

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



1034th  
PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 11 October 1961,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

|  | Page          |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Agenda item 9:</i>  |               |
| <i>General debate (continued)</i>  |               |
| <i>Statements by the representative of Nigeria . . . . .</i>                     | 399, 403      |
| <i>Statements by the representative of Senegal . . . . .</i>                     | 400, 404      |
| <i>Statements by the representative of South Africa . . . . .</i>                | 400, 403      |
| <i>Statement by the representative of the Ivory Coast . . . . .</i>              | 402           |
| <i>Statements by the representative of Liberia . . . . .</i>                     | 403, 404, 405 |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Niger . . . . .</i>                        | 404           |
| <i>Statement by the representative of the Central African Republic . . . . .</i> | 404           |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Tunisia . . . . .</i>                      | 404           |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Morocco . . . . .</i>                      | 405           |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Ethiopia . . . . .</i>                     | 405           |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Indonesia . . . . .</i>                    | 405           |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Afghanistan . . . . .</i>                  | 405           |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Australia . . . . .</i>                    | 406           |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Chile . . . . .</i>                        | 406           |
| <i>Speech by Mr. Ortiz Martín (Costa Rica) . . . . .</i>                         | 406           |
| <i>Speech by Mr. Fawzi (United Arab Republic) . . . . .</i>                      | 409           |
| <i>Speech by Mr. Peter (Hungary) . . . . .</i>                                   | 415           |

**President:** Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 9

### General debate (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Before we resume the general debate, let me remind the Assembly that at the end of this morning's meeting we left unfinished the debate on a point of order raised by the representative of Liberia, who moved that the statement made by the representative of South Africa should be deleted in its entirety from the official records of the General Assembly. We have first to complete the discussion on this motion, and I shall now call upon representatives who wish to speak to the motion—and not in exercise of their right of reply.
2. Mr. WACHUKU (Nigeria): On the point of order arising from the motion made by the representative of Liberia, I want to say that we who come from that great continent called Africa have had this morning a display of one of the worst forms of crudity that can be made manifest in this Assembly.
3. Yesterday I made certain remarks about South Africa [1031st meeting]. The statement that was made this morning by the representative of South Africa [1033rd meeting] has fully justified my statement and, in fact, offers conclusive proof of what I alluded to. The Foreign Minister of South Africa, who claims to represent an African State, came here and insulted

the whole of the African people, the African States and everything for which the African States stand. And as we are Members of the United Nations, by insulting the whole of us he insulted the General Assembly.

4. Of course, I am not surprised from reading the records. The record of South Africa has been one of consistent refusal to behave as a Member of this Organization. All resolutions of the General Assembly and all the decisions of the various Committees have been ignored by South Africa. Everything that any honest and decent people have decided has been ignored by South Africa. In other words, South Africa has shown by its very behaviour that it is not fit to associate with decent States and decent peoples. It was therefore normal that Liberia thought it fit and proper to have the venom that was poured out here expunged from the records of the Assembly so as not to give the impression that this is the type of thing that is normally found in the records.

5. As regards the point of order, I, on behalf of my delegation, want to appeal to the representative of Liberia to reconsider his stand. I think that if the Foreign Minister of South Africa has done any thing today, he had done one of the worst disservices—in fact, a great disservice—to his country because he has supplied us with abundant nails with which to nail his country into the coffin. It is only a question of time to bury it. In fact, I think that if we follow the advice of the representative of Liberia, we will be deprived of a very effective weapon with which to deal with South Africa at the appropriate time. There can be no denial of what he has said here; it is on record; he cannot withdraw it. I therefore implore the African States and all people who feel resentment to agree with me that we should ask the representative of Liberia, having made this resentment known—which is voicing the sentiment of all representatives here to reconsider his view.

6. If the Foreign Minister of South Africa really considers himself to be a legitimate Member of this Organization, the normal thing would be to minimize the insult that has been levied on the people as a whole and the representatives here, and he should come forward courageously and apologize to this Assembly for coming here and polluting these environs surrounding the high and exalted position of the President. That at least would show that he as an individual may not be responsible for what he says. But if he refuses to do that, then I am entitled to say that not only was he voicing the opinion of those who sent him here, but also he was voicing his own personal views on this matter. I say this because when I read the speech that was delivered here, I noted that this gentleman had the audacity to mention the good name of my Prime Minister and to quote him out of context, a deliberate falsification of the statement that he made, using it as justification for the intervention in Katanga. This shows you exactly the type of persons we have to deal

with. They do not even understand English. I am referring to a particular statement. Mr. Louw said:

"In August of last year no less a person than Sir Abubakar Balewa, the Prime Minister of Nigeria, stated in a television interview here in New York." [1033rd meeting, para. 83]. He is supposed to be quoting the Prime Minister. The Foreign Minister of South Africa continued: "I do not believe Africa's Non-Self-Governing Territories will benefit from the immediate granting of independence. I don't think there are enough trained people to man the civil service." [Ibid.]

Then Mr. Louw went on from there:

"Sir Abubakar speaks from experience. Under the system of 'colonial oppression', as it is sometimes termed, the British not only prepared his country for independence, but were good enough on their departure to leave a large number of civil servants and technicians to assist Nigeria during the first years of independence." [Ibid.]

Then he went further to give his own interpretation of the views of the Prime Minister:

"In view of this statement, one wonders whether the Prime Minister of Nigeria approves of the high-handed action of the United Nations in arresting and deporting European civil advisers of President Tshombé of Katanga, who was anxious—as were the Governments of Ghana and Nigeria—to retain the services of trained advisers for the purpose of ensuring the continuation of the stable economic conditions which have prevailed almost ever since the United Nations General Assembly decided to take action in the Congo." [Ibid., para. 84.]

7. By implication this man is suggesting that my Prime Minister was opposed to the independence of an African territory. I was present when he spoke. He was asked the question whether he approved or supported the demand that all territories, colonies throughout the world, as was declared, should be immediately independent, by which he referred to a particular date, 1961 or 1962. Of course, he stated that if all of them, including those tiny islands in the Pacific and everywhere were given independence by that date, a lot of problems would arise. He was careful not to leave out all those aspects of it. The Foreign Minister of South Africa extracted just one portion of it. This kind of distortion may be found in the Press, but it should not be found in the Assembly. It is a dishonest statement and a deliberate falsification, an attempt to mislead the Assembly. South Africa, by doing this type of thing, has obviously made it clear that this microscopic minority which exists in South Africa is not fit to live on that continent.

8. Not only did the Foreign Minister go as far as to refer to my Prime Minister; he has shown, in effect, that the trouble in Katanga is not caused by Tshombé alone but that in fact his country, his Government is behind the whole thing. They have been arming Katanga and trying surreptitiously in a very wicked manner to dismember the Congo. We Africans now know exactly where Tshombé derives his authority. The question then arises whether a Member that has not only shown disloyalty to the Assembly but which is also waging war against the United Nations can remain in this Assembly and claim to be abiding by the Charter. That is a matter in which, as the representative of Australia and others have said, principles are involved. Not only has this man shown by his

speech that it is not the indigenous African who is the savage, but also we now know who the savages are. Therefore, in order to assure the superiority of the system which obtains in Liberia and Nigeria and in other places, we cannot treat the Foreign Minister of South Africa just as he would like to treat others. Therefore, if he is not willing to apologize for this, we will treat him with the contempt that he deserves.

9. We in Africa today want an ordered development. It is not only Africa that has been insulted here. References have been made to the United Kingdom and the United States and others for supporting the independence of peoples, and South Africa expects to be heard.

10. Having had the opportunity to raise this point of order and using the opportunity to ask South Africa to come and apologize for its misdeed, I implore the representative of Liberia to reconsider the position, to let the debate continue and to let us have the South African Foreign Minister's words on record, because if his statement is expunged from the record Members will not have the opportunity to study its full implications and to take a stand. In future, when we bring forward draft resolutions in the Assembly, I think they will be in a position to understand the problem that faces us and to see how magnanimous we have been in dealing with South Africa; but to wipe it out completely would deprive us of this most valuable contribution and deprive us of the possibilities that will flow from this most amazing speech. Having made this remark, I thank the President for giving me the opportunity to raise my point of order.

11. Mr. SEYNI LOUM (Senegal) (translated from French): I have the honour to have been preceded at this rostrum by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Government of Senegal, who defined to the Assembly in clear and precise terms [1012th meeting] my country's position on the South African problem. Accordingly, we can only support unreservedly the motion proposed this morning by the representative of Liberia. For the statement which was made here this morning by the minister of External Affairs of South Africa is a vile insult to all Africans present in this chamber. We cannot pass over such a statement in silence. The absence of this statement from the records will not be any loss to the United Nations, for all of us here know South Africa's policy, and that policy has been confirmed to us. So let the statement be purely and simply struck from the records. That is what I have wished to say.

12. Mr. LOUW (Republic of South Africa): This is probably one of the most extraordinary motions or points of order ever put before the Assembly. If this motion were to be carried, I see a very dismal future for further debates in this Assembly hall. If it were to be carried, it would strike a very serious blow to the principle of free expression of views by representatives who come to this Assembly to put before it their own views on various international matters, to put the views of their Governments in regard to those matters and where necessary, where their own policies have been attacked, to have the opportunity, in addressing this Assembly, of explaining the policies of their Governments, as I did this morning when I explained to the Assembly exactly what the policy of South Africa is with regard to its non-European, non-white population. I say it would strike a blow at the free expression of views in this Assembly, and the first people who would suffer if this were to be accepted

as a precedent would be the very representatives who today have taken this attitude in making this motion. As far as we are concerned, if the motion is accepted, we shall certainly let no opportunity pass to take exception and to move that any matters which may be reckoned to be offensive to South Africa be expunged from the record.

13. Let us consider what the position would be if we applied this principle to the records of the Assembly during past years. Let us take the discussions that took place here last year. If, on this principle which certain Members wish to have adopted today, everything that was said, particularly at last year's session, were to be expunged from the record, there would be very little record left. The representative of Australia put this very clearly this morning. He said that he does not agree with all of our policy, and if he does not agree I have no objection to that. But if the Assembly accepts this motion, then I can only say that I can see a very poor future for further deliberations in the Assembly this year or in future.

14. May I remind the representatives that the Charter states in Article 2, paragraph 1: "The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members." That means that, so long as one does not indulge in purely personal statements, any Member of this Organization, whether one of the Western nations or Eastern nations or Communist nations, is free to express his views freely from this rostrum, whether or not the other Members of the Assembly agree with them; that he is free also to express his views strongly if he is of the opinion that his own country has been unjustly attacked; that he is free to set out his own ideological or other views if he feels so disposed. Again I refer to what happened last year when views were expressed very forcibly in this hall. Nobody then suggested having those views expunged from the records.

15. The representative of Liberia bases his motion on a statement that what I said here this morning was offensive and insulting not only to Liberia but to the African States as a whole. The representative of Nigeria, who has just spoken, said something along the same lines.

16. We have here a situation developing—whether it is geographical or ideological I do not know—in which the States situated in a certain continent, bound by certain lines, club together so that anything one may say about one of them—it may be a perfectly legitimate criticism—is to be regarded as offensive to that whole group of nations. I say again, where are we going to land? For example, if one were to go up to this rostrum and say something disparaging about one of the Latin American States, would any of the other representatives of Latin American States come up and say that all the Latin American States were insulted by that particular remark?

17. No, we are going far, and I am glad that the representative of Australia expressed this view so strongly this morning. I agree with all he said.

18. I made a statement here, and we are told that it was offensive to the African States. I want to put the question: in what way? Ninety per cent of my statement was an exposition of South Africa's non-white policy, its policy for amicable relations between the non-white sections of our community. And I ask representatives who have an open mind on this matter—that is our trouble; some representatives do not have an open

mind but approach this whole issue with only one idea: South Africa must be damned—in what way was my statement offensive? Let them reread that speech of mine; let them take it home and read it carefully. If those with an open mind read it, I am quite sure that if they want to be honest they will have to agree that my statement was a fair statement, an objective statement. It was designed mainly to show that these attacks being made on South Africa are not justified, that they are based largely on false and often malicious Press reports. That was the whole tenor of my statement this morning.

19. Here and there in my speech, I admit I compared unfavourably conditions in certain African States with conditions in South Africa, particularly in regard to such matters as housing, health and social services, etc. I do not know whether those particular representatives were suffering from a guilty conscience; knowing that my comparison was perfectly justified, they turn around and say that all the African States have been insulted and that I was offensive towards all of them.

20. I object most strongly to a statement of that kind, and I say again that any objective reading of my statement will confirm that what I have just said here is the case; there is nothing offensive.

21. I come back to this extraordinary motion before the Assembly. During the past two weeks of the general debate, one representative after another, with very few exceptions, from the African countries went out of their way not only to criticize South Africa, but to make most disparaging and often insulting remarks about my country. My own impression is that the speeches which we have heard during the past two or three weeks have every appearance of a prearranged campaign. It is extraordinary that one representative after another should suddenly get up and make these attacks on South Africa. And that prearranged campaign has had its culmination in what happened here this morning. I am quite certain that if I were to make the mildest criticism of African States, we would have had this same motion before the Assembly.

