

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



**906th
PLENARY MEETING**

Monday, 17 October 1960,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Statement by the Secretary-General</i>	741
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
<i>Speech by Mr. Rossides (Cyprus)</i>	743
<i>Speech by Mr. Krishna Menon (India)</i>	745
<i>Agenda item 51:</i>	
<i>Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly:</i>	
<i>(b) Committee on Contributions</i>	
<i>Report of the Fifth Committee</i>	758

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

Statement by the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the next speaker in the general debate, I give the floor to the Secretary-General.

2. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: In my first intervention during the general debate [871st meeting] I reserved my right to ask for the floor at a later stage for such clarifications and comments as might seem indicated. I thank the President, for giving me this opportunity of saying a few words at this final stage of the debate.

3. The President of the Republic of Guinea said in his speech the other day:

"Let us regard the Congo as a part of the life of our human race and consider the fate reserved for millions of men, women and children. Let there be less discussion of Mr. Lumumba, Mr. Kasa-Vubu, Mr. Mobutu, Mr. Ileo and others, and let there be serious efforts to find this problem a just solution which will serve the cause of a people who desire only well-being, peace and progress." [896th meeting, para. 52.]

4. Much has been said in this debate regarding the Congo (Leopoldville), its problems and the United Nations effort in support of the independence, integrity, peace and progress of the Congo. Much has been said which has been ill-founded. Whether this has been the result of misinformation, of an emotional engagement or of tactical considerations but flimsily related to the interests of the Congo, I leave to others to consider. Following the statement of President Sékou Touré which I have just quoted, I would, instead of taking up the Assembly's time with setting straight a record mainly concerned with basically superficial and temporary problems, wish to fill out the picture of the General Assembly by talking about what has not been mentioned: the needs of the people of the Congo and the work of the United Nations in assistance

of the authorities whose responsibility it is to meet those needs.

5. In the confusing fights and conflicts which have now been going on for more than three months in the Congo among political dignitaries of that country, an impression has grown that few have realized that to lead and govern is not a privilege to be sought but a burden of responsibility to be assumed.

6. It is not those names which we read about in the papers which are tied to the painstaking daily efforts to maintain a minimum of order, to keep an administration—on a minimum level—running, to forestall epidemics and cure disease, to keep the transport system working, to feed the hungriest, to see to it that the many workers for the State are in a position to pay for the necessities of their families. No, that work has been undertaken by many who are nameless, by Congolese officials who are never mentioned and whose names will probably never be known to the world. They have chosen to serve instead of to rule, they have chosen to subordinate themselves instead of searching for power. May I pay tribute to these men and to what they have done to give life and sense to the independence of the Congo. It is those with whom the United Nations has had to work, it is those we have been able to consult, those we have tried to assist.

7. In doing so, we have been accused of serving the interest of foreign elements, of working hand in hand with imperialists and of impeding the legitimate authorities. We have been accused of substituting ourselves for those authorities, of seeking power for the United Nations in the Congo and of reinstituting some kind of colonialism. Let nobody be misled. Those many men, from very many nations in Africa, Asia, Europe and the trans-Atlantic countries who are serving the United Nations in the Congo, why are they there? They have left their families. They do not solicit merits for future advancement in the home countries to which they want to return. They work against the heaviest odds under a continuous nerve strain, they have endless working days, they do not know whether all that they do will not be swept aside one of these days by new waves of political unrest. And yet, they give the best they can. May I pay them a tribute as pioneers for that growing group of men all over the world who regard service to the fellow members of the community of mankind as a reward in itself, giving sense to their efforts and to their life—guided by faith in a better future and maintaining the strict norms of behaviour which the Charter requests of an international civil servant? Blame them for their shortcomings, if you will; say that they should do more, if you believe that you are entitled to say so; criticize this or that decision they have taken because in your perspective another decision might have been better, but do not throw doubt on their honesty and seriousness, do not impugn their motives and, es-

pecially, do not try to depict them as enemies of the very cause—the well-being of the Congolese people in a life of peace and true independence—for which they are giving so much and, in worldly terms, as individuals, receiving little or nothing.

8. I wish to say this as an act of justice, necessary if this Organization is to live up to the moral standards it professes and if it is to be able to count in the future on the services of those for whom those standards are a creed which it is their duty to uphold in practical action.

9. Much of the debate has had as its obvious background this or that specific United Nations emergency step with supposed political implications—or even supposed motives. The listener may have got the impression that what the United Nations is doing in the Congo is really crystallized and summed up in those few actions. In my perspective they are details in a vast pattern of activity; important though they may be in themselves, they are only highly-publicized events which have occurred when, in the course of the political complications of the situation, the activities of the Organization, because of the principles which it must maintain, momentarily may seem to have collided with some specific party interest.

10. With the collapse and disintegration of the Congolese National Army as a stabilizing factor, there are now instead, on an emergency basis, close to 20,000 men of the United Nations Force in the Congo, found necessary to maintain a minimum assurance for the life of the people and, thus, carrying a burden normally assumed by the national security forces. This complicated operation, rendered possible very largely through the generosity and sacrifices of other African States, is also heavily dependent on a highly-qualified cadre of officers of very many nations and on highly-developed and costly technical services. The Force could not be there without one of the biggest airlifts in history, which we could arrange only by drawing on the resources of the most powerful countries in the world. The Force is serviced by technicians with the most qualified technical schooling and machinery available. And yet it is feeble in relation to its own tasks. Indeed, this is a strange background for statements to the effect that the Force should and could be withdrawn or that its tasks could be taken over by the national security forces or by a few of the units now making up part of it.

11. But the activities of the Force are, I hope, a quickly passing phase in the United Nations effort to give to the Congo its full and real independence and to re-establish its integrity. Already now, and increasingly so, the civilian operation is of decisive importance. And in that civilian operation what has been achieved has required the services of all the agencies in the United Nations to their full capacity.

12. In the vastness of the Congo, where so much movement depends on air services, everything would have been grounded in the last three months but for the air traffic control, the radio and navigation aids, the weather forecasting and telecommunications provided by the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Telecommunications Union and the World Meteorological Organization. Even the food and milk so generously provided by Member States for supply to children and refugees—when supplies were not interrupted by political disturbances—have been

largely carried in United Nations aircraft to country-wide distribution points where local authorities and the Red Cross took over. The early break-down of surface transport which caused local shortages of food has been overcome by United Nations personnel, who saw to the dredging of the river and reopening of the ocean port, who moved pilots by helicopter to increase their effective working hours, who reactivated the oil pipe-lines between port and capital, and who are supervising workshops and maintenance of harbours and railways. Some of these engineers have been diverted to the preparation of a programme of public works for the relief of unemployment. International Labour Office programmes are dealing with a number of crucial labour and social security fields. Hospitals, abandoned by their medical staff, have been quickly restored to use by medical units provided by Red Cross societies of many countries, and the elementary health services have been maintained by the World Health Organization. Plans and actions for the re-opening of schools and the organization of secondary and technical education have largely depended on the activities of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

13. Plans for maintaining agricultural services are being developed through the Food and Agriculture Organization. Research institutions of continental value, whose prestige is world-wide, are being protected and maintained through the United Nations. Plans are being drawn for the training of tomorrow's doctors, teachers and civil servants, so that the Congo may make the maximum use of its reservoir of youth, its greatest and most durable asset. All these vitally essential services are rendered under the United Nations flag, thus eliminating any risks that they create a dependence of the Congo on any specific foreign powers or that outside elements be permitted to establish what might develop into vested interests in the country. They, thereby, effectively help in establishing and strengthening its true independence.

14. You may ask, where, then, the Government and the administration are to be found in this picture. I think I have already given the reply. We have tried to consult to all the extent there was anybody who could be consulted—and who paid any attention to the needs. We have co-operated on a continuous basis of great intimacy with a number of Central Government officials. We have avoided taking decisions for which we could not get authoritative approval, but when a specific situation reached the stage of acute crisis, requiring immediate counteraction, and when we could not find those whose support we wished to have, we have had to act as responsible human beings facing a desperate emergency. You try to save a drowning man without prior authorization and even if he resists you; you do not let him go even when he tries to strangle you. I do not believe that any one would wish the Organization to follow other rules than those you apply to yourself when faced with such a situation.

15. I said in the Congo, some time ago, that the birth of an independent Congo had come to coincide with the birth of true co-operation of the United Nations family of agencies in the service of a Member Nation. As a spokesman for all these administrations, I can say that we are proud that we have been permitted to serve in this way, but I should add that we shall be even prouder when, through all the joint efforts, the stage has been reached when our services are no

longer necessary in the Congo and when we can leave the country solely and fully in the good hands of its own people, with its independence, peace and prosperity safeguarded by its own means.

16. Of course, the end of all political effort must be the well-being of the individual in a life of safety and freedom. In the case of the Congo, as elsewhere, the means to this end are in the first place the independence, peace, integrity and prosperity of the country. In turn, this goal requires the maintenance and progress of economic life, the functioning of a good judiciary system, a soundly working administration, all under the responsibility of a Government, stable thanks to its firm roots in the free will of the people, expressed and developed in democratic forms. This is the perspective in which the effort of the United Nations must be seen. This perspective should determine our judgement and give us the sense of proportion necessary if we are to avoid substituting the means for the ends and the interests of the man or the group for those of the people.

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

17. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Cyprus, as one of the recently admitted countries to the United Nations, comes into this general debate with all the diffidence of a newcomer. We have no experience of the intricacies of the subjects under discussion, and we bring no accumulated knowledge of them. But we may bring, I hope, perspective in outlook and objectivity of approach in the consideration of world problems. We bring also our faith in the United Nations and our profound dedication to the cause of peace, based on justice and freedom, that very freedom and justice for which the people of Cyprus have long struggled and fought.

18. At this moment my thoughts go out in gratitude to all the nations that supported our cause and took a stand for the right of the Cypriot people to a free and independent life. And I recall with warmth of feeling the encouragement received from many delegations in this Assembly.

19. It has been the destiny of Cyprus through the ages to pass through many vicissitudes and tests. In the course of its long history it has known periods of independent life, when philosophy and art flourished. And it has also known its periods of foreign domination. However, in weathering the storms of centuries, its people have perhaps acquired fortitude of spirit and understanding of other peoples; they have thus learnt the lesson of patience and of tolerance.

20. We come to the United Nations at a crucial time for the world and for the Organization itself. We are in no way committed, and we shall not align ourselves, as a matter of routine, with any Power blocs or camps. We shall follow an independent line, guided by what is right and for the common good. Our commitment, and a strong commitment, is to the United Nations and its Charter. In these historic moments we are fully conscious of our share of responsibility in the decisions to be taken and in the international developments that may ensue. We shall, therefore, need all the clarity of thought and understanding that comes from sincerity of purpose and from purity of mind.

