincerely wished to aid economically under-developed countries. Nobody, even our greatest enemy can charge

that the socialist countries, in rendering assistance, try to make economic or political capital. Our only aim, corresponding to our ideas and aspirations, consists in helping under-developed countries to liquidate as soon as possible the heavy inheritance of colonialism, to create the prerequisites for their quick economic and cultural development. All the forms of assistance granted to the under-developed countries through the United Nations, should be directed to the fulfilment of the aim of final and speedy liquidation of the colonial régimes.

39. Life persistently demands the elimination of colonialism everywhere, after which friendly relations among all the peoples will develop wherever there burn at present the flames of anti-colonial struggle. The way to achieve this consists in approving and putting into practice the noble provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, submitted by the Government of the Soviet Union.

40. All of us are deeply concerned about the developments in the Congo (Leopoldville), the more so as the tension of the situation in this Republic is being connected with the name of the United Nations, and, consequently, directly concerns each of its Members. However, the Government of the Ukraine is not inclined to put the blame for the existing alarming situation in the Congo on the United Nations as a whole, since the colonial Powers and those who support them are only a part of the United Nations Organization.

41. It is necessary to point out that it is on behalf of this part that the United Nations Secretary-General acted, as a faithful servant of the imperialist Powers. It was he who covered up the disgraceful deeds of the colonialists in the Congo with the name of the United Nations. It was he who gave instructions to use the United Nations Force not for rendering help to the lawful Government of the Republic of the Congo in establishing order in the country but for the persecution of the lawful Government and the lawful Parliament of this young Republic. It was he who assisted the colonialists in conducting the policy of dismembering the country and came out as an accomplice of the dissenters acting in the interests of big foreign monopolists. Replying here to the just charges, Mr. Hammarskjöld stated on 26 September 1960 [871st meeting] that in putting into practice the decisions of the Security Council in regard to the Congo, he was guided by what he described as "my own conviction". All his actions speak more eloquently than words about the nature of these convictions of the Secretary-General and about whose interests they serve.

42. Our charges against the Secretary-General are not without proof; they are based on undeniable facts. I would invite the Assembly to pay special attention to such an important and authoritative document as a memorandum [A/4518] of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Republic of the Congo which was recently received by the General Assembly. This memorandum openly says that:

"... wrongful interference by United Nations officials in the political affairs of the Congo has long paralysed the country's legislative and executive organs, thus plunging the country into anarchy"; that the United Nations Organization

"... is preventing the legal Government from accomplishing the task of safeguarding the unity of the country and of restoring order".

43. In this document the Congolese Parliament requests that the United Nations should co-operate solely with the legal Government of Patrice Lumumba, the powers of which were confirmed twice by the Congolese Senate and the House of Representatives.

44. The document quoted by me is a serious charge against Mr. Hammarskjöld, by whose actions the honour of our Organization has been soiled. The Congolese memorandum is an indictment of the colonialists and their protectors, who crushed democratic order in the Congo and disgraced, with the help of Mr. Hammarskjöld, the United Nations Organization, which is called upon to defend firmly the interests of the peoples freeing themselves from the colonial yoke.

45. The just condemnation at this session of the General Assembly of the Secretary-General's "activities" caused a hysterically sharp reaction on the part of the United States. In response to the constructive proposals made before the Assembly [869th meeting] by the Head of the Soviet Government, N. S. Khrushchev, which are aimed at the strengthening of the United Nations executive organs and the elimination of the one-sidedness in their functioning, the Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, hastened to declare that these proposals were "a general attack, a declaration of war against the structure, personnel and the location of the United Nations". Mr. Herter alleges that the Soviet Union is trying to undermine the United Nations by resorting to fabrications.

46. But let us impartially look at the facts, at the real situation obtaining in the executive bodies of the United Nations. The structure of the United Nations Secretariat was established fifteen years ago in historical conditions that radically differ from those of our time. Today it clearly fails to correspond to new demands. The present United Nations Secretariat finds itself in a position when its actions run counter to the interests of many of the countries represented in the United Nations, and this is due both to the imperfection of the Secretariat structure and to the specific selection of its personnel.

47. I should like to cite here certain data which show by what principles the Secretary-General was guided in recruiting his staff. Article 101 of the United Nations Charter directly states that in the staffing of the United Nations bodies due regard should be paid to the recruiting of personnel on as wide a geographical basis as possible. In fact, this requirement, so important from the point of view of principle, is flouted most flagrantly.

48. Beginning with the Offices of the Secretary-General, the staff consists mainly of persons pursuing the policy of Western countries. At present, about 1,170 officials selected under the principle of geographical distribution are working in the United Nations Secretariat. Of these, 800 officials, that is about 65 per cent, are citizens of the United States and of the United States' allies in the military blocs, while the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other socialist countries have only eighty-four officials, neutral Asian countries about ninety officials; that is, each group of these countries has about 7 per cent of the total number of officials, and the countries of Africa have thirty-two officials, approximately 3 per cent. The Government of the Ukrainian SSR considers it inadmissible that there are only two citizens of our Republic in the United Nations Secretariat, though the

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Ukrainian SSR has repeatedly made representations on that score to the Secretary-General.

49. United States nationals in the United Nations occupy sixty higher posts, the United Kingdom nationals, thirty-two. At the same time, fifty-six countries of the world, including Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Mexico, and Afghanistan, are barred from any form of participation in the United Nations administration. It is not without reason that people say that the majority of the United Nations Secretariat bodies have been turned in fact into branches of the United States State Department.

50. Or let us consider such a question as United Nations technical assistance. Last year, for instance, of 2,291 experts sent to various countries, 1,420 were sent from the NATO countries. The Soviet Union's share was forty experts and that of other socialist countries, only twelve.

51. What do these facts show? They show that the United Nations administrative body preserved the correlation of forces that existed many years ago, that the Western Powers have for all emergencies such positions as will enable them to pursue their own line, acting in the name of the United Nations. Finally, these facts testify to the fact that there exists a situation in which the United Nations administrative body can act, and does act, against the will of the peoples, translating into reality the interests of one group of States bound by the ties of military and political blocs.

52. So it follows that the question of changing the structure of the Secretariat, in accordance with the new correlation of forces in the world and the task confronting the United Nations, has already matured and calls for a solution. That is why the Ukrainian delegation fully supports the proposal on the changes of the Secretariat's structure, on establishing the offices of three United Nations Secretaries in accordance with the present correlation of forces and on determining a new Headquarters for the United Nations. Without the United Nations Secretariat's structure being changed, we shall not be able successfully to solve the major problem of our time, the problem of disarmament, which by nature acquires a particularly strict co-ordination of actions in the interests of all nations and not of one group of States. Without this, we cannot ensure the effectiveness of the United Nations and we shall doom our Organization to futility in the solution of the most pressing questions of international life.

53. Yesterday's statement [883rd meeting] by Mr. Hammarskjöld made in reply to the criticism of his activities reaffirms once again the fact that the Secretary-General is ready, as before, to remain in future in the service, not of the United Nations, but of a certain group of States whose policy runs counter to the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations, set forth in the Charter. This leads us to the conclusion that so long as the executive power of the United Nations machinery is concentrated in the hands of Mr. Hammarskjöld, it will not be able to function normally and efficiently, and it will be deprived of international character, to the detriment of the United Nations itself.

