

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1049th
 PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 8 November 1961,
 at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Statement by the President	587
Agenda items 88 and 22:	
The situation with regard to the implementa- tion of the Declaration of independence to colonial countries and peoples (continued) . .	587
Assistance to Africa (continued):	
(a) A United Nations programme for inde- pendence	600
Agenda items 73 and 72:	
Continuation of suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests and obligations of States to refrain from their renewal (con- tinued)	
The urgent need for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective international control (continued)	
Report of the First Committee (part III) . .	600
Agenda items 88 and 22:	
The situation with regard to the implementa- tion of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (continued)	606
Assistance to Africa (continued):	
(a) A United Nations programme for inde- pendence	606

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): There are two items on the agenda for today's meeting. The first is the continuation of the debate on items 88 and 22 (a); the second concerns the third part of the First Committee's report on items 73 and 72. In the letter that he has addressed to me the Chairman of the First Committee suggests that this item should be considered by the General Assembly "as soon as possible". I propose that we should begin today by continuing the debate on items 88 and 22 (a) that we began yesterday.

AGENDA ITEMS 88 AND 22

The situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (continued)

Assistance to Africa (continued):

(a) A United Nations programme for independence

2. Mr. LUNS (Netherlands): What we are here to discuss at present is not just another step along the road that leads from colonialism to the equal status of all peoples in this world. It is much more than that;

no less, in fact, than the closing of an era. The aim and essence of our debate should be to reach agreement on the final measure necessary in order that concrete results may be obtained from the practical application of three sets of rules. They are: first, the general principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations; secondly, the specific obligations imposed by it and by various General Assembly resolutions on Member States administering Non-Self-Governing Territories and, thirdly, the directives laid down in resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

3. If the President will allow me, I will give a brief enumeration of these principles, obligations and directives.

4. First of all, we find in the Charter the principle of respect for the equal rights and self-determination of peoples, mentioned in Article 1, paragraph 2, and that of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, embodied in Article 1, paragraph 3.

5. Among those human rights and fundamental freedoms, the right of self-determination occupies a prominent place. The right of peoples and nations to self-determination was made the subject of General Assembly resolution 637 (VII) A, which, after having reiterated that States Members of the United Nations shall uphold the principle of self-determination of all peoples and nations, goes on to state in paragraph 2:

"The States Members . . . shall recognize and promote the realization of the right of self-determination of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories . . . and shall facilitate the exercise of this right by the peoples of such Territories according to . . . the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, the wishes of the people being ascertained through plebiscites or other recognized democratic means, preferably under the auspices of the United Nations."

6. In paragraph 3 of the same resolution it is said that, "pending the realization of the right of self-determination and in preparation thereof", the indigenous populations should be allowed to participate in the legislative and executive organs of government of the territories and be prepared for "complete self-government or independence".

7. These obligations have also been further elaborated in General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV). That resolution makes it clear that the task of every Administering Power is to bring to the people under its administration a full measure of self-government through the emergence of the Non-Self-Governing Territory as a sovereign State, through its free association with an independent State or through its integration with an independent State. Concerning

integration with an independent State, principle IX in the annex to that resolution has the following to say:

"(a) The integrating territory should have attained an advanced stage of self-government with free political institutions, so that its peoples would have the capacity to make a responsible choice through informed and democratic processes;

"(b) The integration should be the result of the freely expressed wishes of the territory's peoples acting with full knowledge of the change in their status, their wishes having been expressed through informed and democratic processes, impartially conducted and based on universal adult suffrage. The United Nations could, when it deems it necessary, supervise these processes."

8. Finally I come to the directives of resolution 1514 (XV), the implementation of which is the subject of the agenda item now under discussion. From that resolution I would highlight the following pronouncements: that the United Nations has an important role in assisting the movement for independence in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories; that all peoples have the right to self-determination that by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status; that immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those Territories, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom.

9. The directives I have mentioned have been approved in this Assembly by large majorities of votes and have created great expectations, particularly in Asia and Africa where the development towards self-government has not yet been completed. What is expected from us now is not that we should indulge in lengthy theoretical discussions but—and the leaders of the African States have made this quite clear to us—that we should devise practical methods to achieve our aims.

10. To mention just one instance, the declaration issued on 18 September 1961, after the Conference of Tananarive,^{1/} states that the United Nations should accelerate the decolonization process by using every possible means of applying resolution 1514 (XV). Practical solutions are what that Declaration asks for.

11. Another point emphasized by a number of African leaders is that their countries and their aspirations should not be used as pawns in the cold war. My delegation fully understands and sympathizes with that view. We, too, hope and trust that the main objective of achieving full self-government for all peoples will not be obscured or frustrated by those whose intentions are rather to fight their own political battles than to aid in the attainment of accelerated independence for dependent peoples and territories. To make haste with the practical application of the guiding principles we adopted last year is necessary not only in the interest of the still dependent peoples but just as much in the interest of all other countries, because the continuance of inequality creates dangerous tensions that our divided world can ill afford.

12. Before I turn to one particular instance of the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) I should like

to sum up once more the desiderata mentioned in the Charter and in the various Assembly resolutions I have quoted. We have found them to be: paramountcy of the interests of the inhabitants; the taking into account of their political aspirations; development of complete self-government or full independence; the right of self-determination; the ascertaining of the wishes of the people through plebiscites or other recognized democratic means, preferably under United Nations auspices; no integration with any independent State except in compliance with the will of the people expressed through informed and democratic processes, impartially conducted and based on universal adult suffrage; and, finally, an important role to be played by the United Nations in this whole process.