21. Just emerging from a liberation struggle, we bear no vestige of bitterness towards anyone, and no prejudice whatsoever weighs upon our judgement. Our dedication, however, to the cause of freedom is no less strong and emphatic in respect of the liberty of others. In whichever lands and in whatever areas of the world people are struggling for their freedom, they may be assured that the hearts of the people of Cyprus are beating with them in rhythm. We have heard with particular interest and deep satisfaction the dynamic message in support of freedom and against colonialism conveyed in the speeches of so many great leaders of nations, big and small. The collective voice of nations has spoken out and has made its decisive pronouncement for the attainment of independence by all subject peoples the world over.

22. The age of domination and force is a thing of the past. All peoples should be allowed to develop their own culture and their own political and economic systems in freedom. A timely recognition of this reality is urgently demanded from those directly concerned with these issues. And it would serve their own long-term interest, no less than that of world peace. For there can be no stability and peace where the will of the people is in rebellion, and where the sense of justice, of freedom and of right is continually violated. It was Woodrow Wilson, that great precursor of the United Nations, who said that "without self-determination there cannot, and should not, be peace in the world".

23. A realistic approach to this problem by those who wield the power is most necessary. The relationship of dominant and subject peoples should give its place to that of co-operation between free peoples, on a footing of equality and trust. This is the trend of history and these are the dictates of moral principle. They cannot go unheeded.

24. On such premises we would like to see a solution of the Algerian problem by mutual understanding between the French nation and the Algerian people, whose cause of self-determination has our full support. The imaginative policy of the great leader of France, President de Gaulle, and his outstanding dedication to freedom in the last war, justify great hopes that such a solution will be reached, and will be reached soon, by free negotiations with the representatives of the brave Algerian nation.

25. We are an island geographically detached from continents. Yet we are not so far from Africa and we have a friendly and vivid interest in the future of all the peoples of that continent. We look forward to the day, not far off, when all African peoples will be free, living in their own States under their own sovereign Governments. It is not for us to define what is called "the African personality", but if it means a sense of unity among all African peoples and States, a concept of the continent as a personality, a unity that would contribute to the consolidation of the world community, we welcome it.

26. Our stand on the question of the Congo (Leopoldville) is consistent with the resolution [1474 (ES-IV)] of the General Assembly, adopted at its fourth emergency special session. We shall fully support the United Nations in its efforts to bring about peace and harmony in the Congo and to safeguard its independence and territorial integrity. There should be no outside interference in the Congo. Its Government and

people, with the assistance of the United Nations, will be able to find their way to peace and unity.

27. The work of the Secretary-General in carrying out the decision of the Security Council was performed, in our view, with impartiality and with commendable efficiency and speed under conditions of great difficulty and strain. My delegation, therefore, wishes to associate itself with the wide expression of confidence in Mr. Hammarskjöld's loyalty to the Charter and in his integrity and his skill. But for the timely intervention of the United Nations and its decisive action, there would have been chaos in the Congo with the risk of a widespread war.

28. It is most essential that the office of Secretary-General, as the executive organ of the United Nations, should in no way be weakened in its power to make decisions, or hampered in its action. Any assumption of the authority and functions of the Secretary-General by a political body, however constituted, or any other interpolation in the Secretary General's duties, would bring the discord of politics into the heart of the executive, and would thus paralyse its action and its efficacy, at times when it was most needed.

29. We have faith in the United Nations as an instrument of peace through freedom and economic development. A distressed humanity places its trust and its hopes in it. Our desire and our objective is that its influence should increase and the field of its activities enlarged. We look forward to a time when the United Nations would have an effective military force at its command to meet all situations, and when military bases would in essence become United Nations constabulary bases in the service of mankind.

30. The past record of the United Nations, in spite of certain shortcomings—perhaps unavoidable—is, on the whole, one of outstanding progress and achievement. Its intervention has already been most salutary in many explosive situations the world over; its economic activities throughout the world, though in their nature less dramatic, have been of great value. These activities should receive every encouragement and enhancement as a constructive effort towards creating world circumstances, in which crises will become less likely to occur.

31. We trust that economic and technical assistance by the United Nations to the newly independent countries will be on an increased and extended scale, in order to meet the urgent needs of those countries and ensure their economic stability and progress in the interest of world peace.

32. In this connexion my delegation wishes to suggest that, for the purpose of enlarging and intensifying programmes of assistance to less developed countries, there should be a re-appraisal of the whole subject of such assistance in the light of past experience gained by the United Nations in the field of economic reconstruction and development. My delegation takes the view that the time is ripe for a more vigorous United Nations action on the economic and social development of less developed areas in the world.

33. On the item concerning Bolzano (Bozen), due for debate before the Special Political Committee, a just solution in a spirit of compromise could well be reached, and we would be happy to help towards such a compromise agreement in every way that we can.

34. On the subject of disarmament, we have studied the annual report of the Secretary-General [A/4390] and the report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission [see A/4463]. We have also before us the resolution [1378 (XIV)] unanimously adopted at the fourteenth session of the General Assembly, for general and complete disarmament. We have, furthermore, listened, with absorbing interest and respect, to the wise statements by leaders of great nations. In all of them we discern a deep desire for peace and for disarmament. We believe in the sincerity of these speeches. All nations wish for peace and want disarmament. One would, therefore, be inclined—and not unnaturally—to ask: Why should we then be in a crisis, and why can there be no agreement on disarmament? We do not question the good faith or the wisdom of the big Powers. We do question the results. It would seem that the main obstacle is suspicion and distrust. Every proposal put forward by the one side is viewed by the other with suspicion. This is probably why all negotiations ultimately fail, though seemingly nearing agreement at times. The aspect of inspection and control should be given some consideration in the light of its help towards creating confidence by unsealing the doors of secrecy.

35. During the last meetings of the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament the gap seemed to have considerably narrowed down. The attitudes of the two sides as to the priority between a plan on disarmament and a plan on control should not be irreconcilable. For instance, parallel plans on disarmament and control could be simultaneously agreed upon as part of one treaty and carried out by stages, while retaining the balance of power. Yet no agreement is visible. What is lacking, in our view, is a degree of mutual confidence. It is feared—and perhaps not unreasonably—that in the process of disarmament the balance of power might be tipped, with dire results to either side. It appears to us that balance of power cannot safely fit in with disarmament. They spring from diametrically opposed concepts. The former stems from antagonism and suspicion, the latter from trust and co-operation. It is difficult, if not impossible, to make them blend. Agreement cannot therefore be reached while suspicion and recrimination mount.

36. For us the first and paramount requirement and the first principle is largely and inevitably a moral one. It is futile trying to find acceptable formulae of disarmament while in the hearts of men and nations the negativeness of antagonism and suspicion persists. A climate of confidence is indispensable, if disarmament is not to continue to be an ever elusive phantom.

37. While the progress of science has reached astounding levels of achievement, moral progress has lamentably lagged behind. In our nuclear age this disparity cannot continue without grave consequences. Scientific regress is impossible. Moral progress is, therefore, an imperative. And it can be achieved. Mankind is now, as never before, faced by the threat of self-extinction, from which there is no retreat and no escape. There is only one way out, that leading up to the brotherhood of man. Humanity will have to follow it or perish.

38. Moralizing may sound out of place in the practical spirit of this debate. Yet it may not be entirely so. The world has moved in the last decade or two with amazing rapidity. Concepts such as that of the brotherhood of man, which were a few years ago considered

a remote and unattainable idea, have now become a practical necessity and a demanding reality.

39. We believe the United Nations can and will play a positive role in this direction. Its rapidly increasing membership has brought it the infusion of enlivening blood from Asia and Africa and the wholesomeness of a growing independence of approach to world problems. By its universality the United Nations now is steadily becoming a vigorous forum of world public opinion, destined to exert a decisive and far-reaching influence in the development of world affairs. Its moral impact has already begun to make itself felt in the general feeling of this Assembly on international issues. It will grow with time, and along with it will grow the confidence and hope of humanity. We are confident that a basically new approach in statesmanship will come, lifting mankind to new and loftier levels of endeavour and achievement. In this spirit we bring to the United Nations the humble, but wholehearted, co-operation of our small country.

40. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): This, the fifteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, began some four weeks ago, charged with expectation and concern, enlarged not only in its size by the welcome addition of part of the world hitherto almost excluded from political competence but also by the presence of Heads of States and of Governments and many Foreign Ministers who headed nearly half the number of delegations present here. My delegation, in the person of my Prime Minister, intervened [880th meeting] with the set purpose of drawing the pointed attention of representatives to the great urgency of the problems before us and of our approach to them. He reminded the United Nations of the parallel of the League of Nations just before the outbreak of the Second World War. At that time my Prime Minister also informed the Assembly that he desired to address himself to the urgency of the problems facing us and to our responsibility as an Organization, for the lack of progress, for our failures, as well as for the consummation that must be reached. We are therefore, as far as my delegation is concerned, in no doubt as to the responsibility severally and collectively borne by the Member States of the United Nations. At the same time my Prime Minister reserved the right of our delegation to intervene again in regard to these problems themselves and to the detailed and special aspects of them.

41. Three weeks have passed since, three weeks of intensive, sometimes acrimonious, but, so far as my delegation is concerned, nevertheless in the long run, fruitful discussion. My delegation, therefore, does not regard these weeks as either wasted or being productive merely of acrimony, because it is in the cut and thrust of these debates, in our capacity to face each other with points of view that are diverse and perhaps with methods of presentation that are also diverse in different countries, that we make progress. Therefore, we intervene once again at the far-end of this debate, with the knowledge that the Assembly wants no more speeches for the sake of speeches, but with the realization that perhaps we have a function to perform, which we must do.

42. It would be a truism to say that this Assembly, though it met with great hopes, faces a situation where, while I hope there is still no despair, there is a great deal of heart-searching and mind-searching in this world, and problems far more basic than formulae

put forward by one delegation or another must come before the propositions on which we have to decide. It reminds me of the lines by the poet Browning:

*It's wiser being good than bad;
It's safer being meek than fierce;
It's fitter being sane than mad.
My own hope is, a sun will pierce
The thickest cloud earth ever stretched.*

43. Even in the Assembly, as I had occasion to say in a previous intervention [876th meeting], there was evidence of some silver linings in the clouds when the two nations of Africa, who cannot claim the kind of modern political experience that others have, came before us, having resolved their differences by peaceful methods, and showed us the way in which even sharp differences—differences between neighbours are always sharper than other differences—were resolved.