54. Many of those who have spoken here have noted with regret that international tension has lately grown

in the world as a result of the aggressive acts of the United States imperialist circles, with the knowledge and approval of the United States President.

55. The flights of the U-2 and RB-47 aircraft into the Soviet air space for spying and reconnaissance purposes have shown that the maintenance of friendship with States and respect for their sovereignty are thrown overboard by the ruling circles of the United States, which regard them as obsolete and unnecessary norms of law. Instead of this, a conception of the deliberate and carefully planned undermining of the lawful basis of international relations was advanced. The Ukrainian Government regards acts based on violation of the principle of sovereignty of States as a most dangerous expression of the policy of the position of strength. The slightest connivance with or lenience towards the aggressive acts of American military and diplomatic circles may lead the world to the disaster of war.

56. It is our duty to condemn the aggressive acts of the United States directed against international security; it is the call of conscience and justice. Such condemnation would be received by all the peoples as a curb to the frantic and impudent violators of foreign frontiers, whose manoeuvres are particularly dangerous in this age of atomic weapons. This is all the more necessary since disregard of the sovereignty of other States, proclaimed by Washington, is manifested in various forms in the foreign policy of the United States.

57. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic deems it its duty to state before the General Assembly that the responsible officials of the United States continue to pursue a policy of interference in the internal affairs of the Ukrainian people, as well as of other peoples of the socialist countries. Although the Ukraine signed the United Nations Charter on equal terms with the United States as a sovereign and free State, the official bodies of the United States, including Congress, systematically carry on the campaign of slander against the Ukrainian State, using for these purposes Hitlerite riff-raff who have perpetrated crimes against the Ukrainian people. Some members of the United States Congress, who apparently are not too busy with State affairs, deliver "moving" speeches, using the same mimeographed crib concerning the so-called "week of captive nations" or "the day of Ukraine's independence" by which they mean "independence" brought on German bayonets.

58. These cheap masquerades arouse the indignation of the 42 million Ukrainian people. They also affect the deep feelings of love for their mother Ukraine among the working Ukrainian emigrants who live in the United States and Canada and they insult their national dignity, since for all of us Ukrainians the Soviet Ukraine is an embodiment of free life and real independence.

59. The rude and slanderous statement made in the General Assembly by Mr. Diefenbaker, the Prime Minister of Canada, has also aroused profound indignation among the Ukrainian people and wide circles of the Ukrainian emigrants. Our delegation has received many letters not only from the Ukraine, but also from the Ukrainian emigrants in the United States and Canada, containing expressions of resolute protest against this affront.

60. Listening to Mr. Diefenbaker's statement [871st meeting] one can think that he has apparently mis-

taken the audience of such a high international forum as the United Nations for a dozen shouters who picket the delegations which arrive here to attend the session, or for the NATO Council, where anything can be said that has an anti-Soviet character. Be this as it may, it is precisely the United Nations rostrum that the Canadian Premier has chosen for unseemly attacks on the peoples of a number of States Members of the United Nations, including the Ukraine. He tried to pose almost as the "liberator" of the Ukrainian people, and this is not his first attempt. But he looked, if you will excuse me, simply absurd and ridiculous. He rather looked like a man who had been sleeping during the last forty years and now, as we say in the Ukraine, he cannot get either through the fence or through the gate.

61. And if he wants to have a simple lesson in history, I can inform him that many years have already elapsed since the Ukrainian people liberated themselves from capitalist slavery. As far back as 1917, they rose together with the other peoples of the former Czarist Russia in the great socialist revolution, and drove both their native and foreign oppressors out of their country. Having taken power in their hands, the workers and peasants of the Ukraine, by their heroic labour, of which only a free nation is capable, have built within a short period of history the beautiful and strong Ukraine, within the friendly and fraternal family of socialist nations, which is a matter of pride not only for the population of our Republic, but for every honest Ukrainian wherever he may live.

62. The economy of the Ukraine surpasses the economy, I would say, of several such countries as Canada. According to the level of industrial and agricultural development, the Ukraine is among the most advanced countries of the world. We have surpassed the United States in the per caput production of steel, pig iron, and iron ore, as well as of some other industrial and agricultural produce. The country which in the past was illiterate has become a republic of highly developed culture, of advanced science and technology. The number of students in the Ukrainian schools of higher education is equal to that in such schools in the United Kingdom, France, Spain, Sweden and Austria taken together, and ten times more than that in such schools in Canada. A whole army of scientists, who have made a great contribution to the solving of important scientific problems in the creation of artificial earth satellites, space ships, etc., are working in 500 scientific research establishments. Is it not clear that an oppressed nation cannot achieve such full prosperity of its land as has been achieved by the people of the Soviet Ukraine?

63. Indisputable facts of modern history show that, wherever socialism comes to replace the old, obsolete and unjust system of capitalism, the system of oppression and exploitation of man, people become really free and attain achievements in all the spheres of life which cannot but be recognized by every impartial person.

64. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is a free and equal member of the mighty family of the Soviet Republics and we need neither help nor care of self-styled trustees.

65. If Mr. Diefenbaker is really anxious to "take care" of the peoples and to "liberate" them from the economic and political domination of other Powers, he need not go very far. His own country could be-

come a good field for precisely such activities on the part of the Prime Minister.

66. I want to stress here that the Ukraine is a peace-loving country and that our people and Government want to live in peace and friendship with all nations, including the Canadian nation, a considerable part of which consists of the Ukrainian emigrants. Having left their motherland in the hard times of the domination of Russian Czarism and the Austro-Hungarian empire in the Ukrainian lands, the Ukrainian emigrants have made a great contribution to the economic and cultural development of Canada. This fact should but promote friendly relations between the Canadian and Ukrainian peoples. We hope that this will be so.

67. The present session of the General Assembly should use its great opportunities to justify the hopes of the peoples and make a positive contribution to the solution of pressing international problems, to facilitate the general improvement of the international situation, to translate into reality the noble ideas of peaceful co-existence.

68. We cannot but see that flagrant attacks continue against the idea of peaceful co-existence of States with differing social and economic systems. But we see as well that this idea has won wide support among the peoples of the world today. It is beyond any doubt that humanity will highly appreciate the United Nations if it does not spare its efforts for the triumph of the principles of peaceful co-existence among all peoples and States.

69. As Nikita S. Khrushchev, the Head of the Soviet Government, said, we know that all peoples want peace, the American people included. But it will not suffice only to wish. This wish should be substantiated by active actions. Now it is more important than ever before to sharpen the vigilance of peoples, to expose the manoeuvres of the aggressive forces, to seek that the principles of peaceful co-existence should become a genuine basis in relations between States with differing social systems.

70. I do not think that there is a single statesman who realizes his responsibilities who would not share these views.

71. The peoples are demanding from their Governments and responsible statesmen that the saddled cold war horses should be hobbled, that preponderance should be given to common sense, that all the energy and skill of statesmen should be directed to finding constructive ways of securing lasting peace.

72. The Assembly, in my opinion, could be compared with an X-ray penetrating the whole complicated international situation, the actions and aspirations of States and Governments. The General Assembly has devoted not a few busy days to important political discussions. It appears that there is a different approach to questions in one way or another pertaining to the idea of peace and peaceful co-existence. Some people submit to the Assembly constructive proposals calling for close attention, others add such "problems" for us as the so-called "Question of Hungary" provoking the cold war. Some propose that measures should be taken to put an end to the colonial system once and for all; others, by exerting pressure, are trying to side-track the Assembly from the solution of vital questions of life. Some propose measures to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations; others respond

with shrieks about "the United Nations crisis", about a "war" allegedly declared on the United Nations, thus hoping to mislead and agitate the world public.