22. My office has given me extracts from every one of the speeches made during the last two weeks in the general debate in which there were these attacks on South Africa, and one of the most insulting of those attacks was that made by the Foreign Minister of Ghana, in which he went so far as to suggest—not to suggest, but to charge—that South Africa had described as "objectionable literature" a speech of his Prime Minister. I hope that representatives will read what I said this morning. There is not the least possible doubt as to what he intended, but he is now giving a different explanation. He is on the hook and is trying to get off it. There is no question about it; it was a most insulting reference to South Africa, suggesting that just because the Prime Minister of Ghana had made a certain speech, that speech as such was described as "objectionable literature". He tried to get out of the idea that what really happened was that his office here had issued that speech in the form of a document. I have the pamphlet and on the pamphlet is the mark of our customs authorities "Rejected". What he read out here this morning was in fact—the words which he said appeared in our official Gazette—the words taken from his pamphlet, not from the official record. These are the insulting remarks on the ground of which we ought to be expelled from the United Nations; and I am expected to sit here and be perfectly happy about it and not to react.

23. The records of the General Assembly over the years show that individual Members have been only too quick to react when the honour of their country has been attacked or when false allegations have been made regarding their country. That there are differences of opinion is another point. The head of the Uruguayan delegation, the Chairman of the Committee on South West Africa, spoke here this morning—and there we have a difference of views since the attitude of that Committee and that of my Government are as far apart as the poles. But there is no reason, because I take up certain views, why it should be said that my statement should be expunged from the record.

24. If this draft resolution is adopted, I warn in all seriousness that it will mean the application in the United Nations of a double standard. I think it was last year, but I do not want to be accused again of quoting out of context, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nigeria said this morning (if he has any complaints he must go to the television people and tell them to report his Prime Minister correctly)—that the Prime Minister of Canada, if I am correct, in an excellent speech, warned against the application of a double standard in the conduct of the affairs of the United Nations. What is sought here today is the application of a double standard. We cannot have a double standard for the strong nations and another for the smaller nations; in the same way, we cannot have one standard for a group which these days happens to be a very strong group—a group of States from Africa, with the assistance of certain other States—and another standard for, say, a minority group.

25. We see there the dangers which are inherent in the motion which is now before the Assembly and which, if accepted, would create a state of affairs in the United Nations which many of the representatives would have reason to regret in the future. It would mean that any representative could move to have expunged from the record any unfavourable reference to his country. If this principle had been enforced I could have come to the rostrum last week and the week before and, if I could have found enough support, could have demanded that many of the statements made by African representatives should be expunged from the record. Of course, I would not have obtained sufficient support because the other group is too strong. But that makes it even more the application of a double standard. But the United Nations is in sufficient difficulties, and its position today as an organization is not so strong that it can afford the application of a double standard in the conduct of its affairs.

26. Those are the views of my delegation, and I will conclude by once again voicing a very serious warning, quite apart from the interests of South Africa in this matter as a Member of this Organization which certain other Members are very anxious to get rid of. I am quite aware that they are anxious to get rid of us because they say so quite frankly. In the discussion last week there were two or three suggestions, including one by the Foreign Minister of Ghana, that South Africa should be expelled. I also could mention certain nations which I think we could do without, but I would not do so. After all, I come back to the Charter and its principle of the sovereign equality of all Member States.

27. They wish to expunge this from the record. They have the necessary majority to do so and they can do it, but a precedent would be created. A precedent would be created in this Assembly, a precedent which

would be acted on in the future and which would make a farce of discussions here and strike a grievous blow at the free expressions of opinions by sovereign Member States of this Organization.

28. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I should like to point out that we have sufficiently discussed the question of this point of order, and that it would be most useful if representatives who still wish to speak on the matter would confine themselves to commenting briefly on the point of order alone; after which, we shall take our decision.

29. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast) (translated from French): I come to this rostrum with some regret, since I am following the representative of South Africa. The appeal I am about to make, if it is accepted by our Liberian colleague, will bring about the same result, more or less, as if his request were approved.

30. The representative of South Africa has called Liberia's motion an extraordinary one. We, however, believe that in an extraordinary situation such as that we experienced this morning, such means are the only ones that can be used. It was somewhat ironic to hear the South African representative quoting the Charter to speak of the equality of all Member States. He forgot, however, that it was a racist doctrine which set off the World War, which devastated the world and which caused the nations to create the United Nations. As a result, the first principle affirmed by the nations was the principle of racial equality. Why did Mr. Louw lack the courage to refer to this principle of racial equality? The Government of the Ivory Coast is most afflicted to observe that racist ideas still persist, when it has set itself the mission of building a world in which the brotherhood of man is supreme. The name of Abidjan was not mentioned in vain in the ignoble statement we heard; for the South African delegation was expelled from an international conference recently held under United Nations auspices at Abidjan. We are regretfully compelled to predict a sad future for the South African Republic. It has been expelled from the Commonwealth, it will undoubtedly be expelled from other organizations, and we wonder whether it has not embarked on a course which will lead to its expulsion in the near future from Africa.

31. Let me appeal to the representative of Nigeria; let me point out to him that on all African problems Africa is unanimous: the twenty-six States which represent independent Africa will fight as one man and with all their strength, first by persuasion and perhaps then by other means, to make South Africa understand the real danger it is running by carrying out on African soil an unworthy policy of segregation which Africans, who are men of no complexes, cannot tolerate.

32. I ask that this statement be retained, that it be kept in the records, so that throughout the debate that is to take place here we can refer to it. If the statement were not included in the records we should be unable to refer to it; but it contains admissions which we shall be able to use to justify our action in this Organization, so that outside it, when people read the vile address which we heard this morning, they will know that while patient Africa is still patient, patience has its limits.

33. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now call upon the representative of Liberia, to speak on the point of order alone.



34. Mr. Henry Ford COOPER (Liberia): We should have thought that South Africa's representative would come to the rostrum in, I would not say a sorrowful, but a repentant mood; in fact, he comes to it to justify everything he said. He said that in his speech there was nothing offensive or insulting to the African States. Well, I do not know what kind of mentality the South African Government or the South African representative has, but to shoot up people and force a man to carry a card in his own country to identify himself, to segregate himself, and then to tell us openly that these people have better living conditions and better rights than all other people in Africa—if that is not insulting then I do not know what is.

35. Many of the African representatives have appealed to us to withdraw our motion. We do so not so much on account of South Africa but on account of the principle laid down in the Declaration of Human Rights that each Member has the right to say what he likes and to write what he likes—although South African has violated every clause in that Declaration.

36. But in withdrawing our motion we make another one. We move that the Assembly pass a vote of censure against the Government of South Africa or its representative for a statement here today which was offensive, fictitious and erroneous, and of which the Assembly fully disapproves.

37. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of Liberia, raising a point of order, moved that the statement made this morning by the representative of South Africa should be deleted from the record. This motion has now been withdrawn by Liberia itself; however, the Liberian representative has submitted a second motion calling for a vote of censure by the General Assembly on the representative of South Africa.

38. I call upon the representative of Nigeria, to speak on this motion.

39. Mr. WACHUKU (Nigeria): I am very happy to second the motion of censure with regard to South Africa for the simple reason that I invited the representative of South Africa to be good enough to show his good upbringing by coming here and apologizing to the General Assembly for what he had done. But what did he do? He came here and reiterated everything he said. In other words, he was not repentant at all. He did not feel that he had done wrong. He did not realize that racism is abhorred by this Assembly. He does not seem to realize that all the representatives have accepted the principle that racism has no place in our present society. Knowing the record of South Africa, we know that every resolution dealing with this particular matter which has been adopted by the General Assembly and by every Committee of the General Assembly has been ignored.

40. How can the General Assembly show South Africa that it disapproves of the conduct of this entity which claims to be a Member of the Organization, which refuses to accept the rules and regulations of this Organization? The Foreign Minister of South Africa has the effrontery to quote the Charter in order to justify his stand. He claims to have a right under the rules of this Organization which he does not recognize. The fact that one becomes a member of this Organization suggests that it will accept the obligation to abide by the Charter and the rules and regulations, and that whenever the Assembly adopts a resolution

that country will accept the obligation to be bound by that resolution and to see to it that it is carried out.

41. But we are being told by this imaginary State called South Africa that South Africa is an exception, that everybody can abide by the rules and regulations and the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly, but that only one country in the world is free not to conform to what ninety-nine States have decided to do. The representative of South Africa said that if we adopted the motion which the representative of Liberia has now been good enough to withdraw, then a serious principle would be violated, namely freedom of speech and equality of sovereign States here. What of the other principle which accepts membership in an organization, with its rules and regulations, and which takes decisions that are supposed to be binding on all members? Has South Africa not consistently violated these rules and regulations, the obligations under the Charter, and the resolutions of the General Assembly in the course of years?

42. If that is the case, I see no other course. In fact this would be one of the mildest steps that could be taken to show that we disapprove of the conduct of South Africa, to let them know that South Africa is persona non grata as far as the Assembly is concerned, and to force South Africa to review its thoughts and to begin to do things in the right manner.

43. I think that this is a motion which any representative here can support with a clear conscience. There is no suggestion that South Africa should be expelled now. The Assembly would show its displeasure at the conduct of South Africa in practising racism. When it has committed this abomination of insulting other Member States and is called upon to apologize, then refuses to do so and has the effrontery to claim rights in the same Charter which it consistently violates, I think this motion is the easiest thing for any Member to support and I have the greatest pleasure in supporting the proposal of the representative of Liberia that South Africa be censured.

44. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of South Africa, who wishes to raise a point of order.

45. Mr. LOUW (Republic of South Africa): I wish to raise a point of order. The leader of the Liberian delegation has now left his previous position and has moved a vote of censure, and if I am to judge by the speech of the previous speaker this vote of censure has to deal with what is called South Africa's racial policy. There is no such motion in today's agenda in the Journal, nothing of the sort. It is not on the agenda for today. But there is a Special Committee to which this very issue has been entrusted and so decided by the Assembly—the racial question in South Africa. That has been sent to the Special Committee, which I believe will be holding its meetings next week. If, therefore, there is any intention now to attempt to discuss the racial question in South Africa, then, with all respect, I suggest that such a discussion would be out of order. It is not on the agenda for today, but it is on the agenda and has already been referred to a Special Committee. I fail to see how the Assembly could now take away from the Special Committee a matter which has been submitted to it. That will be discussed next week.

46. For the sake of these Members, I will now inform them that I will be present at that Committee and I shall be there prepared to answer any allegations and

charges made against South Africa. But I submit, with all due respect, that the present motion is out of order; it is not on the agenda for today. What is more important is that it is a matter which has actually been referred to a Committee and I fail to see how the Assembly can remove from the Committee a question which has already been sent to that Committee for consideration.

47. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of Liberia, to speak on the point of order raised by the South African representative.

48. Mr. Henry Ford COOPER (Liberia): I cannot follow the South African representative's argument at all. We are not asking him to discuss the race question in South Africa. That we have on the agenda. What we are asking for is a vote of censure as regards the statement he made here today, which we say was offensive, fictitious and erroneous. It is not the question of the race policy in South Africa; that is going to be discussed in the Committee.

49. Furthermore, the Assembly is its own master. Under the rules of procedure the Assembly can take whatever decision it cares to take, and in this case I do not think that the argument of the South African delegation applies at all. We are asking for a simple vote of censure on the statement which he made here today and which we say was offensive, fictitious and erroneous. We are not discussing now the question of the racial question of South Africa. That will go to the Committee. I still maintain my motion.

50. Mr. DIOP (Senegal) (translated from French): A few moments ago, Senegal supported the motion to delete from the records the statement made by the representative of South Africa; similarly, it will now support the proposal that a motion of censure be passed on South Africa.

51. We are not at all convinced by the picture of the happy Eldorado enjoyed by Africans in South Africa which the representative of that country just tried to present to us. You have given them happiness, you say; but what sort of happiness? A selective happiness. You build fine houses for them, perhaps; perhaps you give them material well-being. But you rob them of the supreme happiness: their human rights, their human dignity and their honour as men. We do not believe in that kind of happiness.

52. It is for that reason that we call upon the Assembly to follow in the tracks of other international organizations which have already taken action against the policy of discrimination practised in South Africa. South Africa has already been expelled from the ILO; South Africa was barred from the meeting of the Commission for Technical Co-operation in Africa South of the Sahara (CTCA) held at Abidjan; South Africa has been expelled from the Commonwealth; and Senegal will not only ask you today to pass a vote of censure on South Africa, but will call upon you tomorrow to expel South Africa, which has violated the United Nations Charter.

53. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of Niger, to speak on the motion of censure proposed by Liberia.

54. Mr. DJERMAKOYE (Niger) (translated from French): As the representatives of the African States have said from this rostrum, the Assembly—and you

will undoubtedly agree with me on this point—is absolute master of its own decisions.

55. I come here to support the eminent speakers who have preceded me and have called for a vote of censure against South Africa. I shall vote in favour of the motion of censure on South Africa.

56. Ignominy, slander, racialism are criminal acts which must be categorically condemned by our Organization. The United Nations, I am convinced, will unanimously condemn South Africa.

57. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of the Central African Republic, to speak on the motion of censure proposed by Liberia.

58. Mr. GALLIN-DOUATHE (Central African Republic) (translated from French): Repetition is the mother of education. That is why, in the opinion of the Brazzaville Group, of which my country, the Central African Republic, is a member, it will not be idle for us to repeat our views.

59. Intoxicated, probably, by the decided immunity which has been enjoyed from start to finish by the South African Republic's racist policy—a policy in any event universally condemned in this twentieth century, in which it has many times been affirmed and reaffirmed that intelligence has no colour, that the blood which flows in our veins has no colour, that the feelings have no colour, except perhaps for the Republic of South Africa—intoxicated, I repeat, by the immunity enjoyed by his Government's racist policy, the representative of South Africa has made a statement which I can only describe, in commonplace terms, as a thunderbolt. For the Brazzaville Group that statement is the very embodiment of the racist policy which we intend to condemn—and with us, all who oppose that policy. For that reason the Brazzaville Group, to which my country belongs and whose views I am faithfully interpreting, will vote in favour of the motion of censure against the South African Republic, pending the day when the Brazzaville States will open up the bulky files of evidence against South Africa which they have in their possession, with a view to bringing about the final expulsion of the South African Republic from this international Assembly.

60. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of Tunisia, to speak on the motion of censure proposed by Liberia.

61. Mr. BOURGUIBA (Tunisia) (translated from French): I believe that it will not be redundant for my delegation—without entering into any study of the intolerable arguments advanced and the completely inadmissible words spoken this morning by the representative of South Africa—to declare its entire support for the motion of censure, the purpose of which is not only to make the South African Republic see reason—if indeed it still possesses any—on the subject of its policy and of the words which its representative has presumed to speak, but to defend the honour of this Assembly; for the Assembly must be jealous of the dignity of its debates and must oppose those who exploit their privileges as Members to flout its most fundamental principles.

62. For that reason, the Tunisian delegation supports and will vote without the slightest reservation in favour of the motion of censure proposed by the delegation of Liberia.

63. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I should like to ask representatives not to continue adding to the list of delegations wishing to speak on the motion of censure.

64. I call upon the representative of Morocco, to speak on the motion.

65. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (translated from French): Out of courtesy to you, Mr. President, and out of deference to this Assembly, my delegation will not speak at length on this subject.

66. For a number of years South Africa has been entering the debates in our Organization to speak the same language—a language which reflects its permanent attitude and which, as no one has attempted to conceal, expresses an ideology and a doctrine.

67. If today anger is being heard not only through the voice of Africa but also through that of the great majority in this Assembly, the reason is that the patience hitherto shown has been interpreted by the philosophers of that doctrine as implying either impunity or indifference; or perhaps even as a justification.

68. We understood, a while ago, the feelings—the spontaneous feelings—which prompted the Liberian representative's reaction in proposing to the Assembly that it should expunge from the words and the decisions making up the records of this Assembly the remarks made by the representative of South Africa. We also approved his attitude when he withdrew that motion; for we understand that the language which South Africa has unfortunately been privileged to use up to now dishonours those who are bound in courtesy to listen to it less than those who abuse their privilege to go on using it.

69. However, we wish to express our strong support for the motion of censure which has been proposed to the Assembly, so that it may be made clear, in this year of Africa, that no one can be permitted to continue with impunity to take this attitude, and that a country whose philosophy and policy are founded on racialism can no longer be heard here in silence—a silence which can now be seen only as complicity.

70. My delegation therefore entirely supports the motion of censure, and would add that those who have asked from the beginning of this debate that certain countries should be expelled because of their behaviour toward Africa do not forget the danger represented by a certain speaker who a few years ago travelled round Latin America and, in explaining the problems of Africa, said to those who were of the white race and accordingly, as he believed, prepared to listen to him: "In both parts of Africa the problem is identical." Today we know what the problem is in South Africa: it is called racialism. We hope that there will be understanding of the problem which has arisen in North Africa, which represents another form of racialism.

71. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I have only two more speakers on my list for the debate on this motion: the representatives of Ethiopia and Indonesia. After they have spoken I propose to call upon the Assembly to vote on the motion of censure.

72. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia): Earlier today I made a very brief statement rejecting the entire speech of the representative of the Republic of South Africa. I did that because I did not wish to take up the Assembly's time in discussing the basis of that speech.

In due course we shall, in the Special Political Committee, examine the basis and meaning of the speech.

73. At this point I wish only to make a very few observations: first, the philosophy of the statement of the representative of the Republic of South Africa was racist from the beginning to the end—the statement was based on the concept of race supremacy; secondly, the language used was uncouth; thirdly, the substance of the statement was completely erroneous from the beginning to the end.

74. For those reasons we support the motion of censure. As I have said, we reserve the right to take the matter up in detail in the Special Political Committee.

75. Mr. WIRJOPRANOTO (Indonesia): The delegation of the Republic of Indonesia will vote in favour of the motion submitted by the representative of Liberia. We shall do so for the very simple reason that our delegation wishes to express its condemnation of the policy of the Republic of South Africa towards our brothers and sisters—a policy which, in fact, constitutes a crime against mankind.

76. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The list of speakers on the motion of censure proposed by the delegation of Liberia is now exhausted. The Assembly will now proceed to vote. Before taking the vote, however, I call upon the representative of Afghanistan, who wishes to raise a point of order.

77. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan): I realize that there are no further speakers to be heard on the motion of the representative of Liberia. I have asked to speak only for the purpose of saying a few words on the manner of voting, before the motion is put to the vote.

78. The term "motion of censure" is quite a well-known term. But, to my mind, the implications of such a motion are not so clear-cut in all cases. I would therefore make the following request. If the President, having heard the debate that has taken place, has a full understanding of the situation, I would ask him to make a statement, before the vote is taken, on what a "yes" or a "no" vote on the motion would mean. If he is not in a position to do that, we would ask the representative of Liberia to be kind enough to come to the rostrum and tell the Assembly, in words that we may fully understand, exactly what is meant by this motion of censure.

79. I think that such a procedure is necessary, particularly in the light of the fact that the terms which have been used in the different statements made here in support of the motion have not been exactly the same.

80. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): May I ask the representative of Liberia to come to the rostrum to read out the exact terms of his motion?

81. Mr. Henry Ford COOPER (Liberia): I regret that the delegation from Afghanistan did not understand what I said. I said that the Assembly should vote a motion of censure against the Government of South Africa, or its delegate, for a statement here today which was offensive, fictitious and erroneous, and of which the Assembly fully disapproves.

82. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The Liberian representative having now clarified his motion of censure, I presume that the request of the representative of Afghanistan has been fully satisfied.

83. I now put the motion of censure to the vote. A roll-call vote has been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Bolivia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina.

*Against:* South Africa.

*Abstaining:* Cambodia, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Australia, Austria.

*Belgium, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America did not participate in the voting.*

*The motion of censure was adopted by 67 votes to 1, with 20 abstentions.*

84. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of Australia, who wishes to explain his vote.

85. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia): The Australian delegation, like a number of other delegations, abstained in the vote, while others did not participate. I think that in all cases the motives were probably much the same, and it is necessary to record them now, so that the position of such countries on the substance may be known.

86. Australia abstained because we do not feel that an important matter like a censure of a sovereign Government and a Member of this Organization is properly taken during the general debate in a resolution introduced without notice and following a speech given by a representative in this debate which covered a wide range of subjects.

87. The views that were expressed by the Minister for External Affairs of South Africa were repugnant to many people in this hall and, as far as the Government of Australia is concerned, we have repeatedly made it clear that we are opposed to racial discrimination and that we believe that throughout the world, in every country, we should all work as rapidly as possible to eliminate it. But the resolution of censure today came, as I have said, on short notice; it was vaguely worded; it was introduced in circumstances—namely, in the course of the general debate—that do not normally produce a substantive resolution. We consider that any resolution of censure against a Member of this Organization is of such importance that it should be a separate item on the agenda. Consequently we were unable to vote for any resolution on this matter, and we abstained. Some other delegations represented here refused to participate in the vote.

But I think that in all cases our motives were much the same.

88. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of Chile, who wishes to explain his vote.

89. Mr. SCHWEITZER (Chile) (translated from Spanish): Chile voted in favour of the motion of censure which has just been adopted by the tremendous majority. It did so because in line with the views of its Ministry of Foreign Affairs, views which have been explained by another spokesman during the general debate, it believes that the defiance of the fundamental principles and decisions of our Organization which we have witnessed on this occasion must not be permitted in the General Assembly.

90. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We have now concluded the debate on the motion of censure, and shall resume the general debate.

91. Mr. ORTIZ MARTIN (Costa Rica) (translated from Spanish): May I extend to you, and through you to the Tunisian Government and nation, my own warm congratulations and those of the Government and people of Costa Rica on your election to the office of President of the Assembly—congratulations which my delegation wishes to be placed on the records of the general debate.

92. It has been the practice of my delegation to concentrate the major part of its attention on the problems which affect our country; we believe that that policy is what a due sense of proportion demands, having regard to the influence we are able to exert on the conduct of the high affairs of world politics. Today, however, the situation is so serious that it affects the survival not of a group of nations but of all nations. Faced with the power-madness of those who daily announce the destruction of their alleged enemies, accompanying their threats with acts such as the reckless resumption of nuclear testing, we who are doomed to die have no other recourse than to raise our voices; and I do so not on behalf of a small country which is a Member of this Organization but as a member of the human race, to appeal for calm and moderation in the face of the tempest of passion set off once again by the historic ill-judgement of the men of power, who have forgotten the wise maxim that he who sows the wind reaps the whirlwind.

93. Costa Rica, which has been a Member of the United Nations since its foundation, is more than ever convinced that this institution, besides being the finest instrument ever designed by man in his desire to maintain a supreme organ capable of regulating and resolving the differences between the Governments of the world with a view to preserving peace through justice, is also the most effective protector of the small States. The great Powers, it seems to us, do not need the United Nations for their military defence. They are sufficient unto themselves. The weaker States, on the other hand, are protected by this Organization against any aggression, and have free access to this rostrum to broadcast to the world their complaints against social, economic and political injustice. It is the weak, the small, the under-developed countries, without distinction and in whatever part of the globe they may be situated, which must devote their efforts to strengthening the United Nations morally and materially. The most unchallengeable demonstration of the Organization's achievements may be seen in the new nations which have attained their



independence under its maternal wing. But for the magnificent work of the United Nations, the new States which now share in our tasks would never have thrown off colonialism without shedding a drop of blood. All of them are to our Organization what her children were to the mother of the Gracchi—her proudest jewels. To be a member of the United Nations in itself implies being against colonialism and all forms of discrimination; for one of the Organization's purposes is to bring independence to the colonies and aid them in their development. The fact that there should be serious problems between some countries and their territories or colonies is understandable; but we are confident that these problems will be settled by peaceful means and that the day of independence is not far off. So far as we are concerned, just as we believe that all men are born equal so we believe that nations are absolutely entitled to be born to freedom and independence.

94. One of the factors which has reduced the effectiveness of the United Nations—and this has been a matter of considerable concern to us—is undoubtedly the veto exercised in the Security Council, a veto used to such excess that the Council's resolutions have remained without effect. One necessity if the United Nations is to be helped to greater achievements is to revise the right of veto; and for that reason it seems inexplicable to us that any support should be expected for the proposal that the executive organ of the United Nations—for that is what the office of the Secretary-General is—should include in its ranks, with the right to veto its decisions, any person coming from the Power which has stultified the work of the Security Council. If we are sincere in the distress we expressed at the irreparable loss of Mr. Hammarskjöld, the Secretary-General, then we must translate our tears into acts, and must follow the counsels offered by the distinguished departed in his desire to lend dynamism to the office he held. The office of Secretary-General must not be, nor can it be, converted into a triumvirate of the type of those which brought such discredit upon themselves in the political history of Rome and of the French Consulate. If he is to be able to act, the Secretary-General must be vested with indivisible authority. In championing this view we are at once being faithful to our own convictions and honouring the memory of the man who, both in his life and in his work, was an integral part of the United Nations: Dag Hammarskjöld.

95. Regrettable problems have arisen in connexion with the applications for membership in the United Nations of the newly-independent countries. It is the view of my delegation that all States which, on achieving their independence, possess the juridical attributes recognized by law and satisfy the requirements laid down in the Charter should be admitted to membership without being subjected to political manoeuvres which treat them as objects available for exchange, pledge or sale. It is inexplicable to us how leaders who style themselves champions of anti-colonialism can deny a colony which has achieved its independence the right to enter this Organization, with the bald assertion that they would admit it if some other State, protected or proposed by them, were accepted. The consequence is that we have peoples that are the victims of the political strategy of certain great Powers—which are very quick to forget the demagogic harangues they have treated us to on this very subject of colonialism. Equality of treatment—that is what my country stands for.