44. It is customary for my delegation in these addresses first to refer to the Secretary-General's annual report. Owing to the lateness of the date and also to the particular circumstances that obtain this year in regard to the work of the United Nations itself, it is not necessary for me to go into a detailed analysis of the reports either of the Security Council [A/4494] or of the Secretary-General. Suffice it to say that it is not an accident, it is not any particular bias in any way, that prompts the Secretary-General in his report to pay great attention to Africa and to the problem of the Congo (Leopoldville). Much has already been said about the new entrants into this Assembly from Africa, and in the course of this morning I hope to address myself again to the problems of the dependent peoples. But my first duty is to express the views of my delegation, as of today, on the problem of the Congo.

45. It will be remembered—and no one in this Assembly, whatever his views, can deny the urgency of the problem, by the very fact that, even three or four days before the General Assembly was about to meet the Security Council in its wisdom came to a decision—the Assembly by its own expression of opinion decided this was a matter of emergency. Although we were to meet on 20 September, three days before that date an emergency special session was called, the issue was discussed threadbare, and we came to decisions. We have to ask ourselves, while we know that the necessary work of the kind to which the Secretary-General made reference this morning was being carried on in the Congo: are we any nearer any understanding of the details of this Congo problem or are we nearer a solution? Are we nearer progress, or are we nearer settlement? Therefore, while we have been sitting three or four weeks here, after convening an emergency special session on a problem which would not wait for the regular Assembly session, we have not acted fast enough to bring this to a fruitful conclusion. Therefore, I am instructed by my Government—and I speak in the name of my Government and people—to say that we must address ourselves to this problem with a greater sense of urgency and imperative than has been possible so far. In that connexion, I should like to say this. It is not the desire of my delegation to seek to apportion blame or responsibilities or to dwell on the past. Neither individuals nor nations can look in two directions at once. We either look backward or we look forward, and if we are wise we will look forward and use what is behind us only as inspiration or experience or as a warning.

46. So far as the Congo is concerned, the United Nations stands engaged, that is to say, every member of this Assembly, the whole of the Organization, has been, and stands, engaged with the problem of the Congo. Some countries, like ours, have probably been and are engaged even more by the presence of our personnel in large numbers. But the entire world is engaged because there in the Congo is presented a spectacle where the liquidation of imperialism presents problems of a character never presented before. I would not like today to go into the causes and reasons, which will come up in committee when we are discussing this question but we should like to make these concrete requests to the Assembly and to see that they are carried out. First of all, we have to remind ourselves that no government of a people, no management of the affairs of a people by another nation or even by all of us together, is any substitute for management by themselves. And therefore there is no alternative to the Congolese but to run their affairs in their own way, which means, as was requested by my Prime Minister when he spoke at the time, that the convocation of the Parliament of the Congo, elected by the people and representing them, must take place without further delay. I beg to submit that further delays will cause further deteriorations; it will give room for those political tendencies that are undesirable, where the expressions of opinion, non-conditioned by circumstances which should not enter into it will not become possible. So, the first request is that the Parliament of the Congo must be convened without any further delay. It is one of the urgent and imperative responsibilities of the United Nations.

47. Second, we would like to suggest that, irrespective of any legal argument in this matter, all foreign personnel in the Congo who are not there in pursuance of United Nations purposes and directives or engaged in humanitarian purposes, such as in leper colonies or in hospitals should, of their own volition, withdraw from there, because the presence of those people who have been associated with the history of the Congo is not likely to help in solutions. Therefore, if there are large numbers of non-Congolese personnel in that area not connected with the purposes of the United Nations, then they will be a hindrance to the solutions.

48. Third, we think that the United Nations must place it beyond doubt that its personnel are not there as arbitrators to intervene between rival claimants, because the Charter does not enjoin the Organization to do that. We should also remember that this is the first time that the forces of the United Nations have been used not as between nations, but within a nation. We should also remind ourselves that if there are problems in law and order, the policing of the Congo will have to be done by the Congolese people. The greater part of our attention should be directed to the fact that from now on, the administration, the policing of the country, the economic developments and the personnel are to come from that area.

49. Having laid so much stress on the urgency of this Congo problem, it is not my intention now to go into any specific proposals before us, but these are the principles that should guide us. If it was fit that we should discuss them in emergency special session, in spite of the proximate meeting of the Assembly, there can be no question of the urgency of it. As I said, we are no nearer an understanding of it, no nearer an acquaintance with the details of it than we

were four weeks ago. That means that, while I would not like to say that the situation was drifting, we have to apply ourselves in a way that some disengagement of the United Nations takes place so far as the present phase of it is concerned. The engagements should be of the character to which Mr. Hammarskjöld referred a while ago, which are all on the constructive side.

50. Finally, I would like to say that while no one can or should prevent assistance, aid or sympathy going into the Congo from any part of the world whatsoever, in the present circumstances it would not be in the interests of the world for very powerful people to fish in these troubled waters; and, therefore, whatever aid, whatever support may be given in this way—I do not say it should necessarily be channelled through the United Nations, that may not always be possible—but it should be with the Organization's cognizance, so that everything will be above board, and the Congolese people will, consistent with the basic ideas of liberty and national government, be able to settle their own affairs themselves. This is the position as we see it.

51. Next, there is another urgent problem of a specific character to which I should like to refer; it goes away from the continent of Africa to the continent of Asia, to South-East Asia, and concerns our close neighbour, the Kingdom of Laos. In the whole of Indo-China, there was a situation also arising as the aftermath of an empire, where, by the efforts of the people, the former imperial Power had decided to agree to relinquishments, including, under the famous Geneva Agreements of 1954,¹ a settlement in regard to Laos. There is the problem of Laos and Indo-China.

52. In the history of the four or five years following the Geneva Agreements, my country and Government have had great responsibilities with regard to this situation. These responsibilities are not isolated from the principles proclaimed in the Charter or the purposes of the United Nations, but they are responsibilities undertaken under the international agreements, at the request of the other parties concerned, with the permission of those directly affected. The Geneva Agreements, with all their limitations, have kept peace in that part of the world. On 11 August 1954 guns were silenced in the world for the first time in twenty-five years. From the time of the Japanese bombing of Manchuria before the war, until 11 August 1954, there was fighting going on somewhere; and when an armistice was declared, there was for the first time at last a day of peace. Machinery was established for the withdrawal of an empire; and whatever difficulties did arise, in the context of an empire withdrawing, it must be remembered that no agreements are perfect in that way.

53. The International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos was charged with certain responsibilities concerning which I do not want to go into detail. As I said, however much we may agree or disagree with the position of Viet-Nam, with that country divided into two, however much we may sympathize or otherwise have opinions about the complaints of Cambodia with regard to the incursions on its territories, I am sure my Cambodian friends will agree that, as a result of the Geneva Agreements, the presence of the Commission, the co-operation and

¹/Agreements on the Cessation of Hostilities in Indo-China, signed at Geneva on 20 July 1954.

the exercise of its functions in the past have kept that part of the world free from actual war. The Geneva Agreements which were brought about by four of the Western Powers and China (and in the Final Declaration^{2/} the United States was associated), are based upon the idea of non-interference in the affairs of these people. There is no hope for an Asian country, particularly a small country, there is no hope of peace in Asia, unless the parties to the cold war keep out of our territories. That is our main objection to military pacts. We are not saying that they are evil or that they are good, or that their motives are bad or anything of that kind.

54. What we are saying is borne out by experience: taking our own history from, shall we say, the beginning of the seventeenth century to the beginning of the nineteenth century; whenever there was a war in Europe, whenever the British and the French quarrelled there was a war in India for no Indian reason. Therefore, when the machinery of conflict—cold war or otherwise—is projected in our areas, these troubles arise. My Government and my delegation does not want to add to complications by referring to individuals, parties or whatever it is. The future of Laos lies in non-interference by the great Powers or parties to the cold war, whoever they may be, either in open or disguised form, in the affairs of Laos.

55. They may run a good Government, they may run a bad Government. They may run a coalition Government or a non-coalition Government. They may associate with peoples whom others regard as undesirable. They may perhaps act in such ways as are not approved of by some other country, but so long as they do not infringe the Geneva Agreements, so long as they keep to this conception of disengagement, and so long as they belong to the areas of peace, they are to be assisted.

56. I have no desire to go into the details of recent developments in the last few days. But there has been evidence of some interference in these matters, and we deeply regret it. Two years ago—and I would like to say, not by the volition entirely of the Royal Government of Laos with whom the Commission has had very healthy, very cordial and very courteous relations—it was found necessary to withdraw the Commission from the territory of Laos. But at the same time, the Commission for International Control and Supervision is not a piece of "busybodiness" on the part of the three members of the Commission, but is a result of international agreements with the United Nations, which it is its bounden duty to take account of—they still exist. They are machinery established by international consent. There are two chairmen of this Commission: the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom and the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union who are charged with this supervision in the last analysis, and what is more, they provide part of the resources that are required for the purpose. No country finds money for things in which it is not engaged. Therefore, this machinery, which to a certain extent has been shaken by these circumstances, is creating a situation there.

57. It is not my purpose to bring this as a special item, but the Assembly must be aware that irritation

in small places leads to larger irritations. It is very important in this part of the world, where there are circumstances, which I have no desire to mention, where very powerful blocs of humanity may become involved, where there is room for ideological conflicts of various kinds, that they should be left alone. In the long run, whether one belongs either to the Eastern side or the Western side, it will be found that non-committedness by peoples like ourselves is to the advantage of both.

58. It is impossible, in any part of Asia, to commit entire peoples to one side or the other, and if one side tries to commit any country to the other side, then at once it will create a reaction. It is surprising that, while the so-called Eastern and Western blocs are antagonistic to each other, one attracts the other. That is the contradiction in the situation!

59. In the problem of Laos, while it is not organizationally a direct United Nations responsibility, I would like to take advantage of my presence on this rostrum—and I think that it is my duty—to refer to this rather combustible area, where today there is a government, which is a constitutional government seeking to get the best support of the people. They should have assistance; indeed they should be free to have the assistance of their neighbours, first in Indo-China. If they are to draw any assistance, they should be able to draw it from their own near neighbours in Indo-China, excluding anyone else. That is the position.

60. Next, I come to the problem of dependent territories. Much has been said about the subject at this session of the Assembly. It is not my intention to express mere general opposition and to use phrases that may not always be entirely historical and certainly not welcome to certain parties concerned in the matter.