13. How have we applied these maxims to the sole Non-Self-Governing Territory remaining under Netherlands administration, West New Guinea?

14. First, we have taken all steps within our power to speed up the educational, cultural, economic and political development of the inhabitants as much as is humanly possible. The New Guinea Council has been established, the majority of whose members are elected on the basis of universal adult suffrage. Of its twenty-eight members twenty-three are Papuans. A number of local councils, elected on the same basis, are functioning and many indigenous inhabitants have been appointed in the administrative services, which in fact are now made up of more than 50 per cent of Papuans.

15. Secondly, we have offered to transfer sovereignty over the Territory to its people as soon as the United Nations is able to take over those necessary administrative services for which the population itself is not yet able to assume full responsibility.

16. Thirdly, we have suggested that the United Nations, aware of the important role it has to play in this development, should establish an authority for this purpose.

17. Fourthly, we have made it a condition—and this is the sole but essential condition—that the full and free exercise of the right of self-determination of the Papuans in the Territory should be unequivocally guaranteed and carried out in good faith through a plebiscite under United Nations auspices; and let me repeat once more that the Netherlands Government will fully respect whatever decision the Papuan people may take, including, of course, a decision to join Indonesia.

18. Fifthly, we have announced that we are willing to continue our contributions to the development of the territory on the basis of the present outlay, which is \$30 million a year, until such time as may be decided upon in the future.

19. Sixthly, if the United Nations so desires, the Netherlands is also prepared to request members of the Netherlands Civil Service in West New Guinea to stay on for a certain time.

20. Seventhly, we have suggested that, as a first move towards the attainment of these aims and in order that even the appearance of our trying to prejudice the decision may be avoided, the General Assembly should set up a United Nations commission and instruct it to visit the territory and inquire into the political, economic, social and educational conditions there, as well as into the opinion among the population as to its present situation and its future. We have

^{1/} Held from 6-12 September 1961.

also proposed that the commission should report on the possibility of organizing a plebiscite under the supervision of the United Nations in order to register the wishes of the population concerning their future, on the timing of such a plebiscite, and on the possibility of bringing the territory, during the interim period, partially or wholly under the administration of an international development authority, established by and operating under the United Nations.

21. Eighthly, our proposal is that the commission should report to the next session of the General Assembly which could then, on the basis of such an objective report, take all the measures necessary for the further implementation of our plan.

22. We have considered it necessary to introduce these two phases into our proposals for three reasons. The first reason is that New Guinea, although it is the second largest island in the world, is to many Members of the United Nations a very far-away country, which, in spite of the voluminous reports that the Netherlands Government has for the past twelve years submitted each year to the General Assembly through the Secretariat, has remained almost *terra incognita* and on the future of which they might find it difficult to make a final decision at this time.

23. The second reason is that our proposal is so novel that Members may prefer not to pronounce themselves on such a concept as, for instance, a United Nations development authority, until all the implications have been seriously studied by a commission. May I stress again that such an offer as ours has never before been made by any administering Power to the United Nations and that the circumstances which have prompted us to make it are unique.

24. The third reason stems from the attitude, claims and allegations of a third State, namely Indonesia. The Members of the Assembly know only too well that Indonesia has claimed the right to incorporate Netherlands New Guinea—or West Irian, as Indonesia calls it—into its own State, and to do so without allowing the Papuan people to express themselves "through informed and democratic processes, impartially conducted and based on universal adult suffrage" under United Nations supervision—I am quoting from annex 16, General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)—on whether they desire to be so incorporated. I shall not, at this stage anyhow, enter into a discussion of the arguments Indonesia has adduced for this truly extraordinary claim which, if allowed, would constitute an open violation of all the principles, obligations and directives of the Charter and of the pertinent General Assembly resolutions.

25. All I wish to say about it now is that, in support of its pretensions, Indonesia has made statements to the effect that the Papuans consider themselves part of Indonesia and wish to be integrated in Indonesia and that the Netherlands Administration is cruelly suppressing them and preventing them from achieving their desire to be part of Indonesia. Were I merely to deny those blatant untruths there might remain doubts in the minds of some delegations concerning the real situation. It is for that reason also that the Netherlands Government would welcome a completely impartial investigation *in loco* by a United Nations commission which can report on the conditions in the territory and give an unbiased account of the feeling among the Papuan inhabitants and of the Netherlands stewardship, so that the General Assembly may be

able to make its final decision next year in full knowledge of the facts.

26. On the strength of these considerations, I recommend to all the Members the adoption of the Netherlands draft resolution [A/L.354]. The proposals contained therein have been favourably received by a great many delegations. A few delegations, however, have asked us why we had "ignored Indonesia", as they call it, in making these proposals and whether the territorial dispute between the Netherlands and Indonesia should not be settled first.

27. My answer to these questions is simple. First of all we were unable to consult Indonesia beforehand, because Indonesia has broken off diplomatic relations with my country and has even gone so far as to refuse to accept the normal procedure in such cases, which is that a third country should be allowed to represent the Dutch interests in Indonesia. Moreover, all the Indonesian leaders and spokesmen have reiterated over and over again that Indonesia could agree to only one solution: the handing over of the territory and people of Netherlands New Guinea to Indonesia without any previous consultation of the Papuan people.