73. It is noteworthy that the United States delegation and those of other leading NATO countries up to now have been doing everything to belittle the significance of the present session of the Assembly, to hinder its fruitful activities and "prove" the uselessness of Heads of State and Government participating in its work. But in doing so they only show that the Governments of these States are seeking to keep away the United Nations and its supreme body, the General Assembly, from discussing and solving essential world problems. That it is so is graphically shown by the fact that the Western Powers refuse to discuss in the plenary meetings the questions of disarmament and the abolition of colonialism, the most important problems of today, putting forward at the same time the far-fetched and provocative proposals like the "questions" of Hungary and Tibet. The lack of any serious constructive proposals on the part of the delegations of the Western Powers and at the same time their desire to hamper discussion by the Assembly of the very important and really urgent questions put on the agenda by the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries—that is the position of these Powers at the present session which exposes them before the whole world as the opponents of refreshing the international atmosphere, consolidation of peace and security of peoples.

74. Speaking today in the general political debate, I wish to state categorically that the Ukrainian SSR will never assent to the flagrant violation of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China. Indeed, it is obvious to everyone that until the 650 million-strong Chinese people are represented in the United Nations, the Organization will not be able to solve successfully the most important international problems and cannot be considered a really representative world organization. Our delegation intends to make a more detailed statement on this question during the discussion of the agenda of this session. We also resolutely favour the admission to United Nations membership of the Mongolian People's Republic.

75. The way to mutual understanding, to the triumph of the peaceful aspirations of humanity, requires great courage, restraint and wise persistency that overcomes all obstacles in its way. We, the people who have gathered here, must clearly realize this and do our utmost, so that our practical decisions and deeds pave the way and help peoples in their advance.

76. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, speaking here in favour of the proposals contributing to the preservation of international peace, acts in accordance with its instructions from the Ukrainian people. Our people wish that the only master of the world may be creative labour, that man may live and improve himself in peace and freedom—the only conditions worthy of our great age. We are convinced that the United Nations can do much to make the brightest hopes of peoples come true. This aim is worthy of effort and it is this effort that we are calling upon all the participants of the present session to make.

Mr. Nesbitt (Canada), Vice-President, took the chair.

77. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Arab Republic in exercise of the right of reply.

78. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic): On behalf of the delegation of the United Arab Republic, I ask leave to say a few words in relation to parts of the statement made yesterday [882nd meeting] from this rostrum by King Hussein of Jordan.

79. It is a regrettable moment indeed when one feels impelled at this time of extreme world tension and crisis to take even a fraction of a minute of the Assembly's time in connexion with unwarranted, uncorroborated and fantastic wholesale accusations. I am therefore confining myself to reaffirmation of my Government's determination to pursue, undaunted and undistracted by any noises of false allegations, its work of constructiveness for the welfare, the happiness and the honour of its people in brotherly and full co-operation with all the Arabs as well as with all the peoples of good will throughout the world.

80. Mr. SALAAM (Lebanon): The General Assembly of the United Nations is now convened at a moment of crisis in world history. The leaders of nations, both great and small, have come together, to debate the crucial issues of our time, and to seek solutions for the main problems facing the United Nations. I have come to represent Lebanon in this historic debate and to present the views of my Government on what we consider to be the most important questions confronting our region and the world at large.

81. Lebanon is a small country. Its economic and military strength is negligible compared to that of the big countries, not to mention the giant nuclear Powers. But I take pride in speaking for little Lebanon, which, together with other small nations, has an important role to play in the Organization. We, the small and uncommitted nations, can perhaps take a more objective view of the world situation. We are disinterested in our attitude towards conflicts among the great Powers, and in this respect, we have no particular axe to grind. We can judge international issues with comparatively greater detachment and impartiality. In a sense the small and uncommitted nations can be said to represent the unbiased conscience of humanity.

82. The old world balance of power is gone. As a result of the nuclear stalemate between the great Powers today, there is a new balance in the world. This new balance requires the great Powers, in spite of their military and economic might, to give full consideration to world public opinion. There is no better representation of this world public opinion than the voice of the small and uncommitted nations present in this Assembly. In the new equilibrium of power, the small and uncommitted nations occupy a potentially decisive position. This lays a great responsibility on them, a responsibility to stand by what is right, and to promote freedom, justice and peace in the world.

83. I take this opportunity to welcome wholeheartedly the sixteen new small nations which have just been admitted to the Organization. I extend to them my warmest congratulations. They have attained the position of equality with other States Members of the United Nations to which they are entitled. They have an important part to play in furthering United Nations efforts to promote economic and social progress and to preserve international peace. In order to enable them to play their full part, however, they, together with other nations of Asia and Africa, should be given adequate representation on both the Security Council

and the Economic and Social Council. It is imperative in our view, that the membership of these two Councils be increased in order to allow the nations of Asia and Africa to participate fully in the political, economic and social activities of the Organization.

84. But the new Member States have not only acquired certain rights and opportunities. They have, like the other small nations, also assumed important responsibilities. Their foremost responsibility, which is shared by all the small nations and which fully corresponds with their desire, is to respect and uphold the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations as set forth in the Charter.

85. For my part, I wish to reaffirm, in the most emphatic terms, Lebanon's loyalty to the principles of the United Nations. We give our firm support for all action by the United Nations directed towards the maintenance of international peace, based on justice, and the promotion of social and economic progress.

86. The small nations need the United Nations just as the United Nations needs the small nations. In its eagerness for development and progress, Lebanon needs peace and stability in the world. The United Nations is our hope for world peace. We will co-operate with other Member States in strengthening its authority and prestige. We will persist in our efforts to make it a more effective instrument for international harmony and world development. We will continue to act through the United Nations, seeking to reduce international tensions, to end the cold war and to banish the spectre of nuclear war. Our faith in the United Nations remains as complete as our dedication to the principles of liberty and justice embodied in the Charter. We do not despair of the United Nations. We cannot afford to.

87. We have supported United Nations action in the Congo (Leopoldville), undertaken with a view to restoring law and order and assisting the Republic of the Congo in safeguarding its independence, unity and territorial integrity. Lebanon was a sponsor of the resolution [1474 (ES-IV)] proposed by seventeen African and Asian States and adopted by the fourth emergency special session of the General Assembly. Whatever the difficulties encountered in the past, we believe we should give support to the Secretary-General in his efforts to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. We hope that the leaders of the sovereign Congolese Republic will resolve their internal conflicts and will co-operate with the United Nations, whose task is to help them establish normal conditions for peaceful development.

88. Lebanon follows a policy of neutrality between the two great Power blocs. This policy was proclaimed as a national policy at the very outset of our independence in 1943. It was an integral part of our national Constitution, and was formulated upon the proclamation of the independence of Lebanon. We believe that our policy of neutrality can best serve the interests of international peace and justice. We do not wish to get involved in the power struggle between world military blocs. Nor do we wish to suffer from the chills of the cold war. Our neutrality stems from a genuine and sincere desire to maintain relations of friendship with all peace-loving nations. Apart from our membership in the League of Arab States and the United Nations, we have no other commitments.