61. The problem of dependence—I do not want to use any other word—the problem of dependent territories is part of human history. All parts of human history are not either happy or complimentary—we would not like them repeated—but it happens that, either by conquest or settlement, newer civilizations have penetrated the areas of older civilizations, as in Asia and Africa, and have brought them into the context of modern life. In the last two years the areas of liberation have become larger and larger. A few years ago there were over 10 million square miles of territory still under colonial rule in Africa. Today there are about 4 1/2 million square miles of territory, with a population of 72 million, still in a state of dependence, or tutelage under the trusteeship system. And here, one must pay one's tribute to those countries such as the United Kingdom which, in the last generation, have either by experience or perhaps also by the association of liberated countries such as Ceylon, Burma, Pakistan and ourselves with them, found that it pays dividends to liberate peoples. Today empires gain even materially by terminating imperialism. Today there is a higher standard of life in the United Kingdom; there is little or no unemployment; there are better relations between the former dependent countries and themselves. So far as our country is concerned, there are more United Kingdom nationals in India today than there were under imperial occupation. Thus, friendship and co-operation have paid.

62. The position today is, however, that under the British system there are thirty-seven units occupying

^{2/}Final Declaration (dated 21 July 1954) of the Geneva Conference on the Problem of restoring Peace in Indo-China, held from 16 June to 21 July 1954.

1,346,000 square miles with a population of 34 million out of which the greater part will become free in the next few months or the next year.

63. Then we come to the French Empire, with a population of about 12 1/2 million and a square mileage of 1 1/4 million. If the problem of Algeria were settled, the greater headaches of France—and I say deliberately "France"—would be over, because there would be a vast ally occupying the greater part of Africa from and including the Sahara to the northern coast, where there are many people of multiracial stock and origin, accustomed to the ways of life of both East and West, of Africa, Asia and Europe, who would make a great contribution to civilization. So what would remain would be only the remnants of the empires of the past; and I have no doubt that if the voice of the United Nations goes forth in unmistakable fashion, and with the impact of the liberty that would be established on the African continent, the example set by their Asian neighbours during the last generation, where liberty has been used for constructive purposes and not for practising racial discrimination in reverse or for continental compartmentalism, the world would begin to realize that the liberation of peoples adds to the social, economic, moral and security power of the world.

64. It is the same as in countries where the women were disenfranchised, and then when they were enfranchised the electorate doubled and the result was an increase in the political and social capacity of those countries, involving at least half as much again of the population.

65. So our own approach to this problem is to deal with the factual situation as it stands and not to apportion blame or responsibility. I would be the last to say that, in the context of history, even these unfortunate events, even the oppressions, even the conquests of countries, have not in some strange way brought them into the ambit of modern life.

66. But today we have to look at the problem of independence—and I speak more from the point of view of people like ourselves, formerly dependent peoples. Independence has no meaning if it is exclusively the removal of foreign rule. In India we often say that on 15 August 1947 India did not attain independence in actuality, but it opened the doors for real independence by removing its main obstacle, namely, foreign rule; because independence for a people means more food, more education, more sanitation, more opportunity, more leisure. These are the things that constitute the reality of independence. The vast continent of Africa particularly—and we are no exception either—is in a state of backwardness in all these aspects, whether in the form of nutrition, or of education, or of opportunity, or of political advancement. These are the things that have to be implemented, and it should be the concern of the United Nations and of the populations themselves not to regard the ending of empire as the completion of their task and the metropolitan countries not to regard it as something that is forced upon them, but as a conscious effort of modern policy. Indeed—and I am making no very accurate comparison—even like slavery of old, it is unhistoric to argue that every slave-owner of three hundred or four hundred years ago was essentially a cruel man; he was the victim of a cruel system. Today no one would like to go back to it. The values of the world have changed and, equally as the ownership of man by man now

stands condemned and reprehensible, the ownership of a country by another country will be completely detested in the next few years. Therefore, we would support anything that comes here which speeds up the termination of the system, even as, a hundred years ago, if our delegation had had the opportunity, and with the present way of thinking, we would have supported the termination of domination of man by man.

67. It is possible to paraphrase for our time Abraham Lincoln's words. "It is not possible", he said, "for a government to be half slave and half free." We should say that it is not possible for a world to be half slave and half free. There can therefore be no area in this world, in Asia or Africa or anywhere else, where there are territories and peoples who are not entitled to become free members of this great society of ours, the United Nations. That is the test of national independence, and from that test we must go forward with the idea of implementing the reality of independence.

68. Here, may I say, particularly for the understanding or at least for the information of Western delegations, that there is a fundamental difference in the recent developments of dependent territories and the development of Western Europe. In Western Europe industry and economic progress, however slow, came first, and political liberty came after and gradually by the demands of the people who worked at the machines. The economic revolution came first. And then came the franchise—in the United Kingdom, for example, it took over a century before people finally were enfranchised. But in all of Asia and, I am glad to say, in Africa, full-fledged political revolutions have come first, whereby every man and woman irrespective of class, colour, tribe, group or such other factors, has political freedom—which means that it has released an enormous amount of aspiration and expectation and, what is more, realization that it is a function of the community, of States and Governments, to keep the community happy. So this contradiction, this division between Western development and ours creates social problems. That is to say, in the whole of this area of free Africa about 177 million people have been liberated and, if we take Asia, it means that some 800 or 900 million people have been liberated.

69. The present and large quantum of aspiration and determination, the large degree of likely frustration if the position is not met is obvious and, therefore, it is necessary for the United Nations, not merely by the time-honoured ways of seeking aid here, there and everywhere, not in ways likely to include economic domination in the politically independent countries, to think of other methods and approaches. And at the right time and in the right context my delegation proposes to put forward proposals regarding these ways.

70. If this world is to be in peace, these imbalances have to undergo rectification. I said, a while ago, that, politically, half the world cannot be slave and half free—and I do not, of course, mean a mathematical half. That statement is equally true from the economic point of view. Unless there is a rise in standards of living, unless there is industrial advancement and, what is more, a consciousness of political equality, social equality and dignity, the world is not likely to go forward.

71. I deliberately wish to exclude from these observations this morning mention of any particular coun-

tries, either dependent or dominating countries, and merely to refer to the problem as such.

72. We must consider whether, while there must be bilateral or multilateral or other specific arrangements and while the United Nations itself can take credit for a great deal in this direction, the time has come for the United Nations to take note of either the expressed or the unexpressed views of the former dependent peoples of Africa and Asia that this development has to be a co-operative effort, in which those people which benefit by it have equal pride; in other words, from each according to his ability—it is a good Christian maxim—and to each according to his needs!

73. It should be made possible for the United Nations to make a levy—a percentage of national income of countries, related to their capacity to pay—which would probably produce, although I would not like to go into figures, a very large quantum of money. The national income of the world is probably somewhere between \$1,200 thousand million and \$1,500 thousand million. If the United Nations is able to obtain agreement from the nations to submit themselves to a United Nations levy, it would be not merely for what are called under-developed countries. The under-developed countries would be participants in the levy scheme, but naturally not in the same proportions, as the more developed ones, because of their much lower standards. However, they must come into it and, side by side with the others, create international pools of technicians and experts. It should be not a one-way flow of traffic. So far as our country is concerned, there is even now both the receiving and giving of aid. But these are multilateral or bilateral arrangements. We the nations of the world should convert ourselves into a really co-operative organization for this purpose, in which each country, whether giver or taker, would not be exclusively a giver or taker. As the world develops, it will become necessary for the developed countries also to have the advantage of the experience of others. Problems of the availability and procurement of raw materials and of markets, the necessity for the advanced countries to be able to keep up their production apparatus in the face of the competition of newer countries, both in raw materials and in finished goods—all these problems will come up.

74. The time has therefore come to make a request for an effort on a very large and ambitious scale, particularly to the more advanced countries, the United States and the Soviet Union—the national income of the United States and the Soviet Union together is getting on for \$800 thousand million—to submit themselves to a United Nations levy, collected by the United Nations and administered by a special organization established for that particular purpose, so that there can be no question of unconscious trends in the thinking of that administration creating situations which are not acceptable, so that a new system will develop whereby some of the problems we have been talking about, involving the incapacity of the Organization to respond to newer situations, would also disappear.

75. We should therefore like to stress the economic aspect of the problem of dependent peoples, which can no longer be a matter of political acrimony and argument alone. The greater part of the world has become free—the Fourth Committee, I suppose, will soon be out of business, and we will be glad when that is so—and we must address ourselves to these problems of food, of education, of sanitation, of administrative

ability, the problem of the employment of leisure, the advancement of the production of raw materials and the solution of the problem of markets in such a way that humanity as a whole will be developed.

76. This is one of the submissions that my delegation would like to make in regard to this problem.

77. I think that a subject people are entitled to use every method to liberate themselves. If others do not like what they may regard as unpleasant methods, it is open to them to avoid the necessity for those who are dependent to employ such methods. Subject people, I say, have the right to use every method to liberate themselves. But a wise world would avoid the necessity of violent conflict, because violence leads to further violence, and hatred and fear, all of which endanger world progress and peace.

78. We also would not like to see in the world a situation in which an empire which has been responsible for the rule of large numbers of people, sometimes not for decades or for generations but perhaps for a century or more, finds that, when it departs, there are no people to take over. There can be no greater criticism of imperial rule than that.

79. I hope that in this matter my delegation has put forward suggestions that are not of a destructive but of a constructive character. However free politically certain territories may be, particularly small territories in backward conditions of industrial, technical and economic development, that political freedom cannot be sustained unless they can hold their own, socially, morally, economically and otherwise. That is why we have suggested this system whereby each country can make its own humble contribution, measured by its capacity to pay, with the aid being distributed to all without exception. Even a powerful country, if it requires some assistance to fill a certain lacuna, must be free to draw from that pool. The time is soon coming when no country in the world will be able to say: "We know everything and we do not want to learn from anybody else." That is how my delegation looks at this colonial problem.

80. I now come to the question of the United Nations. The Secretary-General said this morning that much has been said here, one way or the other. It is not my purpose to follow that line of argument. But we have to remember that the United Nations was founded some fifteen years ago, when the greater part of the world was politically, economically and socially not competent. In other words, the political dimensions of the world, the social dimensions of the world, have become larger, as I said a while ago, with the liberation of countries and peoples and with the advance of human ideas. Today, therefore, though we are dealing with a world which has shrunk because of methods of communication, we are dealing at the same time with an expanded and expanding world. Both the political liberation of peoples and the advance of technology have created a situation in which progress has to be fast, progress can be fast and of considerable dimensions.

81. I mentioned a little while ago the difference between the evolution of the former dependent areas and the evolution of the Western world, and I want to say that, in this matter, time is not with us. We have to take account of the aspirations, the hopes, the demands of people, and, what is more, we must realize that the knowledge that conditions which are not suit-

able can be changed by human effort, and that humanity has the right to demand the giving of co-operative assistance, has become a conscious part of our thinking.