28. With regard to the settlement of the territorial dispute I would remark that what is important at the present juncture is not so much the legal issue whether sovereignty over New Guinea rests with the Netherlands or with Indonesia although I may remind the Assembly that we have repeatedly offered to submit that legal issue to the International Court of Justice, and that Indonesia has consistently refused to do so. What is important now, and of paramount importance, is the future of Netherlands New Guinea. On that future no one except the Papuans themselves is entitled to decide. To let them decide for themselves is the only method compatible with the principles of the Charter. It is *inter alia* also the only way to achieve a peaceful and durable settlement.

29. I still cherish the hope that Indonesia will come to realize that this is the right way, and that our withdrawal from New Guinea and the establishment of a United Nations authority there will enable the two countries to reach a better and friendlier relationship. To that end co-operation from the Dutch side will always be forthcoming.

30. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland): As can be seen from the general debate and judging from the deliberations of our Main Committees, the problems of final liquidation of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations, with all its implications and effects, continues to focus the attention of the present session and of the United Nations in general. It is but too easy to see why.

31. Colonial subjugation is not only the most inhuman form of political oppression curbing the independent national development of peoples deprived of freedom, it is a most brutal form of economic exploitation that favours and adds to unjust lack of equality and to disparity in the use of the benefits of natural resources and manpower. Also, it serves to hinder free cultural development of peoples which, though not independent, have the same right as any nation to enrich the treasury of human culture.

32. The impact of powerful social and national forces, set free after the tragic years of World War II, rocked the foundation of the colonial system. This was when the twilight, when the process of the downfall of colonialism gained force. The Charter of the United Na-

tions, written and signed after the end of hostilities, could not ignore this historical development.

33. Imperfect and restricted as it is, the United Nations Trusteeship System and that concerning the Non-Self-Governing Territories has played its part by bringing constant pressure to bear upon the colonial Powers in order to implement the basic principles of the Charter—to ensure the right to self-determination and the right to political independence of the inhabitants of dependent territories.

34. But the provisions of Chapters XI and XII of the Charter would have remained on paper for a long time, had there been no mass expansion of national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and elsewhere. The socialist countries, of course, feel complete solidarity with these strivings for freedom and independence, so wide and strong as to have no precedent in the history of mankind.

35. Thus, a favourable climate and auspicious conditions for the struggle for independence have been created owing to the new relationship of forces in the world. In effect, even those who would go to any length to prevent any change, have to reconcile themselves with the new developments.

36. A telling evidence of that is the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)], adopted, as the result of the initiative of the Soviet Union, by the General Assembly at its fifteenth session. Eighty-nine States voted for this charter of freedom. No one dared to pass a vote against it. The colonial Powers abstained. In the face of the entire world, colonialism was condemned, sentenced, and finally outlawed by virtue of this historic act.

37. Based on the principles of the Charter, the anti-colonial Declaration is binding on all Member States. It proclaims the necessity of bringing an unconditional end to colonialism and declares in paragraph 5 that immediate steps shall be taken to transfer all powers to the peoples of Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence. The Declaration lays emphasis on unconditional, I repeat, unconditional and immediate, I repeat, immediate, implementation of its provisions.

38. Barely a year has passed since the Declaration was adopted, but among the scores of dependent territories Sierra Leone is the only one that has attained independence within that time. To be sure, we have had the great pleasure of welcoming Sierra Leone in our midst as a new Member of the United Nations. As a matter of fact, the Committees are already discussing resolutions sponsored by Sierra Leone; Sierra Leone is already active here.

39. Tanganyika is expecting its independence in December. Western Samoa is expecting its independence in January. And that is all. In other words, what ought to have been the general rule in 1961 has been restricted to isolated cases. And this, in spite of the fact that more than 70 million inhabitants of Africa, Asia and Latin America are still suffering under the colonial régime; in spite of the fact that some territories, such as Ruanda-Urundi, Oman, Uganda or Kenya have their own outstanding statesmen and a quite well-organized administrative machinery ready to take over all powers immediately. In spite of the fact, I say that the Assembly could also profit from hearing

Kenyatta, Jagan and other leaders from the hitherto-dependent countries.

40. While deferring the granting of independence to those countries whose right to independence is explicitly safeguarded in the United Nations Declaration of last December, the colonial Powers resort to armed action and mass reprisals to smother national liberation movements, in defiance, of course, of the terms of the Declaration.

41. The colonial rule of lawless abuse has been glaringly exposed by the bloody events in Angola in recent months. Responding in their own way to the wave of the heroic struggle for freedom of the Angolan people, which did not flinch from any sacrifice, colonialists proceeded to ruthless measures of extermination, resulting so far in tens of thousands of casualties among the Angolans. And Angola continues to be soaked in blood. Later, under another item of the agenda we shall have an opportunity to speak more extensively of the situation in Angola and also of the situation in Algeria whose population for seven years now has been heroically continuing its just and courageous struggle for liberation.

42. We cannot refrain from mentioning at the same time that colonialism not only directly violates fundamental human rights and the right to self-determination, but it also undertakes to circumvent those provisions of the December Declaration which strictly prohibit the imposition of any arbitrary ties between colony and metropolis.