96. To turn to other fields of our work: we need changes to reflect the fact that there are now a hundred States Members of the Organization, or double our original number. The procedure of the various organs must be revised and their membership must be expanded. It is wrong that in a matter of such plain logic the revision of the Charter should have met with resistance based on petty political considerations so that the functioning of the Organization's entire administration is being hampered. Just as seats are added in the General Assembly chamber and the Committee rooms when new Members are admitted, so should places be added on a proportional basis in the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, subject to the provisions of the Charter, which require adequate representation in accordance with the principle of geographical distribution. The problem is an easy one to solve and should not be complicated; and we accordingly declare our view that an increase in the membership of the two Councils is an urgent necessity.

97. We have continued to maintain our opinion that nationalist China represents a moral concept which is in harmony with the principles on which the United Nations is founded, and that Red China, on the contrary, is manifestly opposed to the Organization's purposes. The United Nations is made up, at any rate so far as its spirit is concerned, of States which believe that human felicity is to be found in peace, and that all conflicts between nations must be settled by peaceful means. What we receive from communist China is not messages of peace but heralds of war. We cannot but note that Red China does not directly state its desire to come to seek peace and international co-operation within the United Nations. Others speak in its name; as though Red China had not the means to tell the world, in its application for membership, what it would propose to do if it were admitted—whether its intention is to abjure war and become a peace-loving nation dedicated to international co-operation or whether it will come to use the veto or to destroy our Organization. I have been unable to hear from the lips of any of communist China's semi-official advocates, who claim to speak on its behalf, what are the intentions of their principal. Nationalist China is a State; it possesses an entirely legitimate Government, a population of eleven million and a clearly-defined territory; moreover, it has been a bastion of the law. I cannot conceive how we could desert it and agree to its being replaced by aggression and brute force. Accordingly, Costa Rica stands today, as it has always stood, at the side of whoever in its view supports principles and justice. In a matter in which the spirit and the letter of the Charter are at stake, our position is inflexible and we shall hold to it.

98. Our brother Republic of Ecuador has expressed for us the anxiety we feel with regard to the question of Berlin, which is keeping the world on the brink of war. We shall never tire of repeating that the shield of the small nations must be justice. Our sole strength is morality, and our sole objective liberty. For that reason, our support and our co-operation will be forthcoming in any matter that involves the very essence of our way of life. We have no hesitation in supporting Ecuador, which has expressed the hope that those responsible for the German tragedy will realize that Germany cannot be suppressed, that the people of Germany must decide their own fate and that they must be given the freedom to give clear expression to their right of self-determination.

99. The people of Costa Rica have sent me a message asking me to tell the General Assembly that they have symbolized their attitude on the Berlin question by the dispatch of a wagon-load of coffee. This message reads as follows:

"The traditionally free people of Costa Rica wish to express their moral support and their deep sympathy for the thousands of refugees who have succeeded in courageously escaping from East Berlin.

"When we go far back into our country's culture, we find that the obvious symbol of our democratic, proud and honest way of life is the richly decorated wagon which is in daily use by our industrious peasants. Such a wagon, carrying a full load of our finest coffee, we send with our affection to a brave people which has resolved to break for ever the shackles of tyranny. It carries the sincere greetings of a people dedicated to freedom and democracy.

"On 15 September, Costa Rica's independence day, the 'Freedom Wagon', laden with hundreds of pounds of 'grains of gold' contributed by the people, was paraded through the principal streets of the capital, and crowds of students thronged round it and escorted it to demonstrate the joy they felt on the eve of its dispatch to West Berlin."

This offering is decorated with the following legend:

"Freedom Wagon. The people of Costa Rica, desiring to demonstrate their complete support of the cause of the refugees from East German communism, send their traditional wagon, laden with 'grains of gold' plucked from the very heart of the Motherland, as a token of their faith in the ultimate triumph of freedom and of a democratic and united Germany."

That is how Costa Rica has demonstrated its feelings on the German tragedy.

100. The resumption of nuclear tests has spread dismay throughout the world, which feels itself drawn into a struggle which it does not want. We are amazed at this evidence of bad faith. While we were being told of the need for the prohibition of nuclear armaments, it seems that these armaments were being manufactured in such numbers that the stocks available were considered adequate to permit an attempt to terrorize the world by exploding nuclear devices daily for several days, regardless of the fact that the radiation caused, as the Canadian delegation has already pointed out, would affect the health of the peoples.

101. My delegation wishes to remind the Assembly of all the arguments which were advanced a few months ago in support of the appeal made by Morocco and other African countries that France should be called upon to refrain from carrying out nuclear tests in the Sahara. On the basis of these arguments, as also for profoundly humanitarian reasons, my delegation has always been opposed to nuclear tests. So far as concerns these inhuman experiments, we should do well to appeal also to those who are terrorizing the world with the threat of atomic annihilation by proclaiming the destructive power of their infernal machines to have some consideration for the lot of the children and young people of all nations, who are growing up in an atmosphere of anxiety which fills them with uncertainty and with distress for the imminent end of the world. Those responsible must be convinced once and for all that they cannot reduce the world to rubble without themselves being destroyed in the process.

102. My delegation remains particularly grateful to Canada for having invited us, at the fifteenth session

of the General Assembly, to co-sponsor a constructive draft resolution on disarmament [A/C.1/L.255/Rev.1 and Add.1-5]; for my small country is so dedicated to the idea of disarmament that its Constitution prohibits the existence of an army. We are still unreservedly in favour of genuine disarmament, and for that reason we support the proposal made by Mr. Kennedy, President of the United States [1013th plenary meeting]. In our view it is not only the great Powers whose armaments raise the threat of great wars, who should disarm. We should like to see the small Powers disarm too, for we feel that armies eat up the very scarce resources of our weak economies, and in most cases serve only to sustain political régimes repugnant to the peoples. In Latin America, at least, there has never been a single dictatorship, whether of the right or the left, that has not based its tyranny on the army. We are against armaments which are used for wars between nations, and we are also against armaments which are used within the frontiers of States to enslave peoples or subject them to the tyranny of Governments lacking majority support.

103. Our real problems are those of economic under-development, which, apart from the material evils it brings in its train, is the source of social injustice caused by inequality among peoples. The principles of the Charter will not be realized until we have left behind the backwardness which at present afflicts the great majority of the human race. The struggle is not in itself an easy one, considering its complexity and the real difficulties it involves. For that reason, we must not, in an enterprise of such grandeur, waste our energies in raking over the embers of the past to determine the nation or nations responsible for the evil. We must turn to the past only for the purpose of studying the causes and eliminating the origins of the evil, and in no circumstances in order to dissipate our energies in vain recriminations. Costa Rica was once a colony, and it knows how the great Powers, in their struggle for commercial domination, made the colonies the victims of their ambitions, cloaking these with attractive banners decorated with symbols of the ideal. The important thing, I repeat, is to begin the task of extricating ourselves from under-development, and to work hard at it. We in Costa Rica are firmly resolved to put an end to poverty, ignorance and disease, and we know that in this titanic struggle we must be able to rely on the deep understanding and the co-operation of the United Nations. We enthusiastically welcomed the United States "Alliance for Progress" plan, which will be of great help to us in achieving our goal, and which demands of us adequate plans of our own, men trained to carry them out and world markets in which justice prevails.

104. We consider it important to draw attention to some of the essential problems involved in the struggle against under-development. The first thing we have to do is to put our own houses in order, by ensuring that our countries are properly organized to produce what they need to feed themselves adequately, that they are self-sufficient, and that if, because of their agricultural economies, they are exporters of some primary commodity—such as coffee, in our own case—they have fair markets for their produce. That is where one of the most serious difficulties lies; so much so that until a favourable solution is found there can be no progress in our task. The price of coffee is not fixed by our farmers and producers; it is fixed for us by the buyer—who, however, prices his manufactures on the basis of his costs of production

and the standard of living of his workers. We sell very cheap and buy very dear. That is why we say that until this problem is solved there can be no progress; for what is the use to us of a loan to help us develop a new industry, for example, if our basic industry remains sick? We must find a way to stabilize markets. Our coffee, our cotton, our bananas, our sugar must fetch stable prices, allowing for the wages of those who produce them. This problem of prices and their stabilization is not one for Governments alone but for the peoples also; the peoples must, in the anxious times through which the world is now passing, co-operate in solving it—particularly those which have highly-developed economies. We are repeating this because the Press has recently reported a new fall in the price of coffee, and the manufacturers have excitedly announced a reduction of a few cents a pound. Do they know what this reduction of a few cents means to the peasants in our country who produce the coffee? A reduction of one cent on 20 million sacks of coffee at \$1.32 per sack, for example, means a loss to the producers of \$26,400,000. But there is worse yet. This loss falls upon the ill-fed, diseased and ignorant; in general terms, it falls upon those countries whose economies are based on the agricultural product in question. If the housewives of the highly-developed countries knew what great evils such a reduction of a few cents in the price of a pound of coffee caused, if they knew that it meant greater hunger, less housing, greater poverty for their fellow-men over the seas, they would certainly not accept the few cents they gain—which in any event cannot improve their family budget. We have spoken of these problems before from this rostrum, and we shall be compelled to repeat our words so long as the injustice continues.

105. A new item has been placed on our agenda at Denmark's proposal, relating to the need for a study of over-population [item 84]. In our opinion this problem is not simply one of economics, and we are obliged, because it would have serious implications for the social and political organization of our country—not to speak of its religious organization—to oppose such a study in the form in which it has been proposed. Our society is based on the family, on marriage. Our Civil Code provides that "the object of marriage is procreation and mutual aid". In Costa Rica, marriages take place for the purpose of procreation. Abortion is punishable under the Criminal Code. This is not the time for me to enlarge on the matter, but I must say enough to make it clear that to agree to this new study we should have to transform our social and juridical organization from top to bottom. We do not, of course, deny the importance and seriousness of the problem, but in our view its solution depends essentially on education in all its aspects, which will help families, within the framework of their own moral and religious convictions, to remedy this acute situation.

106. Let me in conclusion reaffirm our ideological position. That position has in no way changed, since we are a free and independent State by virtue of our ethnic origins, our education in Christian civilization and the fact of our having had our birth in America, which has always been the land of liberty. For that reason, and because in our country we worship God and revere liberty, we have no ideological problem. Our problem, as I have already said, is an economic one; and it is because it appreciates that fact that the Government of the United States has undertaken to join with us in this struggle against under-development,

in this fight to do away with poverty, so that to the dignity of the free man may be added his right to satisfy his needs and to enjoy the well-being which the civilization of our day, in its many inventions, has placed, to be enjoyed, within the reach of everyone who labours and earns his bread by the sweat of his brow.

107. Mr. FAWZI (United Arab Republic): Mr. President, please allow me to congratulate you upon the well-earned and well-deserved unanimity with which you have been elected to preside over our deliberations during the present session of the General Assembly. May we all succeed together in steering safely the ship of the Assembly through the agitated seas in which it will have to sail.

108. The world has been tense and grim while living with the haunting anxieties of recent events. At a moment when a glimmer of hope for disarmament and the stability of peace was looming before our eyes, happenings in Berlin and in several other spheres were almost suddenly made, or allowed, to take a bad turn and lead to a steeper and more ominous arms race.

109. To the accompaniment of an angry exchange of recriminations and of threats between the principal countries involved and of the poisons and the callousness of nuclear tests, this arms race goes on in disconcerting parallelism with word-eloquent professions, from all quarters, of love for peace and for all humanity. My Government does not challenge the sincerity of most of those professions of good will. Yet it can but draw the inevitable conclusions from the painfully awkward contradiction between them and the realities of action and of fact.

110. We can derive no comfort, no consolation, from the eloquence of words, while nuclear arms tests are carried out with utter contempt for human values and human life, and while the day is rapidly approaching when the choice will have to be made between the continuance of the human race and the continuance of the arms race.

111. We all know and believe that it would not be just or fair to accuse any responsible leader of wanting war. But it should be permissible, nay, it is an inescapable duty, to warn against errors, miscalculations or false moves which could lead to war.

112. It is true that no one can validly visualize war as the proper answer to the problems of the world. Yet no one can realistically discard war from among the hazards of present-day international life.

113. Throughout the ages and until today, morality and reason have not always been, though they have often been, the guiding stars of human behaviour; and there is no warrant for any assertion that man's fallibility and the blind spot in man's otherwise brilliant mind have not grown along with his over-all growth. This has been particularly discernible during the last few months; and we have, therefore, still to vanquish the beast of war, to make war against war, against poverty, disease, ignorance and tyranny.

114. But if we are to succeed, if we are to be victorious, the world community of nations will have to learn, far better than it has done until today, how to work hand in hand, and this Organization of ours must cease to be in actual fact the Divided, and become indeed the United, Nations, united in upholding the principles of the Charter and in faith in fundamental human rights, the dignity and worth of the human



person and the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small. For, if principles do not govern the policies and actions of nations, and if the rule of law does not prevail in international relations, the prospect for peace and for a really civilized world society would indeed be very dim. This is but a truism which has proved itself whenever and wherever peace between nations is threatened or disturbed.

115. I have mentioned the crisis of Berlin. Calling it so is an over-simplification and is almost a euphemism. There is of course a crisis which can be considered as relating to Berlin as such and having a direct impact on it. But the range, the substance and the implications of the present crisis in connexion with that city are, as we all know, incomparably wider and deeper than that. Unless this is taken into consideration, the search for a solution would be constantly doomed to failure. Keeping this in mind would help to give us a measure of how serious this crisis is and how much of a challenge it is to all those who endeavour to find a way out of it.