82. As I have said, the United Nations was founded so many years ago and is the successor to so many previous efforts. But at no time did anyone think, and certainly not at the time when the Charter was formulated, that the last word had been said, that institutions are unchangeable, and that the Charter was to be a steel frame from which there would be no escape when it was necessary to respond to modern needs. Needs have changed through the vast expansion of the economic functions, the security functions, the peace functions and other functions of the United Nations. From being an Organization with about fifty Members, we have become an Organization with about one hundred Members. There are very few parts of the world which are outside this Organization. As we look back to San Francisco, we find that even those who formulated the Charter were conscious of this. The President of the United States, Mr. Truman, who was taking a leading part at that time, said:

"This Charter, like our own Constitution, will be expanded and improved as time goes on. No one claims that it is now a final or a perfect instrument. It has not been poured into a fixed mould. Changing world conditions will require readjustments, but they will be readjustments of peace and not of war."^{3/}

83. I think that both the first part and the second part are important. The most important document in this context at San Francisco was the report of Commission I presided over by the famous Belgian jurist, Mr. Rolin, which had as its rapporteur a colleague of ours at this session of the Assembly, Mr. Delgado of the Philippines.

84. This Commission, under the presidency of Mr. Rolin, made the following report at a meeting presided over by a former Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom, Lord Halifax. This is not an individual's opinion, it is the report of the Commission appointed for this purpose. The report reads:

"Taking cognizance of the facts that the Charter being prepared at San Francisco could not be perfect and that the delegates could not foresee all eventual developments in international affairs, Commission I recommends for inclusion in the Charter provisions for a special conference on the revision of the Charter....

"The special conference may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly with the concurrence of any seven members of the Security Council. It is also provided that, in case the conference is not held before the tenth annual meeting of the Assembly following the entry into force of the Charter, the proposal to call such a conference is to be placed on the agenda of that meeting of the Assembly and a conference may be called by a simple majority of the Assembly with the concurrence of any seven members of the Security Council."^{4/}

85. As the Assembly will note, we have taken all these steps. My purpose in reading this extract was to bring out that it was in the minds of those people, who were conscious of their great idealism and competence, that one-half of the world was not there. The defeated Powers at that time were not present as members. The last parts of the colonial empires—countries like our own—were still sitting on the doorstep, participating and not participating. Therefore, it was in the minds of those people that these things should be changed.

86. From those generalities we now come to the present situation. If we take each of the organs of the United Nations and put them into relation with the countries concerned, we find that the original membership from Africa was four, whereas the present membership is twenty-six. The membership from Africa, therefore, has increased between six and seven times.

87. The membership from the Americas has remained stationary: there were twenty-two Members at that time and there are twenty-two Members at present.

88. From Asia there were nine Members. In this case we lost one Member, as far as numerical calculations are concerned, when Egypt and Syria, as a result of a plebiscite held in both countries in 1958, became the United Arab Republic. But other Members were added, and within a few years they became fourteen, and today they number twenty-two.

89. From Western Europe there were ten Members, which afterwards became nine. Today there are nineteen.

90. From Eastern Europe there were six original Members, and the present number is ten.

91. So that we find in all these cases membership has multiplied by three to six or seven times. This must certainly create problems in regard to organization, and we get some rather bizarre conclusions if we take, for instance, the Security Council. Our country then and now, as expressed by the Prime Minister, has always been of the opinion that, logical or otherwise, it is necessary for the United Nations to be based upon unanimity of the great Powers, because they represent the objective facts of the world, and no great nation can, merely by a majority vote, be asked to exercise security functions or accept security decisions. Therefore, we are not in the least quarrelling with the position of the great Powers in the Security Council. That is not the purpose of this.

92. But let us take the position as it is today. Western Europe has two representatives for its nineteen Member States, whereas when it had ten Member States it had also two representatives. Eastern Europe has one representative for its ten Member States, whereas at the time of joining it had one representative for only six Member States. When we come to Asia and Africa, we get even more bizarre conclusions. The whole of Asia was at first provided with no representative. Asia was, as it were, distributed between what is called the Middle East and the Commonwealth—and I am sorry to say, for myself I do not understand this area which is called the "Middle East". It depends on where you are looking from. In my part of the world the Middle East would be somewhere in the Pacific. We must not take the view that all political meridians and longitudes are necessarily measured from Greenwich. However, the Middle East had one seat and the

^{3/}United Nations Conference on International Organization, Plenary Sessions, 26 June 1945, vol. 1, p. 680.

^{4/}United Nations Conference on International Organization, Commission I, 24 June 1945, vol. 6, p. 251.

Commonwealth had one seat, and the Commonwealth at that time had one Asian Member, namely, India. So Asia had practically no representation, but the Middle East—meaning, I suppose, mainly the Arab countries—had one representative. Latin America had two, and it has two and it will have two.

93. Africa at that time had no representation on the Security Council, except for Egypt, which is in Africa but which was included, once again by some strange geography, in the Middle East.

94. But our present position is this. Take India, for example. If it were desired to give membership on the Security Council to the Commonwealth group, we would be there, in the present state of membership, once in twenty-four years, and from the end of next year, India would be in the Security Council once in forty or forty-six years. An African country under this system, unless the Asians and Africans came to some arrangement among themselves, would not be there at all; but even if some arrangement were reached, they would be there only once in seventy or eighty years. That is to say, if a two-year term is to be distributed among all. Perhaps this is not a completely fair way of describing the situation, because not every country may want membership; but in any event, it takes a very long time—some ten to thirty years—before a given country can be on the Security Council.

95. Now, joining the Security Council does not mean being invited to social parties. It means distribution of responsibilities; it means that large and small countries in different parts of the world must all feel the sense of "belongingness". Otherwise the Security Council functions in one compartment, the Assembly functions in a separate compartment, and the Secretary-General and other organs function in other compartments. This to a certain extent is inevitable, but it becomes accentuated.

96. Therefore, looking at these purely geographical and physical facts, the necessity becomes apparent for finding ways and means of dealing with this problem calling for an amendment of the Charter. My country has been a consistent opponent of any amendment of the Charter without getting agreement among the great Powers, because it can lead only to cold-war controversy otherwise. Agreement, unanimity, of the great Powers is required to expand the organs of the United Nations. But in the same circumstances, I am sure that the great Powers, whether they belong to the East, to the West or to Europe, would recognize that the Security Council lives in a political vacuum that is unconnected with the realities of the modern world and, what is more, will create in the Assembly a caste system of nations that may get into the sanctum sanctorum, and nations that may not. And this applies equally to other organs of the United Nations which we shall be discussing in special committees.

97. Field Marshal Smuts, who was one of the formulators of the Charter and who is quite a good authority for us to quote, said, in his concluding address at San Francisco:

"Unless the spirit to operate it is there, the best plan or machine may fail. . . . It is for our peace-loving peoples to see that this great peace plan is

backed with all their energy, all their hearts, and all their souls."^{5/}

98. That is, when we try to change this system it is not sufficient for us to be logical, it is not sufficient for us to approach the task with the aim of tearing things down; we must rather respect the principle of unanimity, that union of hearts and minds that is required so to fashion the Organization as to breathe the breath of life into it, so that it can respond to the needs for it, whether they be economic, political, matters of security or otherwise. This is the submission that my delegation would like to make.

99. Next, though it may seem somewhat removed from the United Nations, my delegation feels it necessary for my country, even if it may be regarded as, perhaps, special pleading, to give some exposition, some expression of view, as to our own approach in these matters. We are not a neutral country. We refuse to accept responsibility for the appellation "neutralist", which is purely a newspaper invention, originally produced as an epithet by people who did not like our policy. We are not neutral in regard to war or peace. We are not neutral in regard to domination by imperialist or other countries. We are not neutral with regard to ethical values. We are not neutral with regard to the greatest economic and social problems that may arise. Neutrality is a concept that arises only in war. If we are neutrals, the Soviet Union and the United States are belligerents—and I do not think they want to plead guilty to that! We are not neutral or neutralist, positive or otherwise. We would take part, we would participate, we would express our views. Even that expression "positive neutrality" is a contradiction in terms. There can no more be positive neutrality than there can be a vegetarian tiger.

100. Therefore, our position is that we are an unaligned and uncommitted nation in relation to the cold war. That is to say, in relation to the great international issues, we think it is good for sovereign nations, in conformity with international law and with their own historic backgrounds, to project into international relations their own internal policies in regard to toleration, democracy and neighbourliness. And the Charter provides the guide-lines that are required.

101. It is not necessary for us to belong to this school or to that school and to sacrifice our convictions, for it is our convictions that have led us to non-alignment in this way. Secondly, we believe that in the circumstances, where the balance of power in the world unfortunately rests on what Sir Winston Churchill called "the balance of horror", it is good for nations, and not only for the nations of Asia—and while I take up no position of telling other nations what to do, the greater the increase of the area of peace in the world, the greater the non-committedness, the more that the so-called committed nations have to canvass for the moral support of others, the greater are the chances of peace. No country which relies upon power or negotiation from strength should be able to take any other country for granted. That is, we should be able to decide, either in our wisdom or otherwise, as to what is good for ourselves in the world. We should be open to persuasion, because if we are not open to persuasion we should never be able to persuade anybody else.

^{5/}United Nations Conference on International Organization, Plenary Sessions, 26 June 1945, vol. 1, p. 678.

102. Therefore, our position is that we are uncommitted in regard to sides. We do not belong to one camp or another. That does not mean that where these issues are involved to which I have referred we would simply sit on the fence and not take sides. What is more, this uncommittedness is not an attempt to escape international responsibilities. My own country, in regard to the situation that arose later in Korea—or even during the Korean war—in Indo-China, in the Lebanon, in the Gaza Strip, and now in the Congo (Leopoldville), is heavily committed, committed far beyond our capacity. We committed ourselves because we think it is in the interests of peace at this time. We want it understood that we do not welcome this appellation of neutral, or neutralist, whatever it means. It means that, if we even accept the appellation, first of all we would accept the freezing of the cold war or the power blocs, which we do not want to see in the world. In this world we cannot continue to live in peace and security, or even survive, unless the great countries of Europe and America come together, not necessarily with an identity of thinking, but with tolerance and co-operation and lay down their arms. This is not possible if there are only two sides and they are ranged against each other, each canvassing against the other. If they are successful in their enlistment effort there may well be no areas in the world that are not precommitted to forceful action. This is a tragic state of affairs.

103. We are happy to think that, while at one time being non-aligned was regarded—as I have been told so many times—as sitting on the fence, or pronouncing a curse on both houses, or trying to canvass assistance from both sides, that day has fortunately disappeared. Today in the world, even in the United States of America, the Soviet Union or European countries, there is a greater appreciation of the integrity of purpose involved in this; and even of the political profit and the profit of the world that might arise from independent countries exercising their policies independently. This is not a counsel of anarchy, or a counsel against co-operation between peoples. We do not regard military alliances between Member States of the United Nations outside the Charter, and as against another group of nations as sanctioned by Article 51 of the Charter.