89. In 1945 Lebanon signed the Pact of the League of Arab States. By this covenant, Lebanon is pledged to the maintenance of close and brotherly ties with the neighbouring Arab States. Our solidarity with our Arab brethren serves the interests of regional peace and contributes to the social and economic development of the Arab world.

90. Two years ago, Lebanon passed through a severe crisis, which was brought before the United Nations. While appreciative of the help rendered by the Organization, I wish to affirm most emphatically that the independence of Lebanon and its territorial integrity were, and still are, first and foremost, preserved and safeguarded by the united will of its own people. The independence and integrity of Lebanon are also guaranteed by both the Pact of the Arab League and the Charter of the United Nations. Furthermore, I am confident that, if ever the security or integrity of Lebanon were threatened, Lebanon could always count on the solidarity and help of the other Arab countries, in conformity with the Arab mutual defence treaty.^{3/}

91. In our support of the United Nations, we should never forget that the Organization cannot succeed in ensuring peace and stability without justice. We are constantly reminded, in this regard, of the great injustice committed by the United Nations in its 1947 resolution [181 (II)] partitioning Palestine against the expressed wishes of the majority of its people. The grave consequences of that decision are still with us today and will certainly remain until justice is done. The peace and stability of the Middle East have been impaired, and great suffering has been inflicted on a million Arab refugees who have been forced to leave their country, homes and belongings. Conscious, no doubt, of the injustice done to the Arabs, the United Nations Assembly, by its resolution of 11 December 1948 [194 (III)], decided that the Palestine refugees should be allowed to return to their homes. This decision was subsequently reaffirmed in repeated resolutions. But twelve years after that decision was taken, and in spite of its repeated reaffirmations by the United Nations, the refugees are still living in misery, away from their homeland, because Israel continues to defy this resolution, as well as other resolutions relating to the Palestine question.

92. Many of these refugees, we must remember, live across the border, at a stone's throw from their own homes and fields. They can see, with anguish and alarm, Zionist immigrants recruited from the four corners of the earth occupying their homes and cultivating their ancestral fields.

93. Let me make it unmistakably clear that the Arab countries distinguish between Judaism and Zionism. For the former we have the deep reverence and respect with which we regard all the religions of the world, but the latter we consider not only as an enemy of the Arab peoples but as a constant threat to regional stability and as a danger to world peace.

94. The face which Zionism presents to the Arab world is very different from that which is seen by the rest of the world. The basic attitude of Zionism to the Arabs as human beings, the long history of Zionist political and military opportunism, the tenets of Zionist ideology—all these do not augur well for the future. Perhaps the most explosive aspect of Zionist ideology

^{3/} Treaty of Joint Defence and Economic Co-operation between the Arab League States, signed at Cairo, 17 June 1950.

is the policy of unlimited Zionist immigration into Palestine. Everyone familiar with the sad and tragic story of the Palestine problem since the First World War knows the disruptive impact of unlimited Zionist immigration.

95. The declared policy of the World Zionist Organization is that of the "in-gathering of the exiles". I use their words. That is to say, it aims at emptying the Jews of the so-called Diaspora of "Dispersion" into Israel. In other words, it aims at the artificial uprooting of established Jewish communities in every part of the world in order to swell the ranks of the Israel population in Palestine. This, to say the least, is a patently mischievous policy to follow. The primary motivation is politico-strategic, rather than humanitarian. It can only end in disaster. We must realize that every single emigrant added to the population of an already congested country is a new explosive element that threatens the security and stability of the whole area.

96. The United Nations is called upon to help in this problem. The hapless Jewish emigrants are not pawns in the hands of the World Zionist Organization, to be cynically used for the furtherance of the territorial ambitions of Israel and the accentuation of world tension. They are entitled to a quiet and happy existence in countries large enough, prosperous enough, and secure enough to afford them the opportunities of normal and peaceful livelihood.

97. One must regretfully admit that the United Nations has failed to ensure peace with justice in Palestine. The responsibility of the United Nations in this respect is all the greater because it was in the teeth of opposition by the majority of the inhabitants of Palestine that the United Nations saw fit to pass the partition resolution, establishing Israel on the territory of the Arab State of Palestine. Yet even this resolution, involving as it did grievous wrong to the Arabs of Palestine, the United Nations was unable to implement. This failure of the United Nations is directly attributable to Israel's defiance of the resolutions of the General Assembly on the Palestine question and the regrettable acquiescence of the United Nations in this defiance. We cannot hope to preserve, as we sincerely wish, the prestige, and to strengthen the authority, of the United Nations, as long as these basic resolutions are not put into execution. The Palestine problem cries out for a just solution. Without such a solution there can be no hope for permanent peace and stability in the Middle East.

98. The Algerian problem likewise awaits a just solution, in accordance with the principles set forth in the United Nations Charter. For the past six years a tragic war has been going on in Algeria with no sign of early settlement. It is causing untold suffering and great losses to both sides. The Algerian people are making immense sacrifices in their heroic struggle for national liberation. Hundreds of thousands of Algerians have given their lives in this struggle. Furthermore, over a million and a half Algerian men, women and children have been forcibly removed from their homes and villages and regrouped in new areas where they suffer great hardships. There are, finally, more than 300,000 Algerian refugees in neighbouring Tunisia and Morocco.

99. This is a senseless war, that should now be stopped, especially after both parties have accepted

the basis of a solution to the Algerian problem. In his declaration of 16 September 1959, General de Gaulle recognized the principle of self-determination as the only basis for a just and lasting solution. In spite of its previous insistence on independence, the provisional government of the Algerian Republic responded by agreeing to this principle. The provisional government represents the national aspirations of the Algerian people and is leading its heroic struggle for liberation. It is the only authority capable of ordering the cessation of hostilities in Algeria. It has expressed its willingness to negotiate on the conditions of application of the principle of self-determination, and the terms of a cease-fire.

100. The provisional government of the Algerian Republic has been unjustly accused of desiring to negotiate on the future of Algeria. The truth is, however, that the provisional government is willing to leave that future to be decided by the Algerian people itself. All it insists on is, that the people's decision should be completely free. It therefore asks that before the cease-fire is ordered, there should be agreement on the conditions under which a free vote would be held. It frankly has no confidence in the impartiality of the authorities who will conduct the vote. After six years of terrible war and enormous sacrifices, the Algerian patriots will not lay down their arms before they make sure that the Algerian people will be able to choose their political future by a free vote. It is to ensure such freedom that the provisional government of the Algerian Republic is asking for negotiations on the guarantees necessary for the true application of the principle of self-determination. Surely no one will seriously suggest that the French authorities will organize a free vote in Algeria.

101. As the French Government has been unwilling to negotiate on the conditions of a free vote to implement the right of self-determination, the provisional government of the Republic of Algeria has lately requested that the United Nations should organize and supervise the voting by the Algerian people. Indeed, this is a reasonable request. The United Nations should be charged with the responsibility of ensuring the freedom of the Algerian referendum. For it is to the interest of France, of Algeria, and of the whole world, that there should be no doubt in anyone's mind as to the true choice of the people of Algeria. France has no reason to doubt the impartiality of the United Nations. Nor does any Member State, France included, have any reason to reject the assistance of the United Nations in bringing to an end the only war in the world today.