43. For, as we know, more juridical links are to be established to chain the inhabitants of Angola, Mozambique, Portuguese Guinea, Goa, Portuguese Timor and other territories to Portugal. However, colonialists are mistaken if they think that their arbitrary move will silence the voices heard from this rostrum and the resolutions adopted by the United Nations in defence of the right to self-determination of the peoples of those territories.

44. We shall continue, and we are certainly not alone, to insist that independence be granted to Angola and the remaining Portuguese colonies. We shall raise our voice in protest against any lawless act committed in those territories. We shall persist in objecting to classifying as "Portuguese" those peoples who desire as soon as possible to break the hateful links with Portugal.

45. The December Declaration envisages that all legislative and executive powers shall be transferred immediately to the peoples of the territories concerned. Now, how is this principle carried out in practice in, let us say, the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland? Out of the 7.9 million inhabitants of the Federation, 7.6 million are Africans and 292,000 are Europeans. But their representation in the territorial bodies is the exact reverse of the actual proportion of the population. Four-fifths of all the seats in the Federal Assembly belong to Europeans; and the members of the Federation's Cabinet are mainly Europeans. In Southern Rhodesia, Europeans have been given every seat in the Legislative Assembly. Europeans hold twenty-two out of the twenty-six seats in Northern Rhodesia's Assembly, and eighteen out of the twenty-three seats in Nyasaland's Legislative Assembly.

46. The constitutions now being prepared for the two Rhodesias and Nyasaland adhere to the existing dis-

crimination against the African population and deny that population's right to take part in the elections according to the "one man, one ballot" rule. This openly defies the principle of representative administration and is an infringement of the anti-colonial Declaration. The Observer, a respectable British weekly, has made the tongue-in-cheek remark that only a professor of mathematics could disentangle the puzzling mystery of the electoral system in the Federation. Is it supposed to be one of the didactical and educational principles recommended by the United Kingdom representative during the general debate at this session? Has one to learn mathematics in order to grasp the intricacies of colonial constitutions?

47. I do not think that there is any need to repeat here the obvious truth that the colonialists refuse to abandon their domination because of the economic, political and strategic advantages they draw from it. Exploitation of natural resources and manpower, markets for expensive industrial goods made in the metropolis: these are certainly sources of great profits. Indeed, they seem to be the true motives behind what is so often advertised here by advocates of colonialism as a mission of education and civilization discharged by the colonial Powers in the territories under their administration:

48. The political significance of possessing a colony has connotations extending far beyond the colony's territorial borders. Colonialism makes it possible to exert pressure not only upon the people of the territory concerned, but also upon the governments of its independent neighbours. The so-called "présence française" in Algeria adds to the tensions throughout the Maghreb area and hinders the process of stabilization and the reinforcement of the complete sovereignty of the countries in that region of the world. Do we need to cite the case of Bizerta?

49. The objective of the repressive measures in Angola is not only to defend the colonial rule in that country, but also to impede the political emancipation of dependant nations in other non-liberated parts of the African continent. An independent Angola would be a blow to the oppressive slave system in South West Africa. That is why both Portugal and South Africa oppose Angola's independence, and that is why they both support the denial of the right of self-determination to South West Africa. Again—and I should like to give one instance in this respect—had it not been for the existence of colonies, the position of the Western Powers in, for example, the Economic Commission for Africa would also have been different, as would have been the essence of the Commission's work if it had had as its sole aim to promote the interests of Africa. Hence, this is a problem involving the activity and effectiveness of the United Nations in its entirety.

50. And there is something else. During the general debate, the representatives of Ghana and Guinea laid strong stress on the fact that the problem of the liquidation of colonialism is closely connected with that of general and complete disarmament. They emphasized that colonialism is one of the reasons of the continuing arms race and that disarmament and decolonization imply the elimination of the spirit of conquest and exploitation.

51. One can hardly disagree with those opinions. We are very well aware of the links between colonialism and the Western military alliances. It is precisely NATO which, through the political solidarity of all its

members and through the arms it supplies, is assisting the colonial Powers to carry on armed actions which further the subjugation of peoples still under colonial rule. If not for that assistance, would it be possible to drag on wars like the one in Algeria for years and years? Would it be possible to use the latest German-made arms, not to mention those supplied by other NATO allies, to slay and decimate Angolan guerrillas armed with primitive weapons?

52. I think that no one, even the staunchest opponent of collective responsibility, would deny that the blame for what is happening in Angola, Algeria and other territories must be borne by NATO as a whole.

53. And if Washington, London and other capitals of NATO countries want us to believe—and they do try to make us believe—that they are in a position to curb the expansion and the aggressive spirit of German militarism and "revanchism", which are of major concern to my country, how can they explain their helplessness with regard to Portugal? Otherwise the real explanation can only be that they refuse to disapprove of the repressive measures applied in Angola. Are we to draw such a conclusion?

54. The fact that military bases are located in a dependent territory is one of the important obstacles on the way to that territory's independence. The countries of Asia and Africa are using their convincing powers of persuasion here in the United Nations to advance the process of disarmament; they are fighting to prevent their countries from getting involved in the arms race; they are standing up for a nuclear-free zone to cover the entire continent of Africa. But all this can be fully achieved only through the final elimination of colonialism and the complete implementation of the anti-colonial Declaration.