104. But at the same time, we have not carried on a campaign against it. As the world stands at present, these systems have come into existence and we hope that with the evolution of proposals for disarmament and collective security they will begin to disappear even though little by little. Therefore, our position in this regard is what is dictated by the Charter; the policy of the good neighbour, the policy that we try to practice in our own country by our democratic institutions, tolerance for differences of opinion. Then, while one does not want to speak for other countries who more or less follow the same policy, speaking for ourselves, our peoples are never able to accept the idea of exclusive good and exclusive evil. There are no individuals, no nations, no groups of people who can say that their policies, their actions, their thoughts, their commitments, or whatever they are, are exclusively one thing or the other. In this changing world of ours it is always necessary to have observation and examination of the opponents' proposals. There is always a chance that the opponent may be right, and if he is right and you reject him out of hand, you lose his contribution. Therefore, we will not con-

tribute our strength, for what it is worth—it is worth very little in economic or military terms—for the promotion of world factions. We shall not be a party at any time to intervening in any way, economically or otherwise, either in the developing continent of Africa and or in other parts of Asia with a view to profiting ourselves or in such a way as to stifle their progress, or anything of that character.

105. There are no troops, there is no soldier, no aeroplane, no horse and no gun belonging to the Republic of India anywhere outside our frontiers except at the behest of the United Nations or international agreements. The last of these were withdrawn on the last day of August 1947. Therefore, we stand, without any reservation whatsoever, as a country that does not want to be involved in the war blocs.

106. This takes me to another, perhaps more controversial question—the classification of uncommitted countries as a bloc. We are against the formation of isolated blocs in the United Nations, because it means that this Assembly has no capacity to decide in freedom; that decisions are reached elsewhere beforehand and that all that happens is degrees of master-minding. This would not lead to the prosperity of this world. Co-operation among like-minded nations, co-operation among people with like-minded experience past or present is both necessary and useful. But to say that we are a third force, or a neutralist bloc, the panacea for everything, is beside the point.

107. At the risk of being misunderstood, my country does not stand for the formation of blocs, because blocs mean isolationism. We stand for a universalist world. In fact, the position the United Nations is facing is what humanity has faced from almost the pre-Christian era, where on the one hand there was the doctrine or approach of universalism, one world and one family, whether on theological, political or other grounds—and on the other hand power for oneself. This has been the contradiction the whole time. In the sixth century B.C., the Chinese tried to bring about some degree of understanding among the rival areas of the Yangtse basin on the basis of peaceful settlements, and they ended up by imposing domination in the Yangtse region.

108. After that, in the Christian world at various times there were moves in this direction, and ultimately there was the Congress of Vienna of 1815. Tsar Alexander preached to the world the universal doctrine of Christendom and the great dreams that he had for the whole world, for the great human family. But he was torn between his dreams and his schemes for power, which ultimately resulted in the Holy Alliance. So here also is the great universal doctrine that has been explored by the fathers of our constitution—the Charter—including the representatives of the United States and of the Soviet Union whose speeches at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco I just read. On the one hand they try to reach universalism, while on the other hand keeping out a good little country like Outer Mongolia; and, on the other hand, not allowing the free play of independent nations through fear of one nation or the other. So unless this Organization remains not only universal in its membership, but universal in the conception pervading it, not divided by factionism, we are not likely to get much further.

109. This was also the feeling of those who framed the Charter at San Francisco, and I have some extracts

from some relevant speeches that I will not take time to read now. But the more we move in this direction, the better. I am happy also because of the independence of uncommitted nations, and because their numbers are being largely added to by newer nations and in the thought that, whatever may be the present situation, liberty carries its own consequences. You cannot set a man free and expect him to remain unfree forever. That would be like countries who say, "You can have self-determination provided you determine as we want you to determine". Therefore, once the blaze of freedom comes to a place and it is followed by the material sustenance that is necessary to maintain itself economically and socially free, certain consequences follow. Therefore, the presence of these free nations here is not only—as I said a while ago—something for which they have to congratulate themselves and rejoice in, but it is a great contribution to the world.

110. I come now to the next of the problems, the most important of all, that is, the problem of disarmament. I hope that the Assembly will forgive me if I take most of the rest of my time for this subject. It is not the intention of my delegation to go into very accurate details on this question before the item goes to the First Committee. But it is the desire of the Government of India to put forward its approach in these matters. First of all, we think that it is essential for us to remember that the idea of disarmament has not come to us overnight but has been born in the context of human evolution. There have always been wars in the past, but that is no reason why there should be war again. In our time, in the last generation or two, there have been two great world wars, and at the end of each, efforts have been made, to create first a League of Nations and afterwards a United Nations.

111. As I said some time ago, the attempts to establish disarmament have a very long history. In our own country right through, when you go from north to south you see engraved in stone or metal by the great emperor Asoka, whose emblem we carry on our national flag today, the counsels of peace, though he had been victorious in his campaigns and pacification had been established.

112. I am not referring to our whole history. Then came, as I said, the Chinese instance. There has been the history of Europe, which is a more modern history. From the middle of the fifteenth century onwards attempts were made in this way from time to time, but I will not take the time of the Assembly to repeat history except to point out that we have now reached situations when we should remember that disarmament is part of a family tree almost, that is to say, since humanity became organized in national groups with national rivalries, there has emerged within the conflicts the concomitant idea of the pacific settlements of disputes. Pacific settlement of disputes in the Western world from the time of Bodin and after world wars makes its appearance at various times in conferences. Its advocates, whether a Tsar Alexander or a Lord Castlereagh, kept their own reservations. When we have pacific settlement of disputes, it follows inevitably that we must have collective security because if there is pacific settlement of disputes there must be some guarantee that it will be enforced or it will not endure. Therefore collective security, which has now become accepted in the world, has followed—ever since the beginning of the century, anyway. If

there is pacific settlement of disputes, then collective security follows in its train. It equally follows that there must be disarmament because it should not be possible for any great Power, or for any Power at the disposal of the United Nations, or any other bloc, to be so powerful as to impose its will by force upon anyone else. The corollary to collective security is disarmament.

113. Having said this much, I want to make the position of my country very clear, as we did on instructions of our Government at San Francisco in 1955 at the commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the United Nations. We regard disarmament only as a means to an end. The end is the avoidance of war. What we seek is not merely disarmament, that is to say, the limitation of arms, the categories of arms that should be avoided and so on, which all have their own purposes, but what we seek is a world without war, where war will be no longer regarded as an instrument of settling disputes, particularly in modern times when large populations are subject to the cruel consequences of war itself.

114. Fortunately, the time has passed in the world where there are nations which regard war as a kind of muscle development, and here I should like to read an extract which I took from a book I read recently. This is an extract from the editor's prefatory note of a special issue of the publication *Daedalus*:

"Until two generations ago, war was widely regarded as a biological and sociological inevitability—even a necessity."^{6/}

You may remember that there was a gentleman who said this during the war years. The quotation continues:

"To most theorists and statesmen, war was not the desperate last resort for settling conflicts; rather it was the mechanism that prevented society from slipping into 'degeneration' and that served as a supreme arbiter for testing the virtue and worth of that society."

Then, in the same prefatory note, we come to a quotation from the great American philosopher, the father of modern pragmatism, William James. He said:

"'History is a bath of blood' but war is 'the gory nurse that trains society to cohesiveness' and provides 'the moral spur' to develop the essential manly virtues of 'intrepidity, contempt of softness, surrender of private interest, obedience to command'."^{6/}

115. That is the formal view of war as an exercise to tune up our muscles. This was the idea of previous times, but now we have reached the situation in which, if the world were to enter into war there would be no muscles to be developed, and apparently this philosopher had the foresight to recognize this even at that time when he said (and this passage is also quoted in that prefatory note):

"When whole nations are the armies"—that is the position today—"and the science of destruction vies in intellectual refinement with the science of production"—that is what is happening to us now—"I see that war becomes absurd and impossible from its own monstrosity. Extravagant ambitions will have

^{6/}See *Daedalus*, Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Wesleyan University Press, Middletown, Connecticut, Fall 1960 issue, p. 674.

to be replaced by reasonable claims, and nations must make common cause against them." ^{6/}

116. Today these two sentences reflect what every thoughtful person believes. But what I am trying to point out is this: whatever may have been the justification for wars between nations or wars to end wars and what-not, today there can only be wars, in a global sense, only to end the world. We are told (I do not know what the basis of the calculation is) that the destructive thermo-nuclear and nuclear power of the world as at the present time, on a conservative calculation, equals the power of twelve tons of TNT per head of the population of the world. Therefore, the destructive power is so tremendous that any kind of outbreak of war would mean possible destruction of humanity as a whole. That is why we say that the idea of total disarmament, a world without war, is no longer a Utopia, it becomes an imperative necessity, because in a world that is disarmed, where war is still the instrument of policy, it is only common sense to think that if war were to break out the men who made the thermo-nuclear weapons, the machinery that could make them, would still be available to nations. The experience of history shows that neither the generals nor the weapons that were prevalent at the outbreak of war are the people or the instruments which will prosecute or end the war! It has been a commonplace that peacetime generals soon give way to wartime generals just as peacetime weapons also give way to wartime weapons. So today in our world, with the technological developments which are taking place, to which I will address myself in a minute, any limitation of armaments which makes large-scale war possible cannot be an end in itself, in that it goes on to the next phase where speed is of great value, because the effort has to begin somewhere.

117. If you asked a person whether he preferred to be destroyed by such and such a weapon or by another kind of weapon, whether the size of the gun should be this, that or the other, I suppose he would be in the position of the fish that is asked, "would you like to be fried in margarine or in butter?" It makes no difference to the fish whether you fry it in butter or in margarine. It is fried! Therefore, the world is not satisfied with being told that we are using more "humane" weapons. Therefore, my delegation wishes to place this in context, perhaps rather abruptly, because we are likely to lose sight of the importance, the necessity, and today, the possibility of total disarmament in the world within a short and measurable time. We stand four-square for the complete abandonment of all weapons of mass destruction and for speedy progress towards their abolition. Today therefore, in discussing disarmament in this general debate, and without going into great detail, I should like to refer to the background of disarmament in regard to the Charter itself. At San Francisco Field Marshal Smuts said:

"Men and women everywhere, including dependent peoples still unable to look after themselves,"—that is, according to him—"are thus drawn into the vast plan to prevent war, to prevent it not only by direct force but also by promoting justice and freedom and social peace among the peoples." ^{7/}

118. Therefore, looking at the disarmament problem, we would say, first of all, that there are large areas of agreement or near agreement. My delegation cannot be regarded as being escapist in saying this and as trying to escape the reality of conflict that exists between the two sides. But in spite of all this, there is no doubt in our minds that there are large areas of agreement and we have not quite exhaustively put down some of the areas in which there is agreement, even though it is of a general character.