102. France has been justly praised for its wisdom in agreeing to the right of self-determination, and therefore to the independence of many new African nations that were admitted to membership of the United Nations on the first day of this session of the Assembly. Algeria, which is certainly no less qualified for independence, is the only African country remaining under French colonial rule. How can France persist in the colossal error of maintaining its rule in Algeria by force against the wishes of its people? There are some Frenchmen who claim that the majority of Algerians desire association with France. They should honourably accept the challenge to submit the question of determining the freely-expressed wishes of the Algerian people to the impartiality of the United Nations. The General Assembly is called upon,

at this session, to take a clear and firm decision on the Algerian question, so as to enable the people of Algeria to exercise their right to self-determination and bring peace to that strife-torn land.

103. Algeria, no less than the other colonial countries of Africa, will win its struggle for independence. It is in vain to try and arrest, at the borders of Algeria, the rising tide of African freedom. The whole of Africa will be free and we shall soon welcome an independent Algeria as a Member of the United Nations.

104. There are other areas in the Arab world which are still under some form or other of colonial domination. I wish to mention Oman and other territories in the southern part of the Arabian Peninsula, where Arabs are prevented by force from exercising their right to self-determination. I am sure their struggle for freedom will soon be rewarded, and colonialism will be banished for ever from the Arab world—indeed, from the whole world.

105. With the end of colonialism already in sight, the next aim of human progress should be the ending of mass poverty, deprivation and misery in the world. The great majority of the inhabitants of the earth suffer from hunger, ignorance and disease. They lack even the barest necessities of life. But they will not continue to accept their sufferings for long. They already know that their misery is not immutable; with the help of modern science and technology they can and will improve their conditions of life. They will strive to overcome their poverty by all the means at their disposal. They will even fight in order to achieve freedom from want.

106. But the means available to the under-developed countries, and particularly the newly-emerging nations of Africa and Asia, are limited indeed. As they emerge from long centuries of economic and social stagnation and colonial exploitation, they find that they lack the resources in capital and technology necessary to attain a reasonably rapid rate of economic development. Without such rapid economic growth, their increased production will hardly keep pace with their increasing population. In order to be able to raise the living standard of their peoples within a reasonable time, they need substantial technical and financial aid from the wealthier and more advanced nations.

107. This world problem of development is a great challenge to the United Nations. Its solution is essential to the long-term maintenance of international peace and stability. The rich industrial nations cannot afford to ignore their responsibility for helping the less advanced nations which are striving to raise their living standards.

108. The inequality in wealth and productive power between different nations is very great indeed. The wide gap which separates the developed from the under-developed countries is growing wider all the time. The rich are rapidly getting richer, while the poor are hardly able to reduce their poverty. This situation cannot last long. Unless it is remedied, the whole world will be in perpetual danger of revolutionary and eruptive explosions. It is to the interest of all nations, co-operating through the United Nations, to prevent such explosions, with their incalculable consequences for world peace and stability. The advanced nations who are devoting vast resources to armaments can surely afford to give greater aid for the economic and social development of the under-developed countries.

109. A future historian may one day look back and comment on the double folly of the arms race in our time. There is, on the one hand, the folly of two competing military blocs piling up enormous quantities of terribly destructive weapons without either bloc increasing its relative security. No one can pretend that either of the two Power blocs, with all the hydrogen bombs and rockets they have accumulated, feels more secure today than it felt five or ten years ago. There is, on the other hand, the folly of wasting immense resources on arms when so much is needed for improving the living conditions of humanity. It can scarcely be considered rational for man to spend so many times more for war, destruction and death than for peace, construction and life.

110. The arms race is not only foolish, but dangerous. If it continues, the chances of the outbreak of a nuclear war of annihilation will greatly increase. The great Powers must, in the interests of self-preservation and the preservation of mankind, agree among themselves on a programme of controlled and complete disarmament.

111. We, the small nations, have little influence in bringing the arms race to an end and bringing about controlled general disarmament. We can only urge the great Powers to persevere in their efforts to that end. We beseech them to negotiate an agreement on disarmament before it is too late. In so doing, we are simply giving expression to the fears and hopes of all men throughout the world.

112. This fifteenth session of the General Assembly has a wonderful opportunity for taking a firm step forward on the road to disarmament. The great leaders of nations gathered in this Assembly cannot, and should not, disappoint the hopes of men everywhere that the danger of war be banished and the opportunities of peaceful development be enjoyed by all peoples.

113. At this historic moment of decision, may the great leaders here assembled rise to the occasion and realize the full measure of their responsibility to their own nations, as well as to all mankind.

114. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) (translated from French): The atmosphere in which the fifteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly opened and, still more, the atmosphere in which our work has at times taken place, has not been comforting. I am very much afraid that the anxiety and pessimism which have been almost universal for the past few months have in no way been dissipated but have rather been exacerbated as the result of our labours.

115. If, as I believe, this is true, we have failed in our duty. The United Nations reflects and has undoubtedly always reflected world tensions, but it is equally true that the United Nations has always helped to diminish these tensions, to encourage reconciliation and to solve very serious problems. If for the first time it is to change its functions and, if, instead of a home where the presence of the whole family helps to calm tempers, we are to make of it an arena where tempers are unleashed and are intensified by loud-speakers reaching to every part of the globe, then we shall have set the United Nations on the road to decline and bankruptcy, for I wonder how many of us would retain our confidence in and, consequently, remain faithful, to an Organization in which, instead of comfort, we found uneasiness, and in which, instead

of understanding and reconciliation, we found only an intensification of differences and antagonisms.

116. There are certain fundamental truths which it would be well for us to remember. The Organization was founded upon the blood shed by millions of human beings who sacrificed themselves for a better world. It was founded by fifty-six nations which, after years of sacrifice, suffering and destruction, were determined, by following the United Nations Charter, to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and the violation of fundamental human rights.

117. The Organization has succeeded, not altogether, but to a very large extent, in fulfilling its task. If today feeling runs high over the fate of the Congo (Leopoldville) or less important matters and if we feel anxious on the subject, how can we forget that in the last fifteen years we have lived through far more serious crises which have been settled thanks to the United Nations? Who among us can doubt that, in certain crises of the post-war period, far more blood would have been shed and far more suffering would have been inflicted on mankind, without the intervention of this world body?

118. Who among us doubts that certain local conflicts have been avoided and others limited, and possibly a much greater conflict spared us, thanks to the United Nations?

119. But thanks to what United Nations? Thanks to the United Nations with which we are familiar, and not the United Nations whose outline seems to be emerging now. That is a fundamental point. We must concentrate upon it, particularly since it consists not of specific and tangible facts, but rather of an atmosphere which is being created and of trends which escape us and for that very reason may set our feet upon the downward path. I say this because the thought that we are deliberately and wittingly setting about the business of weakening the United Nations is far from my Government's mind and far from my own.

120. We believe that all peoples and all their representatives want peace and international understanding. The means differ, and, to use a very useful expression, the approach differs.

121. This is a point which I venture to bring to the Assembly's attention, for the hour is truly grave, truly full of menace and danger to the most fundamental interests of all mankind. It is in this spirit and with full awareness of its responsibilities, as the representative of a people and as a founding Member of the United Nations, that the Greek Government is participating in the work of the fifteenth session of the General Assembly.