55. Experience teaches that wherever the colonial Powers feel that, because of the growing force of national liberation movements, they can no longer maintain their rule by means of traditional colonial methods, they seek other forms of domination in order to keep their positions.

56. We denounce "classical" colonialism in all its aspects and we as firmly oppose all attempts at preserving or restoring colonial domination in a neo-colonial form. The right of all peoples to independence must be observed in full also after the attainment of independence. For there is no independence with restricting, imposed strings attached. And the attainment of independence must not be contravened by any obligations linking the home or foreign affairs, the economic or defence policy, of a newly-emerged State to the former administering Power.

57. But the fact remains that highly-developed Powers, making use of their material superiority, attempt to pursue the exploitation of young post-colonial countries and to impede, to distort, their harmonious development by all kinds of political, economic and military measures. And this, in turn, is bound to lead to new crisis and new conflicts, which should be prevented.

58. If the actual intention is to do away with neo-colonial exploitation and to help the newly-emerged countries to overcome the first difficulties in the shaping of their independent existence, it seems to the Polish delegation that there are three requirements which have to be met first of all.

59. To begin with, the countries concerned must be relieved of all burdens and all obligations imposed by

previous colonial policies, since those burdens are bound to delay and distort the normal course of their development.

60. Secondly, those countries should not be hampered in their freedom of movement of agreements executed between metropolitan countries and their former dependencies in obvious conditions of inequality.

61. Thirdly, the newly-independent countries must receive economic and technical assistance, be it unilateral or multilateral, in such a way as to accelerate the process of achieving full sovereignty and economic independence.

62. It seems that it is only by meeting such conditions that we shall be able to bring substantial aid to the countries liberated from colonial domination. As the British economist A.H. Hanson puts it, those countries:

"... conscious of their nationhood and anxious to make their marks in international affairs as quickly as possible, are not prepared to accept the existing division of labour because it involves acceptance of the existing division of power."^{2/}

63. Elimination of colonialism implies a change not only in the division of power. It also implies a change in the pattern of the international division of labour. The newly-emerged countries must attain not only political and military liberation from the domination of the colonial Powers; they must also cease to be only an annex to the metropolitan economy. They have to free themselves from what Gunnar Myrdal has called "enforced bilateralism"—which, by the way, might soon be transformed into a new enforced link, in line with the concepts of the European Common Market. For it is precisely the European Common Market that presses a number of post-colonial countries into accepting a form of enforced economic cooperation to suit not so much their own needs as those of the main European Powers. This, too—I submit—can take the form of neo-colonialism, and this too has to be taken into consideration when the problem of assistance for Africa is being discussed.

64. In more cases than one, the former rulers try to apply the classical rule of colonialism, *divide et impera*, in their neo-colonial policies pursued against the newly-born countries. We are thus witnessing attempts at dissecting the newly-liberated countries to establish neo-colonial rule in an isolated province or part of their area.

65. The most glaring example, of course, of that is the tragic case of the Congo, where only two obvious efforts are being exerted to make Katanga, the richest province of the country, secede under the banner of the Union Minière. The position of the Netherlands with regard to West Irian seems to be another blatant example of violating territorial integrity to create a new form of dependence.

66. We listened with respect to the distinguished Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, but we regret to say that he did not succeed in convincing us. We all know only too well that West Irian constitutes an integral part of Indonesia, as admitted by the Netherlands Government's report presented to the United Nations in 1949. The report explicitly mentioned "West New Guinea" among the chain of islands com-

prising Indonesia. But that territory continues to remain under the Dutch Administration. And the Dutch proposal, submitted in the draft resolution [A/L.354], to hand over the control of that territory to the United Nations, runs counter to the anti-colonial Declaration, which clearly prohibits any attempt at the disruption of the national unity of a country. Of course, the Dutch proposal contradicts also the United Nations Charter.

67. This conflict with the main documents of the United Nations cannot be concealed by means of tactical, or textual, manoeuvres, like the ones used in the Dutch draft resolution—used, I must admit, quite skillfully. We must reject it. The only just decision which the United Nations can adopt with regard to West Irian is to have that part of Indonesia incorporated in the rest of its homeland. This is also, in the opinion of my delegation, the only solution for the question of the enclaves of Sidi-Ifni, Ceuta, Melilla, and other ones which are under colonial administration but constitute an integral part of Morocco.

68. We followed here yesterday with interest the remarks of the representative of Ceylon [1048th meeting], who brought forward a few extremely interesting, arguments—worthy of consideration—on the problem of free association, and the problem of colonies on whose sovereignty claims are being laid by various United Nations Members.

69. A survey of the situation in the territories which have not yet been liberated from the colonial yoke, and an examination of the events since the adoption of the anti-colonial declaration of last December, lead us, in the view of my delegation, to the following conclusions:

70. First, the attainment of all democratic rights and freedoms must be immediately ensured to the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, in order to enable them to take over without delay all legislative and executive powers and the administration of the countries concerned; secondly, all military bases and other instruments of military pressure must be withdrawn from those territories, and any agreements that might restrict the sovereign rights of the peoples concerned on their attainment of independence must be declared null and void; thirdly, all decrees and regulations binding the territory concerned with the administering Power under different forms of agreements imposed upon the colonial people must be invalidated; fourthly, the Powers having colonial territories under their administration must be asked to abide by the provisions of the December Declaration [resolution 1514 (XV)] and to implement it as soon as possible.