119. In resolution 1378 (XIV)—which was passed unanimously, not by acclamation—the Assembly agreed on general and complete disarmament. For the first time in a resolution, we laid it down that it was to be a world without war, that disarmament should be general and complete. Second, there was agreement on the fact that disarmament should be carried out in agreed stages and completed as rapidly as possible within specified periods of time. That is to say, the Assembly, in a practical and reasonable way, has accepted the view that we should not throw out the good because we want the best. Phased disarmament is accepted, but not phasing in order to avoid reaching the ends we want to reach. Third, it is common ground between the two sides that disarmament measures should be so balanced that neither side has at any time any significant military advantage. Fourth, it was agreed that the implementation of the disarmament measures should be carried out from beginning to end under effective international control through the establishment of an organization within the United Nations. Finally, it was agreed that as the disarmament steps were implemented there should be an international force within the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

120. Those are the common grounds, and while the substance of this will be discussed in committee, I want to draw attention to Article 11 of the Charter, which definitely lays down disarmament as part of the purposes of the United Nations. Article 11 provides that one of the functions of the General Assembly is to consider "...the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments and make recommendations with regard to such principles ... to the Security Council..." and so on. Having said that, we would like to put forward the position of our Government, especially with regard to this.

121. First of all, we would like to express our opinion that many of the differences about which there is a great deal of noise made, especially where there is the modern medium of publicity and where, of course, disagreements between great peoples are better news than agreements between them, lack substance when looked at in the cold light of reason. Coming from a country like mine or from an individual like me, this may perhaps be regarded as tendentious phraseology. Therefore, I will refer to what may be called sources which will be unimpeachable in a great part of this Assembly. In a publication of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace which was issued the other day, it was stated:

"In effect, disarmament negotiations themselves have become a weapon in the cold war." ^{8/}

^{7/}See United Nations Conference on International Organization, Plenary Sessions, 26 June 1945, vol. 1, p. 678.

^{8/}Joseph Nogee, *The Diplomacy of Disarmament*, International Conciliation, No. 526, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York, January 1960, p. 281.

That is to say, instead of our trying to reach an agreement, we make use of it to show that one party is opposed to, and the other party for, war.

"Speeches made in commission, committee and plenary Assembly have more often been designed to influence different segments of opinion than to reach an accommodation with the other nations represented at the conference table. Both East and West have become masters of the art of appealing directly to peoples over the heads of their governments.^{2/}

"Beginning with the proposals for international control of atomic energy, both sides have developed and refined the technique of utilizing the discussions for propaganda purposes. This might be described as the 'gamesmanship' of disarmament negotiations. A cardinal feature of this 'game' has been to reject the proposals of the other side without appearing to sabotage the discussions.

"Every plan offered by either side has contained a set of proposals calculated to have wide popular appeal. Every such step has included at least one feature that the other side could not possibly accept, thus forcing a rejection. Then the proposing side has been able to claim that the rejector is opposed to the idea of disarmament in toto. The objectionable feature may be thought of as the 'joker' in every series of proposals."^{3/}

122. That is to say, disarmament discussions have gone on in such a way that one side has agreed on one thing one year and next year has objected to the same thing, and we have to get away from this position, realizing the consequences for the world. While we are not alarmist, we have to remember that the so-called "brinkmanship" is not a very safe device or strategy. The world stands poised with these great armaments on the edge of a precipice, and with the great armaments of the powerful nations the decision may be of such a character that it is based upon ignorance of circumstances and, what is more, upon fear. Fear makes people hate each other, leads to violence and makes negotiation and settlement of any kind impossible, because we always ask how we can know that the other side will keep the bargain. People little realize that if that is the real conviction, then why negotiate at all, because that applies to all negotiations. In the disarmament negotiations, therefore, in our opinion, in the Assembly there must be a full statement every time, by those who believe in it, that the substantive discussions must deal with the final objective so there can be no question of this going on for up to ten years.

123. Then we have to address ourselves to the increasing dangers of delay. I would like to refer to one of these dangers to which the President's own country has applied its mind. That is what has been called the problem of the Nth power. There is a report of a committee of American scientists, to which Mr. Khrushchev made reference last year, which points out that there is a large number of countries today, including my own, capable of producing nuclear weapons in a comparatively short time. The advance of nuclear science and technology is such that in two, three or four years they could produce these weapons. The number of those countries, which was about ten

last year, has become twenty this year. We have read in the newspapers that one country has now stumbled across or come to discoveries which make the production of these things very economical and very speedy. Three or four years ago, when something of this kind was said in the First Committee by my delegation, one of the great savants of disarmament said that we were indulging in science fiction! But, whatever it is, the production of weapons of mass destruction by a number of countries, and by smaller countries with lesser responsibilities and perhaps with smaller quarrels, is increasing and in three or four years time it may be quite impossible to introduce controls or inspection in the ways we want it.

124. Second, we of the former dependent world and the less fortunate countries have another fear in this matter. Supposing one of the possessor or would-be possessor countries—I will not mention anyone—in order to qualify themselves for membership in the nuclear club had become possessed of one of those instruments or intended to do so actively, they would know very well that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States was likely to precipitate a world war in the interests of a particular local quarrel. That is the hard fact of life, and, therefore, they could with impunity and with safety perhaps use this weapon in the same way as at the end of the war the atom bomb was used at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Suppose that were to happen to a country with a large colonial revolt, it would mean the use of atomic weapons for purposes contrary to those for which the Assembly stands.

125. More than that, the spread of these weapons, along with the technology that goes with it, will make it very dangerous even for the great Powers when they no longer have the control of the destructive processes that would be let loose in a world war. Therefore, the spread of nuclear knowledge by itself creates the compelling conditions for complete disarmament and total prohibition and destruction of all existing stocks so that there will be no halfway house in this matter. There must be complete totality in this direction. That is our position.

126. It is necessary that we consider the ways and means of preventing a break in the disarmament discussions. Since the founding of the United Nations, from 1946 onwards, there have been various things done to make it possible for these discussions to continue. I will not go into the history of it. My delegation, although this may not always appear in resolutions, has taken a considerable part in helping to devise machinery of this character. We had the Committee of Five, and with that Committee, we had the Disarmament Commission of twelve members. Then we had the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament and my delegation, quite illogically—perhaps, and many people at that time had reservations on the matter—agreed that these discussions should go on between the two great Powers and their supporters in what was called the Ten-Nation Committee, even outside the United Nations, because it has the same purpose as the United Nations.

127. Now the Ten-Nation Committee has been stymied; it is not negotiating any more. It is the view of my delegation that no efforts can be spared. In fact, we cannot accept a situation where there is a gap in disarmament negotiations, because once those negotiations are left with a yawning gap in that way, the

beginning of fresh negotiations would be even more difficult. It may well be difficult, for example, for a new President of the United States to begin from a position of total negativity or something like it, whoever the President may be. Therefore, we are most anxious that, whatever may be the procedures, there should be some method by which disarmament negotiations are kept going, whether or not the Ten-Nation Committee meets again.

128. None of these things can happen unless the United States and the Soviet Union and their allies and participants on either side, their colleagues on either side, agree, because they have the possession of arms. Therefore, any kind of resolution that we pass which does not attract their co-operation at some stage would be of no value.

129. If the Ten-Nation Committee could continue its negotiations, my delegation would be pleased, even if past experience was against it, even if there were misgivings on one side or the other. But we would not swear by this committee or that committee; we want negotiations. What we want is that the traffic for disarmament should go on, regardless of whether the proposal is that the Ten-Nation Committee should have other people added on to it or that the Committee should be replaced by a committee of another composition where more than ten nations or less than ten nations join with others, whatever the forum, in order that the present suspicions may seek to be removed. It should be the purpose of this Assembly to use its influence mainly on uncommitted nations in order that the world may feel that the United Nations has not abandoned the fight for disarmament. We want to say with all the strength we can command that the effect of not allowing some machinery to operate would be to create despair and despondency in the minds of the masses of the peoples of the world. Even though we have thrown away not very fruitful negotiations, if you like, we cannot for that reason now throw away negotiations altogether. That was one of the purposes of the introduction of the draft resolution [A/L.317] by the five Heads of State some time ago, which unfortunately did not get the total majority that it should have had.

130. So there should be some substitute for it. That replacement is possible either through the continuance of the Ten-Nation Committee in some form or other, with additions to it, through its replacement, or, alternately—and I don't put this forward as a proposition; if the Assembly will permit me, it may be regarded as thinking aloud—it may be considered whether, on account of the tension that now prevails between the two sides, as an immediate and proximate step the Assembly may not be able to find a group of nations who would be able to talk to these two sides separately—I don't mean moderate—pending a more convenient committee being formed. This is a third suggestion which I would like to try out in the First Committee. So whatever the process be, there must be the continuation of disarmament negotiations.

131. We have spoken about two things. Therefore, the request of our delegation is that the First Committee this year, instead of merely being satisfied with draft resolutions submitted by one side or another, amended or not amended, and going through in order to avoid greater harm, should definitely give directives. It is necessary that the Assembly should

take greater responsibility. This applies as much to the Secretary-General as to anybody else.

132. If I might digress for a moment: if the Security Council passes a resolution, the Security Council must bear with courage and actively the responsibility for giving directions in regard to implementing it, and not turn round afterwards and say it was not implemented. It is open to the Security Council to devise the machinery as to how such a resolution should be carried out.

133. As by way of example, the General Assembly this time must give directions to whatever body there is, or make a request to the great Powers and say, first, the first directive should be the object before us, the total abolition of all arms so that we can live in a world without war; second, that disarmament should be accomplished within measurable time. I purposely said "measurable", because it must be done with speed and a time should be largely mentioned. As I mentioned a while ago, if there is too much delay, then it becomes impossible. It may mean three or four years. It must also give a directive, since the areas of agreement are so large, that progress should be made within those areas of agreement instead of putting those on one side and seeking for the differences. The present approach seems to be to agree on something, put it on one side and see if we can find a difference.

134. Then it would be necessary, in the event of a crisis of confidence or anything else, in order to create that confidence, that the Assembly should formulate some kind of code which afterwards would become part of our international law and behaviour whereby the attack on one country by another country—not only the great Powers—the surprise attack by two neighbours, if you like, without adherence even to the older laws of war, would be regarded as a violent breach of international obligations. I am not saying that in the event of atomic war it means anything at all; but if we introduce into our international life the outlawing of the idea of surprise attack—as we did in the case of various weapons by the Geneva Convention, and so on and so on—that may create the climate. This is not a reference to a technique for preventing a surprise attack. I think we are getting rather involved in techniques and forgetting the purposes.