122. Before venturing certain opinions on the most serious problems now before us, I should like to say a few words on the most outstanding event of the fifteenth session. I mean by this, of course, the admission of the new Members, and in particular those from Africa. The Republic of Cyprus is particularly dear to us for reasons which are well known and were referred to only a few days ago from this very rostrum. That is why I greeted with such emotion the affirmation of its international personality, completely free and independent, out of which will certainly spring a new flowering of its 3,000-year-old civilization. Today, however, in this more general debate, I should like to lay particular stress on the importance among us of

the new African States, today sixteen in number, and tomorrow seventeen with the addition of Nigeria, that vast and populous State whose independence was proclaimed on 1 October 1960.

123. My country has been closely linked for thirty centuries with the ancient but ever young peoples of the whole northern coast of that vast continent. Our civilization and our interests are and have been influenced by them; their civilization and interests are and have been influenced by us. Moreover, for some decades, several tens of thousands of my compatriots have been living as brothers among almost all the African peoples. Apart from the African States bordering the Mediterranean, which are the closest to us, Ethiopia, the Sudan, the Congo, Cameroun, Ghana, Nigeria and many other countries in that vast continent have been and are for us a second beloved and respected homeland.

124. Apart from this fact of particular interest to us as Greeks, we regard as members of the international family, the spiritual and political awakening of Africa as an event which will make a profound impression on the history of the world. All these States—rich in moral and material resources, and strong and vigorous in their youth and their legitimate aspirations to domestic progress and international recognition—will undoubtedly give new impetus to our family of nations. I say family, because even though—as Mr. Nkrumah, the President of Ghana, stated [869th meeting] so brilliantly—the African continent is a well-defined entity, it is none the less true that modern technology has brought the continents closer together than regions or even neighbouring valleys were to one another in the not so distant past.

125. The proofs that they can fully achieve such international recognition exist already not only for the relatively old African States but also for those which have just become Members of the United Nations. Their presence among us has already made itself felt in a manner full of wisdom and dignity. Many delegations, certainly my own, have been impressed by their culture, the profoundness of their political thinking and their spirit of serious and constructive international collaboration. We have found this spirit, to cite only one instance that applies to a great many cases, in their official acknowledgement of the fact that independence was undoubtedly earned and deserved, and that it was at the same time offered with dignity, good will and promptitude.

126. It is true that the deep satisfaction evoked by the achievement of political recognition on the part of a vast continent has been somewhat marred by the situation in the Congo (Leopoldville), to which independence was also offered with good will and promptitude. On behalf of my Government, I had the honour, during the fourth emergency special session of the Assembly, of taking a stand on this matter, which is as important as it is painful. It only remains, therefore, for me to repeat that we hope whole-heartedly that order and well-being will be restored in the Congo under a Central Government which is both effective and legal from the international point of view. We firmly believe that this can only be brought about if all nations abstain from any intervention in the Congo's internal affairs, since any action along these lines will inevitably provoke interference by other parties and turn a peaceful and independent country in the heart of Africa into a vast battlefield of the

cold war. This cold war, which Africa certainly does not want, is only too likely, if it finds a suitable battleground, to degenerate into war pure and simple.

127. We firmly believe, therefore, that all who are sincerely interested in the independence and well-being of the Congo should accept and support the assistance which only the United Nations can offer, for the United Nations is supra-national and universal and hence able to act as a disinterested and pacifying mediator, and the United Nations has executive organs whose capability and objectivity have already been proved in all the great crises with which we have so far been faced. We are convinced that they are being similarly proved in the Congo today, and we have confidence in the action of these organs. If we needed a further example, we were given it a very few days ago by a person who can certainly not be accused of conniving with the colonialists. I mean the statements of General Ben Hammou Kettani, Commander of the Moroccan contingent of the United Nations Force in the Congo, who said, as reported by the Press throughout the world, "The United Nations troops have done their duty and, thanks to them, the situation generally is calm".

128. I should like now to speak of the problem, by far the most important with which we have to deal, which occupies and more particularly preoccupies us all: namely, disarmament.

129. The need for the regulation of armaments is specifically referred to in the basic provisions of the Charter. This means that there was created for us all—and for all without exception—an obligation to make a start on disarmament. Today, fifteen years later, this obligation has not been fulfilled. On the contrary, the grave dangers created by the never-ending arms race are daily becoming more threatening. The entire international community is already faced with the spectre of total destruction. I mention these facts, which are only too well known, to emphasize our very heavy responsibility for the deadlock now affecting the disarmament question.

130. Despite the slaughter and the mountains of ruins caused by the Second World War and its aftermath, the progress in armaments during the past fifteen years has been gigantic. Rockets streak incessantly across the heavens while disarmament sinks deeper and deeper into a morass of endless discussions and printed matter.

131. While rearmament constitutes for all of us the real action and the real fact, disarmament appears for some States to belong only to the realm of words or propaganda. Thus, at the very moment when armaments are increasing and being perfected, disarmament has been made into a means, a tool, of political antagonism. In other words, disarmament has become a weapon. In our contemporary world where so many words have lost their true meaning, we have thus arrived at the paradox of disarmament itself becoming a weapon.

132. However, though facts must be faced, lamentations are useless and superfluous. Instead we must look closely at the problem and see what we can do.

133. The Greek delegation, which is here to convey the ardent faith of the Greek people in peace, freedom and security, will spare no effort to contribute, as it has in the past, to the progress of this matter

within the framework of the various United Nations bodies engaged in this task. At the present time, the problem with which the General Assembly is faced is not that of finding a solution to the question itself, but rather of finding an adequate method whereby disarmament will cease to belong to the realm of words and will become a practical reality. In this connexion, I should like, very briefly, to describe the principles upon which my country's attitude to this problem is based.

134. It can, or rather must, be taken for granted that there is a basis of good will, but if we are to free ourselves from the present paralysis and avoid a descent into propaganda, the political aspect and the technical aspect, which together constitute the complex problem of disarmament, must be separated. Considerations of a technical nature constitute the basis and at the same time the primary condition for the adoption of any political decision on this matter. It is natural, therefore, that the technical aspect, which is preliminary but decisive, should have priority over the purely political aspect. We believe therefore that there is one essential prerequisite.

135. As the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom so eloquently put it in his statement [877th meeting], disarmament under effective control—and more particularly certain aspects of control—should be the subject of expert study. The experts—specialists in disarmament, defence and the application and control of the proposed measures, and also technicians and scientists—should be called upon to submit their conclusions to the United Nations within a reasonable time, possibly determined in advance. Such an arrangement, I believe, would take into account the remarks made by Mr. Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, in the course of his brilliant statement [882nd meeting]. It may be pointed out in this connexion that the experience acquired in other fields has been encouraging in so far as the usefulness of dealing with similar problems by technical methods is concerned. I refer to the conference of experts at Geneva on the detection of nuclear explosions.^{4/} I may even go so far as to say that the progress made by these experts is the greatest and the only really tangible achievement in the whole field of disarmament.

136. Today, at the political level, we speak of controls without knowing exactly what we mean. There is talk of balanced disarmament, the purpose of which is to protect one side from suddenly finding itself weaker than the other. There is good reason to speak of this, for it is a serious obstacle that impedes effective progress, but we do not know exactly how this balanced disarmament can be brought about. Today the tremendous diversification of weapons, ranging from machine-guns to tanks, and from aircraft to nuclear missiles, makes an answer even harder to find. Tomorrow, on the other hand, after detailed study by experts, these questions and many more will be presented in their true light and in their exact and precise dimensions, and this will make it possible, at a second stage, to evaluate them and to take the necessary decisions at the political level.