116. At the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries held in Belgrade, the following Declaration was adopted on 6 September of this year:

"The countries participating in the Conference consider that the German problem is not merely a regional problem but liable to exercise a decisive influence on the course of future developments in international relations.

"Concerned at the developments which have led to the present acute aggravation of the situation in regard to Germany and Berlin, the participating countries call upon all parties concerned not to resort to or threaten the use of force to solve the German question or the problem of Berlin, in accordance with the appeal made by the heads of state or Government on 5 September 1961."

117. I have already referred to the arms race, which is now at its worst, and to the raging continuance of nuclear arms tests. The contenders in these tests and in that arms race are, to quote from an old play, acting as if they were "seeking the bubble reputation even in the cannon's mouth".

118. Had the principles of the Charter been upheld in deeds and not merely in words, had there been actual and proven faith in these principles, the human race would not be facing today the danger of annihilation and utter shame. Had principles, faith in them and loyalty to them prevailed, we would not be facing the threats to world peace, the contempt for human worth and the negation of right which are taking place in Algeria, Palestine, Oman, Bureimi, the Southern Yemen, Bizerta, Angola, West Irian, the Congo, South Africa and in many other parts of the world. Nor would the rapacity, indignities and humiliations of colonialism and other forms of foreign domination have continued to survive.

119. It is clear at the same time that merely to talk and moralize about these matters would be of little or no avail. Finding solutions and taking action should be foremost in the positiveness and daring of our thoughts. Yet, to do that successfully, we have to be fully informed and aware of at least the principal elements of appreciation regarding the various pending problems.

120. To begin with, one can take as an illustration the problem of armaments and nuclear tests of which

I have just made mention. Behind this problem, too, and intimately, vitally, practically and mentally linked with it, are such basic and real elements as the balance of power, security, suspicion and fear. Unless and until we take into full consideration these and related elements of appreciation when dealing with the armaments race and with nuclear tests, we shall be groping in the dark and getting nowhere.

121. We should all welcome and wish success for the talks which the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States are having in an endeavour to reach an agreement regarding this problem. We have welcomed equally the joint statement of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations argued by the two Governments on 20 September 1961 [A/4879]. But the world is still kept waiting for even a beginning of the formally accepted disarmament, and the cessation of nuclear tests.

122. The Assembly, which, as has been often said, is the common forum of the world, should further concretize and express and give concrete form to its views as to the objectives and the immediate steps to be taken in this regard. It cannot and it has no right to sit silent and indifferent while, year after year, the nuclear Powers indulge in barren negotiations regarding disarmament and the cessation of nuclear tests, and while these tests grow in frequency, dimensions and lethal effect. The voice of this Assembly must rise high and above the rumblings of those explosions. It must make known the fears, the resentments and the hopes of all humanity.

123. At present it seems to be agreed theoretically everywhere that there should be a cessation of the production and the testing of nuclear arms and the accomplishment of general and complete disarmament. But theoretical agreement is obviously worthless, as long as it does not step into the sphere of actual deeds and become a tangible reality of life.

124. We understand and respect the legitimate concern of any country for its own security and for the safety and happiness of its people. But we do not fail to realize that this concern has been strained and stretched to extremes which are making it self-defeating. Indeed, the more arms there are, the more precarious world peace becomes and the more formidable and threatening will be the Sword of Damocles which hangs over this universe and over all who live in it. There has never been, in the long history of the human race, less secure security than that which has been brought about by the current armaments race; and humanity has never needed as direly as it does today to get out of a dangerous impasse.

125. From countries which do not belong to one or the other of the two big contending blocs, and which indeed do not form or intend to form a third bloc, assistance may be required in this connexion, considering the fact that the problems involved are of universal implication and world-wide concern, and in the hope that these non-aligned countries can make a more detached appraisal of the international situation and that they might be able to contribute at least a needed little towards the finding of ways out of the present deadlock and leading to the vitally necessary solutions.

126. The presence of countries which do not belong to any of the two big blocs has been felt increasingly during the last few years as a result of their growth and self-assertion and of the widening cleavage be-



tween the two big blocs with, at their head, the permanent members of the Security Council, whose unanimity was one of the basic assumptions of the Charter in relation to the preservation of international peace.

127. Alignment and non-alignment grew, in fact, together after having been born almost on the same day. Besides being two parallel growths, they represent two parallel departures, a real departure by the members of the two blocs from the precept of unanimity between the permanent members of the Security Council, and an apparant departure by the non-aligned countries from the precept that all Members of the United Nations must be aligned formally as allies, through the Charter, in safeguarding world peace and security, and in realizing the purposes which they have agreed to serve.

128. It is obvious that non-alignment, as intended, refers only to antagonistic blocs, and is a counter-balance to their disagreements which seriously endanger world peace and security. It is not intended to be a passive attitude of indifference to what is going on in the world, or a mere protest against the upsurge of antagonistic blocs whose cold war quarrels and rivalries shake the foundations of peace.

129. It should be understood, therefore, that non-alignment is not a passive mood or a posture of indifference or brooding or of merely telling the world what the non-aligned countries are not, without saying what they are. Having this in mind, some have called it positive neutrality. But this has evoked the thought that neutrality is a war-time attitude and, unlike non-alignment, not applicable in times of peace. Consequently, and although a not-quite-cold cold war is going on, the term "non-alignment" is currently more often used.

130. The Asian-African Conference held at Bandung, Indonesia, in April 1955, ten years after the signing of the United Nations Charter in San Francisco, was attended mostly by non-aligned countries, and the general trend of the Conference was, essentially, one of non-alignment. Although the Conference was African-Asian and was not attended exclusively by non-aligned countries, attendance at the conferences which were held in the following years at Accra, Addis Ababa, Casablanca and, this year, in Belgrade was completely non-aligned. From each of these conferences came a strong reminder that there exist in this universe other countries and other ideas besides those of the two big antagonistic blocs, and that these blocs have not, either by their agreement or by their disagreement, any monopoly on deciding humanity's destiny.

131. At the beginning and in the heat of the so-called cold war, the two big blocs were antagonistic not only to each other but to the very thought and attitude of non-alignment. At a later stage they began to tolerate non-alignment, though reluctantly, and to outgrow and overcome, to a degree, their resentment of it. But this feeling has, nevertheless, been showing symptoms not unlike those of recurrent fever, and the non-aligned are occasionally reminded of this in no equivocal terms. Even when, as in recent years, the leaders of the big blocs say a generous word for non-alignment they do not usually fail to show at the same time a lingering impatience with it.

132. Be that as it may, one should find a good deal of satisfaction and of hopefulness in the growing companionship and the closer consultations between the

various groups of the two blocs and the non-aligned. This new relationship can become the greatest alliance against war and for the realization of the peaceful, constructive purposes of the United Nations.

133. At the same time the new awakening in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and the enthusiasm with which those continents, in their immensity and great potential and in their determination to meet the challenges of modern times, give promise of a much brighter and richer world in the years to come, a world where human and material resources are fully and properly activated and where economic or other co-operation is neither a veil for domination nor a means of exploitation. It will then be discovered that there is in this world quite enough for all and that the magic wand of freedom can produce undreamt-of wonders.

134. Beside the overhauling of the economy and of the ways of life in Asia and Latin America in the direction of more positiveness and a more expressive vitality, Africa's awakening and its growing independence are among the most decisive and most impressive events in all history. There is no doubt left today that Africa is determined to complete and consolidate its freedom and to foster relations in all respects between its countries and the rest of the world. The efforts made and the results accomplished in this regard are already quite satisfactory, although we shall in Africa work and look for infinitely more. These efforts and results relate in great part to the fields of economy, health and culture and will be outlined and commented upon in detail by my delegation, for its part, in due course.

135. My Government has expressed, clearly and at large, its policy and its position regarding the various other problems which I have mentioned in my present submission. I shall not, therefore, waste the time or tax the patience of this Assembly by going beyond the bounds of utmost brevity in dealing further today with some of these problems.

136. My Government and my country maintain their position with regard to the Algerian question. We maintain our positive and unstinted support to the Algerian people in its struggle for its political and human rights and for its country's independence and territorial integrity. We are confident that the valiant people of Algeria will finally attain its worthy objectives and take an honourable place in the United Nations and among the independent States of the world; and we wish to trust that wisdom and foresight will finally prevail and that the time for Algeria's—all Algeria's— independence will not be far away.

137. From the point of view of the United Arab Republic the people of Algeria has, since long ago, earned its right to independence and has, furthermore, in a sublime plebiscite of struggle, sacrifice and blood, unequivocally expressed its determination to be free.

138. My Government and my country equally maintain their support to the Arabs of Palestine, and continue to stand firmly by them until their rights are fully and actually recognized.

139. The immorality, the injustice and the danger to peace in the Middle East which Israel represents cannot rightly be denied, nor can there be any cavil about Israel's being a spearhead of imperialism and neo-colonialism. It will be recalled, and it is on record, that Israel has constantly taken the side of colonialism each time an important position had to be

taken concerning vital problems about Africa—notably Algeria, the Congo, the French nuclear tests and Bizerta.

140. None of this has, however, deterred the Israel spokesmen from repeating to the Assembly, one year after another, the same refrain of claimed Israel innocence, immaculate record and deep love for peace. This was repeated here as recently as two days ago, but it cannot possibly deceive the fair minded or the well informed. From this very rostrum Israel has been asked, again and again, whether it was ready to recognize actually and fully the rights of the Arabs of Palestine, as is their natural heritage and as the United Nations has recognized them in its resolutions. The question has been asked so many times here in very clear language. The answer by Israel and its spokesmen has steadily and consistently been either a complete silence which meant "No", or a deviationary argumentation which equally meant "No". Included in this has been Israel's reference to navigation in the Suez Canal.

141. Since this and related tactics are not new, I beg leave to refer to a speech made in the Assembly on 5 October 1959 by the representative of the United Arab Republic in which the following was stated:

"the original sin"—he was referring to the so-called difficulty with navigation in the Suez Canal—"is in the plunder of Palestine from the Arabs ...", its lawful owners, which was followed in close succession by "the very long list of United Nations resolutions, warnings, rebukes and agreements, which Israel has ignored completely until today, including the General Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel, which is violated systematically and even pronounced dead by Israel, and on which was based the Security Council resolution of 1 September 1951 that Israel tries, nevertheless, to separate from its context and to single out for implementation...."

"[Israel] ... would rather hasten to accuse others of imaginary aggressive intentions before others array again, for the Assembly to remember, the many real aggressions committed by Israel and recognized and deplored as such by the United Nations. And they [Israel spokesmen] would include in their accusation a synthetic problem exclusively made in Israel and presented as a problem of the freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal. I shall submit facts and figures demonstrating, at least in part, the immense contribution of the Canal, under Arab management, to international navigation and trade, a contribution far greater than any previously made.... The traffic and progress they represent are not imaginary, but are as real as anything can be. Navigation in the Suez Canal is in perfect health. Let not world political Zionism fool anybody away from this reality; let it not sell to us, out of a clear sky, an artificial storm which does not exist. There are, God knows, enough storms in the world beyond the little cups with which world political Zionism and Israel are playing." [820th meeting, paras. 51 and 52.]

142. Furthermore, while the Arab refugees are victimized and humiliated and are living and having their children grow up in ghastly camps, motley groups of Jewish immigrants continue to pour into Palestine to join the more than a million Jews who have gone there in recent years. While this continues, some people say that it is no more realistic to maintain that the Arab

refugees should go back to their homes and lands, and that they should find outside their own Palestine some other land of refuge and of hope.

143. These people forget, or choose to forget, that their own Governments have approved, and claim still to approve, the United Nations resolutions recognizing the rights of the Arabs of Palestine, including the right of these Arabs to return to their country, to their homes and their lands. Those people wish to forget the United Nations resolutions which their own Governments still claim to approve, until today. They might try also to forget or to cavil about Israel's endless violations of the Armistice Agreements, frequent disturbances to peace and security and its taking part in the attack against Egypt in 1956. But all these are registered in the records of both history and the United Nations.

144. Israel, nevertheless, and in spite of all that, receives yearly contributions amounting to hundreds of millions of mostly tax-free dollars as donations from abroad. This is every year—hundreds of millions of dollars. Had the Arab countries received proportionate help, it would have amounted to \$10,000 million every year—I repeat, \$10,000 million every year. The Arabs are, of course, neither given such help nor are they asking for such help. What they ask, what they insist upon, is that morality, justice and fair play be the basis of all our dealings with the question of Palestine.

145. Concerning the Tunisian city of Bizerta and the crisis relating to it between Tunisia and France, I wish to recall General Assembly resolution 1622 (S-III), which was adopted on 25 August 1960 without any dissenting vote, during the third special session. The operative paragraphs read as follows:

"1. Reaffirms the Security Council's interim resolution and urges the Government of France to implement fully the provisions of operative paragraph 1 thereof;

2. Recognizes the sovereign right of Tunisia to call for the withdrawal of all French armed forces present on its territory without its consent;

3. Calls upon the Governments of France and Tunisia to enter into immediate negotiations to devise peaceful and agreed measures in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations for the withdrawal of all French armed forces from Tunisian territory."