135. I think technical examinations are necessary, but technical examinations must be directed towards a particular purpose, and this directive must include the idea that preparation for surprise attack or holding out surprise attack as a weapon for domination is against the code of nations. That must become part of the accepted doctrine of international order. It may appear Utopian for the time, but unless we create this climate, we are not likely to succeed.

136. Second, the directive must include speedy agreement in regard to the termination of test explosions. Unless this is done, the danger to which I referred a while ago, the spread of these nuclear weapons and, what is more, the effects of ionizing radiation, will so vastly increase as to endanger humanity. Therefore, it is our request that at the end of these disarmament discussions there should be directives from the Assembly. The Assembly must find some medium, some machinery, some device whereby there will be no total gap. It is possible to create greater difficulties by allowing such a gap to grow. If those direc-

tives were given, then the Assembly would devise the method, even before the session closes, and could see to it that those directives, by negotiations, could be implemented.

137. It appears to us that all this is probable, if we are conscious of the fact that what is required is, as President Roosevelt said in 1945, when war was still raging: "More than an end to war, we want an end to the beginning of all wars." That is what we have been trying to do.

138. Therefore, we must in these negotiations approach the matter with a new mind and, realizing that we have come to a situation when this session of the Assembly, where great Heads of State and Heads of Governments and Foreign Ministers were gathered, had no easy approach to these problems, but, at the same time, that in all conscience the troubles of the world were great and to disguise them might lead to catastrophe. We must set ourselves against the idea of men's natures wrangling for the inferior things though great ones are their object. This is the position that we must accept, and accept the responsibility this time for giving directives.

139. Until now the Disarmament Commission has been a post office. Its Sub-Committee has met and wrangled, as I said here when I read out from the Carnegie Endowment publication, and then met either the day previous or two days previous to the opening of the Assembly session, merely to pass on its report. I submit that the Disarmament Commission has defaulted in its activity. Whether it be the Disarmament Commission of eighty-four or the Disarmament Commission of twelve, we should give a directive to this negotiating body or the committee, whatever the machinery, and it must make a report to the whole Disarmament Commission within three or four months so that the Disarmament Commission can decide whether to convene a session of the General Assembly to carry on with the work. We are not supporting one proposition or another in this matter, but we believe that greater association of all Members of the United Nations, the repeated expression of their concern, greater knowledge in the world of what is involved and the progress that we are making, and, what is more, the publicity that will come upon what some of the public may regard as activities of obstruction, that would speed the way to disarmament. That is all I wish to say at this moment in regard to disarmament, because I propose to take this up in detail in committee.

140. Now I come to the last part of my observations this morning, which has fallen to my lot because representatives will see before them a draft resolution [A/L.320 and Add.1-6] sponsored by some fifteen or sixteen countries, including my own, whose names it bears. Just before I came to speak here Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Guinea, Nepal, Nigeria and Sudan asked me to say that they wanted to be added to the list, and I believe other countries also have put down their names. The Assembly will see that this is not an expression of aspirations or an expression of opinion that comes from one part of the world. Here are countries not only of Asia, where I come from, and Africa, with which my delegation is closely associated—and where I feel sure, with one or two small exceptions, everyone would have been willing to sponsor the document—but also countries from Latin America, whose part in disarmament discussions

has been notable. There are also the countries of Europe which are not involved in the present arrangements or Power groupings. There are Austria, Finland and Yugoslavia, on the one hand, and, on the other, Bolivia, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Venezuela—I hope that I have not forgotten any. All these countries are also in it. There are the Arab countries, the African countries and the Asian countries.

141. This draft resolution has come before the Assembly not only with their good wishes but also with the appeal they make to the Assembly for its adoption. I do not think it is necessary for me to argue this at great length, but I would like to say that my delegation does not regard this as a kind of form of words with little meaning. It is not what is called a general draft resolution, giving everybody a feeling of escape into unreality. It has been put forward because we all know that tensions have increased in this world. The proceedings of the Assembly up till now have not been of a character which has left its mark by creating a different climate with regard to this, and some of us felt that it was necessary, both for ourselves and for world opinion outside, so that confidence in the United Nations might remain, so that the peoples of the world should not feel frustration and so that their expectations and aspirations should inspire even those who do not see eye to eye with each other to realize that there is a compulsive force outside which will not take account of their individual peculiarities, or even of their individual fears, and that this is a world problem, where the world stands before a catastrophe, where its economic and social progress also is being delayed by the continual threat of war and where relations between nation and nation, instead of becoming more tolerant and friendly, are becoming more grouped on one side or the other, and where the new nations which come into this Assembly, who should have a chapter of co-operation, are faced rather with a conflict of faith. Therefore, we have put forward this draft resolution without any desire to apportion blame or responsibility, but to enunciate positions which are in total conformity with the Charter and which take into account the factual situation. For example, the draft resolution says:

"The General Assembly,

"Deeply concerned by the increase in world tensions,"

and

"Considering that the deterioration in international relations constitutes a grave risk to world peace and co-operation,".

142. In the course of informal discussions on this matter—naturally, one looks at every side—the problem we posed ourselves was, "Does it constitute an alarmist statement on affairs?" It is not an alarmist statement, but the world does give cause for alarm. That is to say, it is right for a responsible body such as ours to say that the increase in world tension—whether we take it among the countries represented here or elsewhere—is so serious that in the present state of technical advance, and with, as I have said, the crisis of lack of confidence, there is grave risk to international peace. Even though it may not arise in the form of a declaration of war or anything of that kind, there is a grave risk to international peace. So we say that in fact it would be wrong not to face the situation. The right thing to do by the world is to take

the world into confidence, if you can do so. Therefore, we do not stand for any reservations with regard to this.

143. We have said also that greater harmony among nations, irrespective of their economic and social systems, to which there are references in the Charter, would contribute towards greater harmony and tolerance between nations, and also that the United Nations should act as a centre for harmonizing the conflicting interests. These are among the fundamental purposes of the Charter, and therefore the third paragraph of the preamble fully sets out our position. Then we have urged that all countries, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, refrain from actions likely to aggravate these tensions. If we want to lessen tensions, it is obvious that we should not aggravate them, and aggravation may be by psychological warfare, it may be by preparations, it may be by forms of intrusion and threats to safety in one way or another—any of these actions—and it is not for the United Nations to prescribe who shall do what, but simply to appeal to the good sense of nations and their loyalties to, and obligations under, the Charter.

144. There we have gone on to operative paragraph 2, which we think is essential in the circumstances because, while we all recognize that the United States and the Soviet Union are the two major great Powers of the world—though the other Powers which have been involved in these discussions are equally concerned—the Organization itself cannot escape its responsibility, and its responsibility and its power come not from anywhere else but from its Member States. Co-operation must be forthcoming in full measure so that it may become an effective instrument for safeguarding the peace, and for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples. At the present time one of the great achievements of the United Nations has been that—in spite of all that has gone on in the world, in spite of all the great conflicts, in spite of the technological capacity for mass destruction and in spite of the crisis of confidence—the Assembly and the Organization have survived. Its survival is a great achievement, and we may therefore do nothing which does not assist towards its greater strength.

145. The Secretary-General referred this morning, and also in the introduction to his annual report [A/4390/Add.1], to various aspects—to the more silent and less advertised work in the social and economic spheres. For all those purposes it is necessary that there should be a reaffirmation of these things, which should go out to the world, to the effect that, whatever may be the difficulties, we, the representatives here in the Assembly, and the Member States, have not only not lost confidence, but place our reliance in the United Nations to carry on, and will make our best efforts.

146. Now we come to the appeal. I hope that this draft resolution will be taken cognizance of and accepted, and that the Assembly will become seized of it, and therefore I move it. I hope that the Assembly will give not merely a vote that is without opposition, but a positively unanimous vote, so that the world will know that, irrespective of all the differences, the aims are harmony and toleration, the creation of the necessary machinery for strengthening the United Nations and the necessary support, and also that we shall, in the coming weeks, address ourselves to particular problems, some of which I have referred to.

147. That is all I wished to say. I referred to the other nations which wish to sponsor the draft resolution, and it must be left to the President's discretion and wisdom how to proceed with this matter. But we would request that, before the general debate is technically concluded, the Assembly should be invited to express its opinion on this, so that it goes out to the world with some positive contribution by way of its support, and, as representative of one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, I would take the liberty of requesting that every vote in this Assembly should be positively cast in its favour.

148. At the beginning of my observations I referred to this fifteenth session of the Assembly meeting in conditions of concern and expectation. I think it would be only right and appropriate—in fact, if I did not do it it would be inappropriate—that I should refer also to the fact that, while there is concern, while there is expectation and while there are, perhaps, doubts, suspicions and so on, there is also in this Assembly the determination for us to keep together, the determination to pursue the ends of the Charter and the determination that the ills of the world arising from exploitations and imbalance, the ills of the world arising from threats of war, should be removed. We should proclaim that in this way, so that we may conclude the general debate and go on to our work with the feeling that, despite all our difficulties and despite the heat sometimes generated, there is also the determination in the minds of people that while people may strike they shall not wound, that here is a medium created by men after many failures, and that even if, unfortunately, failures should occur here or there, we shall not be daunted by them in the sense of throwing in the sponge, but shall go on from endeavour to endeavour and, in the words of the poet, say,

Ye rigid ploughmen bear in mind

Your labour is for future hours.

Advance! spare not! nor look behind!

Plough deep and straight with all your powers.

149. I say this in all humility—the humility of a nation that does not seek power and does not seek to prescribe a remedy, but seeks to express its own positions and to make its humble contribution to the world, irrespective of the risks that we may have to take for peace.

150. The PRESIDENT: That concludes the list of speakers in the general debate. Seven delegations have, however, asked for the floor in exercise of the right of reply. As the Assembly is aware, His Majesty the King of Denmark will address the Assembly this afternoon. I would propose that after His Majesty's address the Assembly should, after a short recess, hear the seven speakers who have asked for the floor in exercise of the right of reply. Immediately they have spoken, I would propose to ascertain the wishes of the Assembly on the draft resolution [A/L.320 and Add.1-6] which has just been presented by the Chairman of the delegation of India.

AGENDA ITEM 51

Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly:

(b) Committee on Contributions

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/4538)

151. The PRESIDENT: We shall now go on to agenda item 51 (b), relating to an election to fill a vacancy

in the membership of the Committee on Contributions. The Fifth Committee has submitted a report [A/4538] on that item. In order to enable the Committee on Contributions to meet today, may I take it that the Assembly confirms the election that took place in the Fifth Committee and is prepared to adopt the draft

resolution proposed in the Fifth Committee's report? In the absence of objection, the report will be considered approved and the draft resolution adopted.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.15, p.m.