137. I shall now go a step further by proposing that the discussion at the political level should take place not in the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament, but

^{4/} Conference of Experts to Study the Possibility of Detecting Violations of a Possible Agreement on the Suspension of Nuclear Tests, which met from 1 July to 21 August 1958.

in a smaller committee whose membership would reflect that of the Assembly, or would at least include the Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, who is at this moment that very distinguished man, Mr. Padilla Neryo, representative of Mexico.

138. I shall venture to take yet another step forward, this time a somewhat more ambitious one, and propose a concurrent study of measures to strengthen peace by transforming the international community into a genuine community of law. The creation of a system of stable peace and security does not depend only on disarmament or, in other words, on the elimination of the means of exerting force, for such means will always exist. It depends rather on the replacement of force by legal standards and the rule of law. This is above all a problem of organization. It relates in particular to the settlement of international disputes, or at least various categories of international disputes, by compulsory recourse to international juridical institutions.

139. It is my impression that, at least in most cases, this is the best means of putting into effect the many injunctions to resort to peaceful methods for the settlement of international disputes. This is the second aspect and is just as important as disarmament to the problem of international peace and security. I therefore have the honour to propose that it should be seriously studied as an organizational problem, so that it too can subsequently be the object of decisions at the political level. Without this, I am very much afraid that we shall achieve nothing practical, and, as a great French statesman once said, politics is the art of finding practical solutions.

140. As this aspect of the strengthening of peace is very important, I regard it as my duty at this point to make a few more general remarks.

141. The question of strengthening peace is becoming more and more a problem for the entire world. Steadily increasing interdependence in international relations, the ever more threatening danger of a general conflagration provoked by local conflicts and the dizzy and ever-growing speed of the vehicles of death all prove that international co-operation and solidarity can only be fruitful and effective if they are universal. In other words, in the efforts to strengthen peace, it is difficult, in our day, to isolate any one sector or region from the whole.

142. If this statement is true in certain fields, it is absolute in the vital sector of collective security. To the extent to which collective security is based upon disarmament, it will in practice be impossible to create local or regional security zones by isolating them from the security systems prevailing in the rest of the world. This observation is based upon entirely objective criteria. These criteria have nothing of the political in them; they are purely technical. It is not a question of differences of opinion, but of facts as they are.

143. I need give only one example, which is a convincing one. When nuclear missiles can reach any corner of the globe, the concept of regional disarmament loses its significance, for a region which has no missiles can be attacked with missiles launched outside its boundaries.

144. The conclusion to be drawn is that general disarmament, which is the primary responsibility of the

great Powers, constitutes the only possible and realistic answer to any idea of, or proposal for, regional disarmament.

145. It is in the light of these observations and with the reservations that I have just made, that the Greek delegation takes its position on the Romanian proposal, concerning "Actions on the regional level with a view to improving good neighbourly relations among European States having different social and political systems", an item included on the agenda of the fifteenth session at the request of Romania [A/4440].

146. As a State which, while not bordering on Romania, is still its neighbour, and because we maintain not merely normal but good relations with that country, we have carefully studied the explanatory memorandum accompanying the proposal in question, as well as the relevant passage in the speech made [873rd meeting] by the chairman of the Romanian delegation, Mr. Gheorghiu-Dej.

147. Before making a few general remarks on this subject, I would like to draw attention to a certain contradiction between the title of the item and both the explanatory memorandum and the explanation given by the chairman of the Romanian delegation in his speech. In the original texts, as well as in the verbal explanations which we were given a short while ago, it was a question of European States in general, while from the speech the proposal appeared to be limited to the Balkans and the wish was clearly expressed that it be accepted by the Governments of Greece and Turkey only.

148. While this contradiction gives rise to some astonishment, it is still more surprising to hear Mr. Gheorghiu-Dej say, in another passage in his speech, that certain States in the Balkans and public opinion in all the Balkan countries have received the Romanian proposals with interest and sympathy. As far as my country is concerned, I would ask Mr. Gheorghiu-Dej and anyone else who likes to make a distinction between the wishes of the Greek public and those of the Greek Government and even frequently likes to draw conclusions on the basis of this distinction, I would request them, I repeat, to remember that six times since the war, six times in fifteen years, general elections have been held in Greece. The honesty and the validity of these elections have never been questioned by anyone. Hence complete and unassailable proof exists that the Greek Government alone expresses the will of the Greek people and represents them.

149. We, although we do not possess such unassailable proofs in regard to every country, have never made such distinctions between the will of peoples and the attitude of their Governments. We do not intend to do so in the future, nor shall we ask others to provide these proofs which we ourselves possess. We are satisfied if at the international level a Government is recognized as lawful. Since, however, this absurd distinction is, for propaganda purposes, being made insistently and at our expense by official personages (and has even been heard from this rostrum), it is necessary to make these remarks and to say that those who insist on this distinction may well impair the good relations that the freely-elected Greek Government, which alone legally and in fact represents Greece, wishes to maintain with them.

150. I shall now revert briefly to the Romanian proposal as formulated in the official texts submitted to the United Nations. As I have just said, we have studied this proposal carefully. We are duly appreciative of the Romanian Government's intentions. We believe that its proposal contains some useful ideas with which we would in principle agree.

151. One constructive element is the observation that good neighbourly relations must and can be developed even between States with different political and social systems. This, in conjunction with the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs and the principle of mutual respect, is but a recognition of present realities and corresponds with the policy invariably followed by Greece.

152. My Government is in no sense antipathetic to political or social systems differing from its own. Co-operation, and even close co-operation, with countries having a different system of Government is for us both possible and desirable, provided there is sincere and complete mutual respect for existing treaties and for the independence and dignity of others and non-intervention in their domestic affairs. It is when this condition has not been respected that peaceful coexistence is endangered.

153. As far as Greece is concerned, whenever this principle has not been sincerely applied by a country, whether great or small, we have made it clear that coexistence was impossible. We have decided to maintain the same attitude in the future, for, whatever vicissitudes we may have to face, we shall defend our independence and our dignity, our honour and our philosophy of life without which existence for us is meaningless.

154. On the other hand, whenever this principle has been sincerely respected, we have been able to co-exist harmoniously and even actively. To mention only one example, among several which affect us, and perhaps it is the most characteristic, I shall refer to our relations with Yugoslavia. Our co-operation is close in a number of peaceful activities. Last year we signed a series of agreements covering many aspects of our economic and cultural relations. Yet we live under entirely different political and social systems and, as is also known, hold different views on certain international questions. None the less the differences that I have just mentioned, and they are by no means unimportant, do not prevent a peaceful and active coexistence with Yugoslavia or keep us from being friends.

155. Another point in the Romanian proposal which is constructive and cannot be disputed is the emphasis on the need for the Governments concerned to pledge themselves, on the regional level, to refrain from violence and other aggressive acts in their bilateral relations.

156. Both points, however, have been the subject of earlier General Assembly resolutions and are also dealt with in the Charter of the United Nations.

157. It would be futile to stress the concept that States must refrain from all acts of aggression in bilateral relations, since aggression in any sphere is strictly prohibited by the Charter. International law would be weakened if this prohibition was applied again in a more restricted field.

158. States must act in conformity with international law and maintain good and peaceful relations with one another, not because they are neighbours, but simply because they are members of the international community and of the United Nations.