146. It is common knowledge that this resolution, as well as the earlier resolution of the Security Council<sup>1/</sup> has not been implemented by France as of today. The Government and the people of the United Arab Republic maintain and will continue to maintain their insistence on the implementation of that resolution and the previous ones without delay and on the redeeming by Tunisia and the Tunisian people of all their rights.

147. Turning to the Congo, the position of my Government, in conformity with the resolutions of the United Nations, remains one of full, unequivocal and positive support to the Congolese nation in its endeavour to secure and safeguard its country's complete and real independence, unity and territorial integrity.

148. The question of the Congo and the implementation of the United Nations resolutions regarding it

<sup>1/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Supplement for July, August and September 1961, document S/4882.

should be among the principal considerations to prompt efforts for a speedy solution of the current problem of the Secretariat. We hope that the United Nations will, without any further delay, have a responsible head for its Secretariat so that this organ can fully, efficiently and speedily contribute to the activation and the implementation of the policies and the resolutions of our Organization.

149. In this connexion we are duty bound to recall with deep respect and admiration the sacrifice, in the service of the United Nations, borne by the great sister State Sweden and by the Swedish people who, on 17 September 1961, had to mourn, as all of us did, a distinguished son of Sweden, Dag Hammarskjöld, and other worthy compatriots of his and, on the parallel date, 17 September 1948, another distinguished son, Folke Bernadotte.

150. My Government also maintains its previously expressed position of support regarding the eradication of race discrimination and of apartheid. I feel impelled to register here the resentment and indignation felt by my delegation on noting the deplorable and provocative way in which the representative of South Africa dealt with these matters.

151. We equally maintain our position concerning the immediate elimination of colonialism and other forms of foreign domination. In this connexion, we are neither overwhelmed nor particularly impressed by any assertion that there remains at present very little of colonialism or of foreign domination. No such assertion will have us relax our efforts for the independence of all nations. We are fully aware, and we shall remain fully aware, of the fact that colonialism and other forms of foreign domination still persist in many parts of the world, that a great number of so-called independent countries are independent only in name and not actually in fact, and that colonialism and other forms of foreign domination are entrenching themselves in their remaining positions, are trying to recapture much of the ground they have lost, and, under many guises, are extending the range and affirming the hold of their sway.

152. The day when all nations will realize and, in their actions, prove to have realized the futility and hopelessness of all forms of foreign domination, that day, unfortunately, has not come yet. We cannot, therefore, afford to relent in our efforts to accomplish, as prescribed by the Charter itself, a world community of independent nations, which has co-operation as its password, and which will banish finally all foreign domination.

153. Here, as in some other fields, there exists a wide gap between the logic of thought and the reality of fact. Many think rightly of the wisdom and foresight of superseding the blunders of the past which creep destructively into the present with wise actions of the present which creep constructively into the future. Yet some continue to abide by the old erroneous ways and attitudes and the blundering outmoded approach to international relationships.

154. Many think in horror of the crushing burden and ominous explosiveness of armaments, but some continue, nevertheless, feverishly to arm. Many think of the ugly anachronism of foreign domination, but some continue, nevertheless, to dominate. Many think positively of the happiness, the dignity and the hope which are the good companions of economic, technical and cultural co-operation, in a world of independ-

ent nations, for developing, through modern science and enlightened planning, the material as well as the moral values that are our heritage. Yet some are still refusing or are reluctant to heed this call. It is time that a great campaign is made to rally us all around the standard of up-to-datedness and foresight. Prosperity and real glory are now, as never before, within humanity's reach. Responsibilities and duties in this regard are incumbent on all nations, whether affluent or poor, strong or weak. The attitude of waiting till the mighty rich extend a helping hand is no more pardonable, no longer to be condoned. From now on we shall all, rich or poor, strong or weak, have to organize far better than hitherto our relationships of constructiveness and of mutual help, and to work hard and exert ourselves to the extreme, if we are to reap the moral and material splendours which are ahead of us and are within our sight and within our reach.

155. As virtually every other country represented here, the United Arab Republic has been doing its part and exerting itself to contribute to the process of economic development and social improvement. It has tried to do so by self-improvement and by mutual co-operation with other countries.

156. After the revolution of July 1952 in Egypt, the national income has as a result been redoubled in a few years; and, after the union, in February 1958, between Syria and Egypt, one of the foremost aims of the Government of the United Arab Republic has been to at least redouble the national income once again within no more than ten years.

157. It was natural that agriculture and other fields of production should, therefore, receive our utmost care. Through agricultural reform, co-operative societies, improved seeds and technology, selective cattle breeding, better regulation of irrigation, harnessing of rivers and control of rain, better exploitation of sub-soil water, intense training of agricultural technicians and guiding of agricultural workers, the productivity of agriculture and the lot of all those who are engaged in it has been definitely and substantially improved. All over the countryside, in villages and in farms, every effort has been made to provide educational facilities, health care, potable water and better communications.

158. It was, furthermore, natural that, in order to regulate irrigation more efficiently and adequately and accomplish the much-needed extension of arable land, various projects should be undertaken and various others planned.

159. The Rastan Dam in Syria has been completed in the current year; work on the High Dam near Aswan in Egypt had already begun in January of last year and is expected to be completed in about ten years from that date; and plans and agreements have been made since July of this year for the construction in Syria of a dam on the Euphrates River. Parallel to this, several minor dams in Syria have been started or projected with a view to the control of rain-water which has hitherto been going to waste.

160. Industry in the United Arab Republic has at the same time been the object of careful planning in recent years, and has had behind it such a driving power and such positiveness and encouragement that it attained hitherto undreamt-of objectives.

161. The Suez Canal has been, as was to be expected, one of the principal fields of activity of the United Arab Republic. The services rendered through the

Suez Canal to international trade and good will can be demonstrated in part by, among other things, the fact that in 1955, the last complete year immediately before nationalization, the number of transits was 14,600 as compared to 18,700 in 1960, and the tonnage was 115.7 million in 1955 as compared to 185.3 million in 1960.

162. The Suez Canal Authority continues to improve and widen that waterway. Arrangements are being made for improving the Port Said Harbour, where the latest methods of loading and unloading are being adopted to save time and expense. Arrangements are also being made by the Canal Authority to put into operation the newly acquired floating dock, which can repair any ship.

163. The progress realized by the United Arab Republic in various fields of production and constructive work was accompanied and inspired mainly by the urge and the need to consolidate and safeguard the country's independence and to give substance and core to its freedom. It has been made possible through a determination to succeed, through a consciousness of the vital necessity, the imperativeness to succeed in the face of, and also because of, dangers ahead. These dangers have on several occasions proved to be real and almost fatal. The tripartite attack against Egypt in 1956 is a conspicuous example. It was followed, in 1957, as will be recalled, by the crisis of Syria, during which Syria's very existence hung most precariously in the balance. On those two occasions, Syria and Egypt gave strong expression to their unity and to the partnership between them in danger and in destiny.

164. When Egypt was attacked in 1956, Syria rose immediately to its help, with unfettered enthusiasm and actual sacrifice. And when Syria was threatened in 1957, Egypt stood firmly by it and, furthermore, announced here in the Assembly, as elsewhere that:

"Syria is Egypt's ally, as well as Egypt's blood relation, and it is fully entitled to Egypt's help, as well as to help by the United Nations for the repelling of any aggression which might be launched against it",

and that:

"Egypt, for its part, will not tolerate that even a fingertip of Syria be hurt, that a hair of the head of Syria be ruffled, by any aggressor, but will immediately rise to a man and stand four-square with its sister State of Syria". [699th meeting, para. 107.]

165. It was not, therefore, surprising that in February 1958, by the union between Syria and Egypt, the United Arab Republic was established and became a bastion of constructiveness and peace.

166. If some events in Syria during the last few days have been discordant, the fact of our brotherhood and oneness of fate will nevertheless remain; and there is no real scope and no real hope for any illusions to the contrary or for any adventures in anybody's thoughts.

167. I ask leave at this point to quote from a speech which the President of the United Arab Republic made on the fifth of this month, in which he said:

"Brethren in all parts of the Arab homeland:

"I feel at this juncture that it is not imperative that Syria should continue to be part of the United Arab Republic. But it is imperative that Syria should continue to exist.

"I feel I am not at the moment occupied with being the President of the Arab people in Syria. What actually occupies my mind is that the Arab people is in Syria and that its existence is protected and preserved.

"I cannot imagine that I shall, under any condition, accept seeing the Syrian people threatened with intrigues, or exposed to danger, or worried by anything of a nature to affect adversely its ability to forge ahead with all its potentialities in order to safeguard the national benefits it realized during the union. I cannot accept seeing Syria find itself day after day despoiled of its possessions while occupied with a temporary problem of secondary importance, which will ultimately be governed by the inevitability of history leading to union. For all these considerations, I now announce within the hearing of all of you, the sons of the Arab nation, the following:

"First, I ask all popular forces who still abide by the United Arab Republic and by Arab unity to understand now that national unity within the Syrian homeland is the prime consideration. Syria's strength is strength for the Arab nation, and Syria's dignity is dignity for all the Arabs. Syria's national unity is a pillar of Arab unity.

"Second, the United Arab Republic will not stand in the way of Syria's application for membership in the United Nations. I do not wish to set up a political or diplomatic blockade around Syria because, in the end, it will be the Syrian people who will suffer from such a blockade.

"Third, the United Arab Republic will not stand in the way of Syria's membership in the Arab league."

Still addressing his brethren in all parts of the Arab homeland, President Gamal Abdel Nasser said, further, that he hoped they would all:

"... agree on one final point, namely, that the Government of the United Arab Republic will never on its side recognize any government in Damascus, except after the crystallization of a free Syrian national will to decide the way it is to follow. I am confident, as I believe in God, that this experience of union between Syria and Egypt will not be the last but rather a forerunner. We have benefited a great deal from this experience, which shall constitute a great asset for the Arab future and for Arab unity, in which my faith grows firmer and stronger. There is still ahead a long history for the Arab nation. The struggle continues and gains more depth through experience.

"I have always tried with all my might to perform my duty as a soldier in the service of this Arab nation. I have also tried to allow no room for dissension. I have tried to leave no door open for intrigues. My enemy and the enemy of my nation is imperialism and the reactionary elements that are working in collaboration with it, and the base from which it is planning to strike at our aspirations, namely, Israel. My hope is the freedom of both the Arab nation and the Arab citizen. I have faith in the inevitability of unity between the peoples of the Arab nation, as I have faith in life and the break of dawn, no matter how long the night."

And President Gamal Abdel Nasser concluded by saying:

"May God help beloved Syria, guide its footsteps and bless its people. This United Arab Republic will



remain, raising its flag high, singing its anthem and driving forward, with all its power, to build itself so that it may be a support for every Arab struggle, every Arab right and every Arab aspiration.

"God be with you."

168. Mr. PETER (Hungary): The problems of present-day international life are so interwoven that, though they are discernible, they certainly are not separate. Consequently, however small and modest the section we intend to choose for consideration, we are inevitably confronted with all as a whole. In every detail the lesson of life and death is put before us. Such an inter-connexion will determine all the deliberations, not only in the plenary but in each of the Committees as well.

169. In such a situation, however modestly any delegate would like to act, he is compelled to deal with issues beyond his reach—one could as well say, beyond his competence. Even when any delegation speaks its mind regarding the local or regional problems of its country, it inevitably will face problems touching the interests of all.

170. What we hear in the course of the general debate about any corner of the world, or about central problems of current international affairs, presents a sorrowful picture of the deterioration of the world situation: deterioration under the shadow and in the direction of growing dangers of a thermo-nuclear holocaust. The choice is tremendous indeed. The words of the President of the United States were wholly justified when he said in this Assembly: "we ... shall be remembered either as part of the generation that turned this planet into a flaming pyre or as the generation that met its vow, 'to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war'" [1013th meeting, para. 94].

171. The questions which arise are, what can representatives to the General Assembly do to reverse the speedy trend towards a thermo-nuclear disaster; what can the Assembly at this session do to stop general deterioration and pave the way for constructive international co-operation. The fourteenth session will be remembered in the future history of the United Nations—provided there is to be such history—as a meeting that put on the agenda of this Organization, and on that of world history, the programme of general and complete disarmament. Also, the fifteenth session will go down in history as having proclaimed the declaration on the liquidation of the colonial system. The present growing deterioration set in after such hopeful resolutions. What is the best this session can do to turn the trends towards improvement? In so far as the sixteenth session is able to translate the words of previous historic resolutions into proper deeds, the process of improvement will be restored.