71. These points which are designed to provide a basis for specific action with a view to carrying the December Declaration into effect, are covered in the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union [A/L.335].

72. It is proposed in the draft that the end of 1962 be set as the target date for implementing the provisions of the Declaration and putting a final end to colonialism. The draft also proposes the establishment of a special commission in order to conduct a comprehensive inquiry into the whole process of implementation of the United Nations decisions in this respect.

73. It is true that the element of time and an appropriate machinery are of material importance in

^{2/} A. H. Hanson, *Public Enterprise and Economic Development* (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959), p. 9.

settlement of the problem. Every year of further delay in the final liquidation of colonialism may lead to new clashes and new conflicts, may cause new tensions and new threats to peace. On the other hand, the final elimination of colonialism will bring a substantial improvement of the international climate and a constructive consolidation of peace. That is the important thing.

74. Efforts have been made from this rostrum in the general debate to talk us into believing that any solution of colonial problems calls for time, that they can be solved only through patience, goodwill and determination. Goodwill and determination—yes. Patience—no. One cannot advise peoples that are suffering colonial oppression, poverty and degradation to wait patiently for years until independence is granted to them. One cannot do it in the age of unparalleled development of productive forces and of unprecedented development of technology; in the historical period characterized by a giant striving for full implementation of the principles of social justice and of national and social liberation; in the era, I might say, when one-third of mankind lives under socialism.

75. It is true that the countries whose independence is still very young encounter diverse obstacles in advancing their cause, but it is equally true that such obstacles are the outcome of the long period of colonial rule. Should colonialism be maintained under any form, it could only multiply those obstacles.

76. Life itself has given the lie to the colonialist theory, still persisting in some places, that peoples can be divided into civilized and non-civilized ones, into those which are and are not mature enough to have independent existence. It was upon our generation that members of the nation which had given life to Goethe and Beethoven committed barbarity so monstrous as has never been known in the history of mankind. The Governments and the colonial administrations of the Powers whose cultural heritage is of very long standing, and which assert their pride in it, are responsible for the cruel subjugation of innocent indigenous inhabitants. The inference is that the dividing line between "civilized" and "non-civilized" peoples probably runs somewhere else.

77. As to the post-colonial countries, their prestige and their influence upon international life have grown incomparably within a short time. One can see their constructive contribution to international conferences and agreements, meetings and discussions relating to the most urgent problems of our time. This could be noticed at scores of such meetings, from Bandung to Belgrade, and through tens of others which have marked the pages of modern-day history.

78. These countries are bringing a great and valuable contribution to the work of this Organization. The United Nations would be inconceivable, the Assembly would be inconceivable, without India, Indonesia, Burma, Morocco, Mali, Ghana or Guinea. I hope I shall be forgiven by the representatives of other countries for not having mentioned them here.

79. We are now waiting for representatives of other nations which, if there is to be immediate implementation of the principles of the Charter and of the anti-colonial declaration, ought to be speedily granted their independence, which must have their rights restored and be given a full chance to contribute to the implementation of the principle of peaceful co-

existence of nations, without conquest and without oppression.

80. As a socialist country, Poland can only sympathize and demonstrate her full solidarity with the craving and the fight of subjugated peoples for independence. We give them our full support and assistance. As a nation which, during the dark hours of the Second World War, experienced through tears and blood, sacrifice and death, the Hitlerite application of the principles of the master-race and "Lebensraum", we are deeply interested in the cause of peace. And the end of colonialism will strengthen peace. The nations now called the colonial Powers will eventually also profit from it. The fight against colonialism is also on their behalf. The issue, therefore, is not one of cold war but of common interest.

81. The preamble to the Declaration approaches the liquidation of colonialism in the following terms:

"Conscious of the need for the creation of conditions of stability and well-being and peaceful and friendly relations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of all peoples ...

"Convinced that the continued existence of colonialism prevents the development of international economic co-operation ... and militates against the United Nations ideal of universal peace ...".

These are the words of the Declaration. And that is why we are raising, with sincere conviction and in a strong voice, the problem of ending colonialism.

82. Mr. SHUKAIRY. (Saudi Arabia): Let me take a glance back for a little while. It was something neither urgent nor special—it was simply the fifteenth regular session of the General Assembly, nothing more or nothing less. Yet it passed into history as an epoch-making landmark as had never before appeared in the life of the United Nations. We need not ask how and why. Colonialism was the item and freedom was the resolution.

83. I dare say, colonialism is not just an item—and how often we have examined items and how many we have discussed! Colonialism is the problem of all problems that betrays the evil of all evils. It is the subjugation of a people by a people; it is the exploitation of a nation by a nation; it is the humiliation of a race by a race; and, in a word, it is the domination of man by his fellow-man.