159. It is true that within a particular region disputes and problems do arise between neighbouring States, but this only affects the parties concerned, who must settle their problems by respecting their international obligations and by giving effect to existing treaties. The violation of this principle is not a serious problem for a particular region, but a serious problem for the international community as a whole. But it would be dangerous to go beyond that observation and to admit the principle that the region, either directly or indirectly, has a right to intervene or interfere in the field of bilateral relations.

160. The same, of course, holds good when a region or even a continent wishes to give expression, in formal arrangements, to its racial and cultural affinities and their logical consequences.

161. I do not think there is any need for me to give my views on other proposals which have been made to us from this rostrum, not only because what I have just said is in the nature of a general reply, but above all because some weeks ago we indicated our first reactions to these proposals, and nothing more is needed for the time being.

162. I have never been in favour of long speeches. I trust that in the past and in this hall the President has had proof of this, in the course of our harmonious and peaceful coexistence. There are, however, at this critical moment certain subjects which I feel it is my duty to touch upon before concluding my statement.

163. I shall deal very briefly with the first of these points, but I am bound to answer it. One of the speakers who preceded me at this rostrum—and I refer to the representative of Albania—said [872nd meeting] that Greece has established rocket-launching bases on its territory and that these bases constitute a direct threat to the freedom and independence of Albania and of the Balkan area. I accordingly feel it to be my duty to state that the information is absolutely incorrect and that there are no rocket-launching bases in Greece. Even if, however, that were not so, the existence of these bases could only be attributed, in view of the fact that five times in a single generation Greece has been the victim of aggression from the north, to a legitimate concern to protect Greek territory and to that alone.

164. In a more general way I should like to take this opportunity to say that several factors make it imperative for Greece to be concerned about its independence and territorial integrity. While not neglecting other means, which unfortunately are not yet fully effective, the Greek Government in the matter of armaments and alliances is guided solely and exclusively by concern for the protection of its national territory. This is also true of various other countries. It is true of a country against which we have fought two appalling wars but which, after the Nazi orgy, is now, we believe, imbued with a true democratic spirit; everyone will realize that I am referring to the Federal Republic of Germany.

165. I shall now pass on to a second point, which I shall likewise deal with briefly. My Government has

on many occasions expressed its full and complete confidence in the Secretary-General personally and in his fellow workers; it believes that Mr. Hammarskjöld and the staff of the Secretariat have been one of the essential factors in the successes so far achieved by the Organization in every field, and especially so in times of grave crisis.

166. Quite apart from these considerations, however, we are unable to accept the proposal to replace the office of Secretary-General by a collective body. A revision of the Charter to this effect would result in a complete weakening of the executive branch of the United Nations and would reduce its efficiency to nil. The great international crises through which we have passed in recent years have required immediate action; a delay even of one or two days might well have produced a number of victims which we should have greatly regretted, and such a delay could have plunged us into hazardous ventures. In an organization which embraces the whole world and can be suddenly called upon to take action in any part of the globe, the decision-making organs are and must be collective. Certain delays, which are sometimes extremely regrettable, cannot be avoided, but if to collective decision-making organs are added collective organs to carry out those decisions, the inevitable result will be, not regrettable and dangerous delays, but total immobility. If this were to happen and the executive organ, in times of grave crisis, had to spend days or even weeks discussing the meaning of decisions and the way in which they should be carried out, that organ would have no other duties to perform except to report on "faits accomplis".

167. To say that the office of Secretary-General should not be collective is not intended to imply that we are against a more adequate representation of groups of States whose importance has increased as a result of the presence in our Organization of a considerable number of new Members. To accomplish this, we favour an increase in the membership of certain United Nations organs, such as the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.

168. Another vitally important question on which I feel that I should say a word or two is that of assistance to the under-developed countries. There are two aspects to this problem; the one concerns what is just and right, and the other, political obligations.

169. The Greek Government attaches the greatest importance to this matter. The question is vital to the whole human race, but it is being approached from the wrong angle. Effective action is hampered on the one hand because much is said and little is done, and on the other because the real nature of the problem is frequently not grasped. My country has had a great deal of experience in this regard because, after being covered with graves and ruins, it was able, through the hard work and ability of its people and the generous and unconditional aid given by the United States, to make a spectacular recovery within a period of ten years. I shall not in the Assembly either praise or make useless propaganda concerning this recovery which, suffice it to say, is still affording us further opportunities for development in certain fields.

170. On the basis of our own experience, I would like to point out that aid to under-developed countries is closely connected with the organization of production and the possibility of establishing fair and reasonable prices for exports. Cases do exist—I could mention

them if necessary—in which very substantial financial aid has been nullified and even counteracted by a simultaneous drop in exports. In such cases is there not a flagrant contradiction, and is it not true that instead of providing the under-developed countries with aid, we are placing difficulties in their way? In such cases, what ought these countries to do? They can, it is true, export on a bilateral basis, but that, as everyone knows, eventually leads to an artificial economy and may have various undesirable consequences.

171. The under-developed countries can also ask for greater understanding and more open-mindedness and for a fair evaluation of the basic facts involved in their problem. However, to ask without receiving an adequate answer is no solution, and without a solution the under-developed countries cannot improve their level of living; they cannot even organize their economy, since their exports, that is to say the existing basis of that economy, sometimes fall dangerously low. What must they do in such cases, which are unfortunately all too frequent?

172. This is most certainly not an appropriate time to formulate the answer. I would merely point out that the problem is basic, that it is complex and that often, unfortunately too often, it is dealt with inadequately, or even wrongly.

173. I promised that I would be brief. I know that the meaning of the word "brevity" cannot be stretched beyond certain limits. That is why I shall refrain from speaking of other important problems such as those of the Palestine refugees and of Algeria, and still others which are of interest to us both as Greeks and as members of the international community. Our delegation will, in any event, have an opportunity to state its point of view on these problems when they are debated.

174. Before leaving this rostrum, I should like merely to go back to the point with which I began my statement. The United Nations sprang from the suffering and destruction caused by the Second World War. In several instances it has saved us from further suffering and destruction. For many years we have seen it at work both in the field of peaceful activities and in really difficult and grave moments.

175. This work has borne fruit. Even in the Congo crisis, the measure of success can be gauged merely by realizing what would have happened if the United Nations had not acted. It is more than probable that this new African State, which bears the imprint of civilization, and whose vigorous people have no less a right than others to aspire to independence and tranquillity, would have become, to say the least, the focal point of fierce local and international antagonisms and one of the most active theatres of the cold war or of war itself.

176. Almost all this has been avoided as a result of the action taken by the United Nations. Therefore let us try to maintain our Organization intact; let us preserve its efficiency and the atmosphere which has thus far prevailed but has now been disturbed.

177. The beginning of our proceedings, the happy event of the admission of so many new Members, the calm addresses of the speakers on the first day—in particular, the brilliant address of the head of the great democratic people of the United States [868th meeting]—all this entitled us to hope for a better atmosphere.

178. My delegation will do all it can to help to restore a calmer atmosphere more propitious to concerted action, for it fears that in the absence of such an atmosphere the United Nations, after fifteen years of constructive activities, will slide down a slope at the end of which dissolution awaits it. If that were to

happen, the closer we came to the end of the slope, the louder and more numerous would be the laments uttered by mankind. May that never happen. May the United Nations preserve the character and efficiency that have been its customary marks up to this day.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.