172. The process of improvement must be restored. My delegation pays much attention to the fact that the present growing deterioration was engendered in a process of a series of favourable developments. I venture even to say that in some respects the whole trend of deterioration is a sort of reaction to general improvements. These facts contain much comfort and much concern; much consolation, but at the same time desolation as well. As for the aspects of concern: the deterioration has overshadowed all the results achieved in recent years through efforts at mutual understanding and has put at stake all that the will for peace and constructive co-operation among nations had firmly established. It has become obvious once again that exasperated forces of destruction may

be regenerated against favourable developments, and what is still worse: even in the future one cannot be vigilant enough to prevent new improvements being reversed by powerful groups hostile to the peaceful settlement of controversial issues. But in the view of my delegation, the aspects of comfort are more decisive. Thanks to basic factors of the present-day international strife, the deterioration came about on a basis more favourable to the will for peace than to destructive intentions. The same factors that have given rise to favourable developments in recent years are active below a deteriorated surface, and if the forces of good will are able to do away with actual harmful measures a new era of hopeful co-operation may be inaugurated for the nations of the world. So, the burdens of concern are heavy and justified by stubborn facts, but the reasons for comfort regarding the fruitfulness of efforts at a radical solution of our crucial problems are much more vivid and decisive.

173. These general observations are but faithful reflections of recent developments on concrete sections of the international field.

174. Let me analyse some of these sections. What is the connexion between the unfortunate events of disarmament talks and previous favourable developments in this domain? It is clear that the idea of general and complete disarmament has gained ground all over the world beyond all expectations. When the Head of the Soviet Government, Mr. Nikita Sergeyevitch Khrushchev, surprised—in the pleasantest sense of the word—the fourteenth session of the General Assembly, and world opinion in general, with the idea of general and complete disarmament as the only realistic alternative of mankind to an inevitable ride towards a thermo-nuclear holocaust, we should remember what the reactions of some quarters here were. In contrast to the general relief of many delegations having most different ideological and political backgrounds, the main Powers of the Western allies mobilized every imaginable argument against the very idea. We had to listen in those months to utterances stating that the whole idea was nothing but Utopia. We had to experience manoeuvres even to avoid using the expression "general and complete disarmament". Without the slightest feeling of reprehension, we have to recall those months for the sake of more comprehensive evaluation of the situation we are in today. The other day we heard the President of the United States say here: "The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us." [1013th meeting, para. 50.] Then he proceeded thus: "Men no longer maintain that disarmament must await the settlement of all disputes—for disarmament must be a part of any permanent settlement." [*Ibid.*, para. 51.] Then, again, he said: "For fifteen years this Organization has sought the reduction and destruction of arms. Now the goal is no longer a dream—it is a practical matter of life or death." [*Ibid.*, para. 52.] He added: "And it is in this spirit that we have presented, with the agreement of the Soviet Union—under the label which both nations now accept of 'general and complete disarmament'—a statement of newly agreed principles for negotiation." [*Ibid.*, para. 58.]

*Mr. Bitsios (Greece), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

175. Indeed the break-through, the march forward, of the idea of general and complete disarmament surpasses all imagination. It must be so because it is really the only realistic alternative against a thermo-nuclear catastrophe. The idea gained ground here

before our eyes. During the first part of the fifteenth session, when the United States delegation of the previous administration was reluctant to deal with the item, the Indian delegation, together with a number of other Asian, African and Latin American delegations, introduced a detailed draft resolution on general and complete disarmament [A/C.1/L.259 and Add.1 and 2]. At a later stage, at the second part of the fifteenth session, when the delegation of the new United States administration asked in the First Committee [1136th meeting] for the postponement of the debate on this issue, giving as a reason its not being prepared for the discussion, the Conference of the Prime Ministers of the British Commonwealth issued a comprehensive statement on the idea of general and complete disarmament. Now, after all these developments, we witness an official proclamation of the United States in favour of general and complete disarmament [A/4880].

176. But here comes the turning point. Parallel to these favourable developments all sorts of threats were unleashed. At a time when the Head of the Soviet Government stated in his letter to Prime Minister Nehru of India and President Nkrumah of Ghana that he was ready for negotiations "at any time, any place and at any level" the most different official sources of the Western Powers went out of their way to show their readiness to launch even a thermo-nuclear war if their interests so demanded. They are even ready to use thermo-nuclear weapons first. Parallel to these declarations all sorts of military preparations took place all over Western Europe, on the territories of NATO countries. Arms shipments and troop movements are to be taken more seriously than mild words.

177. All that we see and hear now should be put in the context of recent history. No one knows exactly why atom bombs fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki at the very end of the Second World War; we may know, however, why atom bombs were not used in the Korean war. Having lost the monopoly of atomic weapons, the Western allies could not expect to use them without risking retaliation. From that time on, it was by the growing nuclear and thermo-nuclear power of the Soviet Union that, on several critical occasions and in different regions of the world, great masses of human beings were protected against nuclear and thermo-nuclear disaster.

178. So far it is the thermo-nuclear power of the Soviet Union that has deadlocked the use of atomic weapons by the Western Powers. Consequently, against growing threats and military preparations of the West, it is the development of thermo-nuclear devices by the Soviet Union that provides the principal protection for the majority of States and for all mankind. After the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Western Powers have no moral basis for challenging the logic of the facts. The new declaration of the Soviet Union regarding the necessity of the resumption of thermo-nuclear tests assures the whole of mankind that the atom bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki may and will forever remain the only tragic experiences of the military use of atomic energy.

179. I apologize for quoting a rather delicate passage from a New York newspaper. I emphasize, the words are not mine. The New York World-Telegram formulated the other day, in its editorial, the following question:

"Why are Americans, collectively, the most unpopular people in the world? It is no exaggeration to

say that this is so: any traveler finds that America is disliked in every foreign land he visits. If, for example, the United States had resumed testing nuclear weapons first, there wouldn't be a whole pane of glass left in any American embassy from Addis Ababa to Zululand."

The question is by no means a private concern of the editor. I could have quoted the Attorney-General of the United States as well, who happened to utter almost the same words in a recent radio interview, and it is generally known that a special commission has been set up to study the problems related to this question.

180. Now, I think I have to do justice to Americans in general. The editor I quoted is certainly mistaken; it is not true that Americans as such are collectively disliked in every country. No, they are not. But it is certainly true that many aspects of the foreign policy of successive administrations are regarded with distrust, and it is especially the armament race introduced and dictated by the United States, first of all its thermo-nuclear policy, that is—to put it mildly—looked upon with suspicion.

181. For example, the insistence of the United States delegation on debating the problem of a thermo-nuclear test ban as a separate item and the two-Power draft resolution circulated on this item [A/C.1/L.280] will not add much to the prestige of the United States. When the item was put on the agenda with a great majority of votes [1018th meeting], one could smell the feelings of victory in statements made by certain Western representatives. However, on second thought, the delegation of the United States could have realized that its proposal rested on the moral basis created in the Assembly by the Soviet Union and by all those who had for years worked here for the prohibition of thermo-nuclear weapons. However paradoxical it may seem, it is self-evident that the result of the vote reflected the deep-rooted effects created by those who have consistently fought in the Assembly against the thermo-nuclear policy of the United States. Records of the plenary meetings and the meetings of the First Committee show that efforts were expended here by the Western military allies just to ridicule those who spoke about the harmfulness of atomic radiation. Statements of United States authorities make it unforgettable how many scientists and public figures of the United States had to undergo all sorts of vexation as allegedly being Communist agents because they spoke out against thermo-nuclear fallout. The present paradoxical situation has a happy by-product, which is that propaganda against thermo-nuclear tests has received laissez-passer even in the United States. It will also have good effects in the future.

182. People of good will recognize that in front of the thermo-nuclear preparations of the West we have had only one choice: either to look upon the growing dangers of a thermo-nuclear disaster without doing anything against it or to develop further the thermo-nuclear capabilities of the Soviet Union against all possible dangers.

183. On our part there is no inconsistency at all. We proclaim with the Soviet Union that it would be better to stop all tests as soon as possible, but the only way to do so is by concluding an agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. As long as the NATO Powers are intensifying their military preparations and staging manoeuvres on the borders of socialist States, we will be com-

pelled to strengthen our defensive forces not only for our security but also to safeguard peace at large in the interest of all nations.

184. We were told by the President of the United States that a new statutory agency fully endorsed by Congress would work to find an approach to disarmament. Since we heard this statement the establishment of this agency has been made public, as well as its name—Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The very name of this agency calls our attention to the danger of the fact that the United States again speaks about control of armament and not about control of disarmament. Future negotiations may make it clear whether the name of the agency reflects its real intentions or not.

185. There is an unmistakably comforting sentence in the statement of the President of the United States. He pointed out: "... men may no longer pretend that the quest for disarmament is a sign of weakness—for in a spiralling arms race a nation's security may be shrinking even as its arms increase" [1013th meeting, para. 51]. In other words, even from the point of view of a policy of strength, the present arms race does not represent any real perspective for any United States Government which would like to continue the so-called policy of strength. There is a qualitative change in the world situation today. In the age of intercontinental missiles and of space exploration there is no invulnerable spot anywhere on the earth, not even in the United States. There is no possible new technical invention applied to military purposes that could alter that situation. So the utter hopelessness of any armaments race for certain military quarters in the West is a compelling force to renew negotiations on disarmament with the view of general and complete disarmament under real and effective control.

186. The test of such good will may be rather near. Yes, we have it near at hand. In a memorandum the Government of the Soviet Union has put forward proposals for interim agreements with a view to lessening tensions and creating a certain degree of mutual trust [A/4892]. I refer to only one of them. The Governments of the States members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization are proposing a treaty of non-aggression to be concluded with the Governments of the NATO alliance. My Government is one of the sponsors of this proposal. Representatives of the NATO Powers would say that their organization is of a defensive character, and they usually qualify our intentions as aggressive. Well, the allegedly aggressive Warsaw organization now makes a proposal to the allegedly defensive NATO to sign a pact of non-aggression. Let the NATO Powers test our goodwill and start negotiations with the view of a treaty of non-aggression. The proposal is in the hands of the Governments of the NATO States. In case of a negative reply, people may well ask why such a proposal is not welcomed when the proclaimed intentions are so peaceful?

187. Berlin is no excuse for not signing such an agreement. Whoever would exploit the problems of Berlin and Germany to make excuses for not being ready to negotiate a non-aggression treaty would admit that he has the intention of searching for a solution to these issues by applying pressure of military strength.

188. The most critical point of the present world situation is indeed the German and Berlin question. There is no doubt about that. But it would be a mistake to think that the origin of the crisis lies in the pro-

posal to sign a peace treaty with both German States and to settle the abnormal West Berlin situation. Such nonsense has been invented here to mislead delegations that are not closely linked with the recent history of Central Europe. It has been invented to convey to those who are not acquainted with the situation in Central Europe the impression that the new proposals are a threat to an existing peaceful situation there. On the contrary, in the true sense of the word, never since the Second World War has the peaceful situation been settled there. And we, the nations of Eastern Europe, have had to experience much trouble even in the post-war period, precisely because of the unsettled German situation. When we speak nowadays about the necessity of signing a peace treaty and doing away with the remnants of the Second World War, our concern is not simply to settle unsettled legal formalities but we wish to extinguish the live embers left from the Second World War in the interest of the German people itself and in the interest of the world's security at large.

189. At the end of the Second World War, theoretically speaking there were two possibilities for Germany. Either the agreement between the great Powers of the anti-Hitler coalition should stand to ensure the democratic development of a peaceful and demilitarized Germany, or the traditional military, political and economic forces of revanchist German quarters should regain power and create a revengeful State endangering the East and the West alike. What really happened is a third solution. Since in the West, with the assistance of the Western Powers, the Federal Republic of Germany was created, opening far-reaching possibilities for old Hitlerite elements to recapture their former strong positions, in the East the German Democratic Republic has developed, faithfully abiding by the principles agreed upon by the Powers allied in the fight against Hitlerite Germany. Nations of the world owe much to the existence of the German Democratic Republic for securing peace against all dangers emanating from revanchist circles of the Federal Republic of Germany. Even Western Powers, especially those bordering upon West Germany, owe a great deal for their security to the existence of the German Democratic Republic.

190. In the heart of the German Democratic Republic, in one section of Berlin, under the cover of military occupation by Western armed forces, all sorts of hostile and demoralized elements are engaged in subversive activities against the German Democratic Republic and other countries of Eastern Europe.

191. The still glowing embers of the Second World War should be done away with in order to bring about peace in Central Europe at long last. The proposals for a peace treaty and for a settlement of the abnormal situation in West Berlin do not disturb any peaceful situation. On the contrary, the proposals have been made in order to bring peace to where there has been no peace so far.

192. The arrangements envisaged for a peace treaty with both German States would not harm any interested Powers, and they would safeguard the rights of the West Berlin inhabitants as well. This has been stated in most official form by competent representatives of the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union said in this debate:

"The Soviet Government and the Head of that Government, Nikita S. Khrushchev, have repeatedly



declared the United Nations could also serve as a guarantor of the status of the free city. To that end the status of the free city could be officially registered with the United Nations, and other forms of United Nations participation in the guarantees of the freedom and independence of the free city could also be envisaged. The Soviet Government is ready to agree to the use of troop contingents of neutral States or United Nations troops as guarantors of the status of the free city." [1016th meeting, para.71.]\*

He also said:

"In the implementation of our proposal for a peace treaty there is no question of banning access to West Berlin or of a blockade as some people try to assert. No, the free city of West Berlin would have the right to establish ties with any country of any continent." [Ibid., para. 72.]\*

193. The intentions of the proposals are favourable to all those interested in the peace and security of Europe. It is rather difficult to understand why certain Western Powers are bursting with indignation. The alarming noise is becoming more dangerous day by day. Troops and armaments are being mobilized and accumulated along the borders of the German Democratic Republic. Provocative demonstrations and ostentatious visits are being organized in and around West Berlin. The irresponsibility behind all these measures is enormous because the slightest miscalculation on the part of any local commander may inflame a tremendous pyre in the heart of Europe that could lead to a world conflagration. What is the use of these alarming noises?