84. The debate was no debate simple, ordinary and usual. It was a long parade of human suffering. It was a tragic exhibition of oppression. It was a disastrous display of exploitation. Millions of people passed across the stage of this Assembly last year, captured, mutilated and maimed, stumbling in the chains of bondage. So many countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America were portrayed—conquered, parcelled and partitioned. Concentration camps and streams of thousands and thousands of refugees were reviewed, one caravan after the other. It was a living movie, a real drama that relayed the record of imperialism and related the tragic story of colonialism. All the characters, all the heroes of colonialism, all the architects, the engineers of imperialism, were made to play their roles—the soldier with his armoury, the explorer with his maps and compass, the adventurer with his dreams, the industrialist with his capital, the governor with his golden maxim "divide and rule", the jailer with his whip and handcuffs and, lastly, the

missionary with his sweet tongue to preach the mission of love, peace and human brotherhood.

85. Indeed, it was a thrilling, sensational and exciting drama, but it was real, factual and actual. Three continents were involved: Asia, Africa and Latin America. Each and every thing was involved—the people and their land, their liberty and their wealth, their markets and their mines, their toil and their labour, and indeed their sweat and their tears, with nothing to lose except the shackles and chains which they possessed.

86. It was a hair-raising story which, at the end, found a conclusion of relief and comfort. The General Assembly passed its historic resolution to meet this historic evil. Decolonization was the answer to colonization. The resolution [1514 (XV)] was passed by eighty-nine votes in favour, with none against and nine abstentions. Of those abstaining, I should like to mention the United States, the United Kingdom and France—the "Three Musketeers" of the free world.

87. As much as we rejoiced that the resolution was passed by the Assembly, we regretted those abstentions. As a part of procedure, an abstention is permissible. It is a method of voting. But how can one abstain from supporting human liberty, how can one refrain from endorsing human dignity and, indeed, how can one say away from the Charter of the United Nations and the principles enshrined in that Charter?

88. The resolution contained no shame or disgrace to deserve abstention. It was the Charter simply paraphrased. It proclaimed "the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations". Could anyone with conscience—and I underline "conscience"—and sanity—and I underscore "sanity"—abstain from upholding the liquidation of colonialism, the greatest evil to which mankind has ever been subjected? Also, the resolution declared that all armed action or repressive action directed against dependent people should cease. Could anyone with the least regard for humanity abstain from such an injunction to be human, if not to be humane?

89. It so happens that the abstainers do not come from Africa or from Asia or, in general, from Latin America. They come from the so-called "free world"—a remnant of empires, often referred to as the free world, and often so advertised side by side with advertisements for Coca-Cola and nylons.

90. Be that as it may, the resolution was passed and it became the resolution of the United Nations, the resolution of this Organization, which is the last refuge for mankind and which represents the conscience of mankind. Originally the item was proposed by the Soviet Union,^{3/} but once it was inscribed on the agenda by the General Assembly it became the possession of the United Nations. It no longer belongs to the Soviet Union; it is the property and the valued possession of the United Nations. It is also true that the resolution was mainly based on a draft^{4/} of the Soviet Union, but once it was adopted by the General Assembly it no longer belonged to the Soviet Union. It belongs to the United Nations as its sacred property and possession.

91. It was, therefore, rightly expected that the resolution would not remain simply a voice in the wilder-

ness of colonialism. We expected that the wilderness would be turned into a paradise of freedom. We expected that this glorious resolution would at last find its way into the hearts of the Administering Powers so as to relieve the world from the curse that blemished the history of mankind. I say "glorious resolution" with full purpose and intention. In fact, of the 1,640 resolutions so far passed by the Assembly up to the present moment, the resolution on colonialism stands out first and foremost, with no exceptions, with no parallel, with no match in the history of this Organization. Could there be anything paramount to freedom or superior to liberty? No problems can have a priority over human dignity. And after all, of what value is it for a people to be dominated in their country, of what worth is it for a nation to be humiliated in their fatherland, and what sort of life is it for anyone to be away from his homeland? Without liberty, life is worthless; without dignity, life is valueless; and without a home and a homeland, life is no life. It is the peak of desolation, the abyss of desperation and the crime of all crimes.

92. It was therefore gracious—and I repeat gracious—on the part of the Soviet Union that last year it requested the inscription of this item on our agenda. This year the Soviet Union has again requested a re-examination of the problem [See A/4859]. What makes it more glorious—and, I repeat, what makes it more glorious—for the Soviet Union to have done that is, that the Soviet Union has submitted the request by telegram to the United Nations—and a request by telegram from the Soviet Union for the inclusion of an item is a measure which has not often been resorted to in the annals of the United Nations. Of course, I can hear the gossiping and the whispering right now; of course, it may be said that this was a propaganda move on the part of the Soviet Union, that it was a vexatious request and that it was intended to expose the Western community. I do not wish to go into polemics nor to refute such a contention. True or false, it matters not. What really matters is the substance of the question. The fact remains that it was the Soviet Union which opened the case of the dependent peoples and the dominated countries at the last session. It would have been just as gracious of the Western countries themselves had they brought the question before the United Nations. After all, they are the "free world"—at least in name, if not by fame.

93. But fame or no fame, or, if you please, shame or no shame, of colonialism or imperialism, it was Western imperialism which again forced the problem before the United Nations. True, it was inscribed at the request of the Soviet Union, but the matter was rendered urgent by the Western Powers. It may be said that the Soviet Union intends again to corner the Western Powers. But why should the West—and I put the question with all due respect, with all humility, towards the Western Powers represented in the Assembly—always choose to be in the corner? If they do not want to be cornered, why do they always choose to be in the corner of imperialism? Why should not the West get out of this corner into the open field of liberty and freedom? Why should the Soviet Union be the constant defender of the freedom of the dependent peoples, and why should the Western Powers be their obstinate gaolers, their greedy exploiters and their stubborn oppressors? And, lastly, why should not the Western Powers cable to the United Nations announcing the emancipation of the "free" peoples before the Soviet Union cables a request for their liberation?