194. Should one suppose that the Western Powers, having no realistic and proper policy for settling the German question as a whole at the present moment when they inevitably have to face the reality of the two German States in order to safeguard their prestige, wish to show that they could achieve by their so-called firm stand and fighting spirit what in any case would come about through peaceful negotiations? Should one say that we are witnessing another sort of Laotian experience in a European milieu? We can remember, and we should remember, that the crisis of Laos started with a declaration of neutrality of the lawful Government of Laos. Against this policy of neutrality Western forces organized all sorts of counter-measures; later they applied most ostentatious military and naval demonstrations. And after all this they were compelled to come out with the same slogan of neutrality against which they vociferated before.

195. I should not like to misuse statements of public figures of the United States. Many of them could be quoted as reflecting the actual reality of the two German States. I cannot help quoting one. I hope I shall not do him an injustice. Mr. Walter Lippmann defined the origin of the difficulties of the West in a most candid and condensed way:

"The Western (European) Governments, knowing that the main architects of that policy (on Germany) were men who wanted only to stand firm and stand pat, saw no future in what they were told was the [United States] policy. Since August 13, when the unrealism of the policy was revealed, there has been a sufficient revival of positive thinking in Washington to open up the grim deadlock of the nuclear deaf mutes."

196. In the noise of the alarming events created by Western military moves and continued threats, not much concrete indication of a revival of positive thinking is to be seen as yet. However, one should hope that a new era of positive thinking will really come to open up the deadlock of the nuclear deaf mutes, and it will be realized that confusion will not decrease if new confusing factors are added and the lack of realistic political thinking cannot be concealed by military demonstrations. It would be beneficial to the general world situation if all interested Powers recognized the necessity and possibility of signing a peace treaty with both German States and of settling the status of West Berlin through reasonable negotiations. This development is inevitable. No doubt about that, because all the real and decisive forces of the present European situation are working in this direction. If, for the time being, the Federal Republic of Germany and some Western Powers do not heed the necessity of time, a separate treaty with the German Democratic Republic will be concluded.

197. The Hungarian National Assembly, which is in session these days, has adopted a declaration on this point in which it states: "The need of international security makes it imperative for present-day history to give in 1961, at long last, a satisfactory answer to this, one of the most important questions of international life."

198. The people and the Government of Hungary have close and friendly relations with the people and Government of the German Democratic Republic in the political, economic and cultural fields alike. We expect the conclusion of the peace treaty in the near future to open a new era of friendly co-operation of nations in Europe. We look forward to the time when both German States will be Members of this Organization. After the full recognition of the two sovereign German States their legally established Governments may pave the way for their co-operation and for one or another form of federation.

199. Delegations in this Assembly coming from different continents of the globe will certainly understand that in the present situation we, the nations of Central and Eastern Europe, are especially and deeply interested in the peaceful settlement of controversial issues related to the German situation. We live in that part of the globe where two world wars started. In our endeavours to liquidate all causes of war forever, one of the most immediate tasks is to eradicate the dangers of war in connexion with the German situation. The mutual understanding that may be strengthened even in this general debate may contribute to extinguishing the dangerous vestiges of the Second World War which otherwise could easily turn into the germs of a third world war.

200. The deepest cause of the present deterioration of the world situation lies in the steady process of liquidation of the colonial system. Monopoly capitalists interested in colonial exploitation use all their influences with Western political circles in order to stop and if possible to reverse, or at least to divert, the historical developments tending towards the national independence of all peoples living under colonial rule. For the socialist countries it would be easy to establish better relations with some Western Powers if we were ready to bargain with them over their colonial interests. At the expense of nations emerging from colonial subjugation, we could be on more favourable terms with colonial Powers. They have already ac-

\* Provisional English version taken from the interpretation.



quiesced in the fact that socialism is a definitely established system in our countries. The main reason for their antagonizing the socialist States lies in their fear that the very existence and growth of the socialist countries will accelerate the liberation movements of colonial territories. The economic and cultural contact of socialist countries with the newly independent nations are not based on profit business and are not hampered by any political strings. An unprecedented, new type of unselfish co-operation among nations is being shaped that is entirely unimaginable from the point of view of monopoly capital. An ever-growing deep feeling of solidarity is being born between socialist nations and nations on the way to new development. And this feeling of solidarity is growing regardless of their differing social and political systems.

201. The General Assembly at this session will certainly continue to deal with the problems regarding liquidation of the colonial system. There were some indications during the last session that certain colonial Powers would like to utilize the cause of anti-colonialism for their cold-war intentions at the expense of peoples under genuine colonial rule. There have been indications of such attempts already in this debate as well. Such attempts make it even more evident that the colonial Powers deal with the problems of liquidating colonial rules only when they are inevitably compelled to do so, but even then they try to exploit the debate for stirring up cold-war controversies in order to shelve the real issue.

202. The way monopoly capitalists look on problems of economic under-development, when they are not confronted by so many delegations to the United Nations interested in the matter, may be seen in a report presented recently to the Finance Ministers of the States members of the International Finance Corporation. The American president of the Corporation, Mr. Garner, stated that the fault of poverty lay with the nations that are poor. He dismissed as a cause of under-development even the past history of colonialism. He said: "Economic development or lack of it is primarily due to differences in people and in their attitudes." Of course, he was very much for private establishments. He even said: "Government-to-government financial aid cannot successfully be used to gain and hold political advantages for the country supplying the funds." This is how monopoly capitalism is speaking even today.

203. To help oppressed peoples to get rid of the powerful influence of the monopoly capital of the colonizing Powers is not only a humanitarian action towards them; it is also beneficial to the family of nations in general, because the representatives of the newly independent nations are deeply interested in lessening world tensions, liquidating war dangers and securing constructive co-operation among nations. Therefore, the General Assembly would act to the benefit of peaceful development in general if it translated into deeds the words of the declaration on the liquidation of the colonial system adopted by the General Assembly at its fifteenth session.

204. The present session of the General Assembly has the great chance of turning the United Nations into a veritable world organization by restoring the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in its ranks. So far it has really been an awkward situation for the General Assembly to deal with world problems without the participation of lawful representatives of one-quarter of the whole population of our globe.

Those who have acted here in the name of China have not been and could not be recognized as such even by those who have so far prevented the delegation of the Government of the People's Republic of China from taking its place here.

205. The former practice of the United States delegation of barring any debate on the representation of China would not work this year, because the sense of reality of the delegations would reject any such manoeuvres known from previous sessions. We are met here with a new strategy. It is an open secret. Newsweek, in the 25 September issue, stated:

"After a long summer of bargaining the U.S. delegation was ready with a new and complex strategy to block Communist China. It was launched ... when New Zealand, with the obvious approval of the United States, proposed that the question of Chinese representation be debated by the Assembly ... The United States' ... recommendation will be that the whole matter go to a committee which will study all questions of U.N. reorganization until next year. Thus, in effect, U.S. strategy is to gain a new postponement, but by different tactics."

206. The General Assembly would only do harm to this Organization, to the world situation in general, and even to the United States, if it yielded to these new tactics.

207. The other day a book was published in the United States under the title Awakened China, the Country Americans Don't Know, written by Felix Greene, an American reporter of British origin who has recently travelled in many parts of China. There is a sharp contrast between what he saw there and what he had heard here about China. In the face of this discrepancy the author states on page 389:

"I ... do not believe you can fake a whole country, and I think in all significant respects this book presents a fair and honest account of what is going on in China today. If this is so, or if only half the facts that I have presented, or even one-tenth of them, are true, then it becomes clear that the American people have been most seriously misinformed ... A nation which allows itself to be deluded to this extent is on a dangerous path."

No doubt, this applies even more to this Organization. If it allows itself to be deluded once again, it chooses a dangerous path. It is clear that the People's Republic of China will grow and develop from all points of view of political and economic life even without the United Nations. The United Nations, however, is not able to fulfil its tasks without the participation of the People's Republic of China.

208. As to the problems of reorganization of the functions and structure of the Secretariat, my delegation would like to offer two observations for consideration. Since the establishment of the United Nations, as a result of the growing membership and the tasks entrusted to the Organization, the functions of the Secretariat have increased and changed in character. The Secretary-General is qualified by the Charter as the chief administrative officer of the Organization. Owing to the growth of the Organization, this originally purely administrative function has become more and more of a political character. In the complexities of the present world situation, administering the implementation of Security Council decisions and General Assembly resolutions demands from the Secretariat more and more political activities. Even formal ad-

ministration has become a whole series of political actions.

209. If that is so, as it certainly is, then it becomes necessary to apply the same spirit in reorganizing the functions and structure of the Secretariat as is reflected in the Charter.

210. When the principles of the functioning of the Security Council were conceived, the founders of this Organization kept in view the necessity of the co-operation of the five great Powers for the sake of peace and security. The basic intention was that this Organization should help the five great Powers to co-operate in all major world issues. The difficulties arose when a group of Member States departed from this principle and tried to use this Organization for the power policy of one group of States against another group of States. Even today the principle of the consensus of the five great founding Powers is disputed by those quarters which would like to use this Organization against its main purposes and against some Member States.

211. Deeply convinced that the principles of the Charter are right and that they are the best precondition for further fruitful activities in this Organization, we think that the same principle is to be applied in reorganizing the Secretariat.

212. If the Secretariat can be reshaped in such a way as to reflect the main composition of this Organization, this will open new possibilities for the United Nations in the International field. This Organization may truly be a guarantee of the peaceful coexistence of Member States with differing social, economic and political systems. The Charter itself is a reflection of the principles of peaceful coexistence of States with differing systems. Exactly in the present state of deterioration of the world situation we have every reason to emphasize the validity and the true perspectives of the idea of peaceful coexistence.

213. One of the distinguished speakers here, although maintaining the necessity of peaceful coexistence, regards this very principle as the most sterile and negative conception of international life produced in the twentieth century. Well, peaceful coexistence has as much content as coexisting nations may be able to bring together.

214. In the present situation, peaceful coexistence is the form of constructive competition of the two systems existing in our world today. On our part, the competition is really constructive. In all fields of international contacts we wish to strengthen friendly feelings among nations. Of course, we are convinced that through this competition socialism will prevail all over the world, but we realize—and we do not mind—that faithful representatives of capitalism profess the same conviction regarding their own system. Let us show the results of our respective systems in a constructive competition for the betterment of human life, but without interfering with the domestic affairs of each other.

215. Just here I must say a special word regarding the so-called question of Hungary, since once again, as a routine act of the United States, it has been placed on the agenda of the General Assembly.

216. Frankly speaking, we are not too much interested in this fact. I say so with all respect for the United Nations. Moreover, not only are we not too much interested in it, but even to the United States Government it would seem more agreeable if it could get rid of it. It was introduced by the United States delegation as a piece of unfinished business. In its present form on the agenda it is in itself contrary to the political intentions of the United States regarding Europe. However, the United States delegation does not know how to finish it. I am speaking quite frankly. The recent facts in this respect are the following.

217. When I left Budapest for this session of the Assembly, the Chargé d'affaires of the United States came to the airport upon his own initiative to see me off. No protocol rules required such a gesture, since I am here exclusively on account of the United Nations. Therefore, I paid due attention to that gesture of the United States. This happened on the very day when the United States delegation presented its proposal to the Secretariat for the inclusion of the so-called question of Hungary.

218. Many representatives here will remember that, for three weeks or so during the resumed fifteenth session, the General Assembly did not work at all; we just waited for the results of the Soviet-United States talks regarding a possible debate on the question of disarmament. Nevertheless, at the end of the session the representative of the United States stated that it was for lack of time that the question of Hungary was not debated. This summer important negotiations were conducted with the President of the General Assembly at its fifteenth session and with some delegations here—among others, with authorities of the United States—about a possible visit of Mr. Boland to Hungary. Everybody seemed to be happy. Then, at the last moment came the United States proposal. The explanations for the change of mood were whispered into the ears of our diplomats in very brief terms; you know, it is because of Berlin.

219. We are ready to make it easy for the United States to get rid of this question without losing face. But it is also clear that until this question is removed from the agenda we are not in a position to negotiate. We have much patience. We have plenty of time, and time is working for us. I repeat that in favourable conditions we are ready to help the United States Government to get rid of this "cold war" issue.

220. In this spirit of co-operation, my delegation wishes that at this session the General Assembly may do away with all "cold war" issues and concentrate every effort upon eliminating the causes of the present deterioration and consolidating international peace and security.

221. Last but not least, Mr. President, I wish to extend to you and to the other officers, on behalf of my delegation, our congratulations and our best wishes that under your guidance the Assembly, at this session, may work successfully towards strengthening the forces of peace.

*The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.*