^{3/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 87, document A/4501.

^{4/} Ibid., document A/4502.

94. These charges are not levelled at random nor are they hurled without reason. The Western Powers have not heeded decolonization, have not heeded the resolution which was adopted by the United Nations, the noblest appeal ever made by this Organization. The resolution of last year was not condemnatory. It slandered no one and offended none. It simply aimed at political freedom, economic emancipation and social liberation. It meant that man should not be oppressed because of the colour of his skin nor should he be degraded because of the curl in his hair.

95. Nevertheless the Western Powers have turned deaf ears and shut their eyes. Not only have they failed to respond to the appeal of the world community; they continued their oppression and domination; they stepped up racial discrimination; and they multiplied human extermination. The record is lengthy, but the evidence is overwhelming.

96. Taking a bird's-eye view of our planet, we must be appalled to know that no less than eighty-eight territories in this world of ours are still under foreign domination. We have travelled a long journey on the road to liberty. The United Nations has now become an Organization of more than one hundred nations. But it is not universality to have eighty-eight territories, extending to Asia and Africa, unable to enjoy the sovereignty we enjoy and to exercise the independence we exercise.

97. In terms of numbers, if we are only to be moved by numbers, these territories have no less than 75 million people—downtrodden, degraded and downhearted. Their land is rich with gold and diamonds, with oil and rubber, with tin and zinc, with uranium and silver; but they are the poorest people in the world. They have an abundance of wool, of cotton and of silk, but they are naked down to the ankles. Medicine is made of their herbs, of their flowers, of their shrubs, but they are sick, infected and diseased. Learning, culture and civilization are their history, but they are ignorant and illiterate.

98. In Africa alone there are now twenty-seven territories, with 50 million people groaning under the yoke of Western civilization, which is another synonym for Western imperialism. The United Kingdom alone is still holding 35 million people under the yoke, as the last vestige of Kipling's Empire. It is a domination of the white man over the black race. If colour is a disgrace, it should not be the colour of the skin of Africa. The disgrace must be the black heart of Europe and the dark conscience of the West. This is where the colour is not only a disgrace but the curse of all curses.

99. Nevertheless, let us examine colonialism not in its generality, but in its actuality; not in the past, but in the present. The past has gone with all its miseries and all its calamities, yet the present is before us—to be seen, to be sensed, to be felt.

100. In the Congo, imperialism is still at work. Its diamonds and uranium are the target. What was described as the wealth scandal of the Congo has become an international scandal and its recent victim—a great and beloved victim—was Dag Hammarskjöld. Belgium, France and the United Kingdom—shooting from different angles at different targets—have thrown the Congo into civil war, into chaos and into a blood bath. The reason is imperialism, and Katanga's secession is nothing but imperialism, open and naked. And what is degrading is this cease-fire

with Katanga. In essence, a cease-fire is a commendable international practice. But there can be no cease-fire with aggressors and invaders, and there can be no cease-fire where territorial integrity is at stake.

101. The forces of imperialism have in fact undermined all the United Nations resolutions which stressed the oneness of the Congo, the unity of its people and the integrity of its territory. As Israel has emerged under the umbrella of a cease-fire, so Katanga is emerging now under a cease-fire arrangement. Just as Western imperialism has driven Israel as a deep wedge into the Middle East, Katanga is now being driven into the heart of Africa—with the same tactics and the same strategy.

102. In Angola the picture is dim and grey. Human suffering is unbelievable. Imperialism is carrying out mass extermination. It is genocide by definition. The people of Angola are fighting to destroy an old fallacy of the Portuguese Empire. Portugal pleads that it is innocent of racial discrimination, but it stands guilty of a more heinous offence—racial extinction by assimilation. Portugal still clings to the outmoded heresy of Angola's being another Portugal in Africa. Apart from history, even geography has not taught Portugal the location of Portugal on the world atlas. The Atlantic Ocean does not seem to be wide enough to separate Angola from Portugal. Indeed, the position of Portugal is an ocean of fallaciousness, typical of imperialism and the reasoning of imperialism.

103. In Algeria, France is now chewing negotiation and vomiting the principle of self-determination. The war has entered its eighth year, and President De Gaulle has lost his glorious record of freedom in the wilderness of the Sahara. The provisional government of the Algerian Republic which is still determined to fight, is still ready to negotiate; the Algerian people are not prepared to surrender. To France, it is, therefore, suicide to continue this colonial war; and it is most brutal not to cease the brutalities of the war. Even on All Saints' Day, last week, a day which is sacred in France, the French shot down no less than a hundred Algerians and wounded many hundreds—all defenceless, weaponless and innocent, men and women alike, with no discrimination. What would France have done if the occasion had been an All Devils' Day instead of an All Saints' Day? On the calendar of this war, every day is a devil's day for France and a saint's day for Algeria. France is fighting to maintain domination, and Algeria is fighting to achieve liberation. This is enough to disgrace imperialism and all those who support imperialism.

Mr. Padilla Nervo (Mexico), Vice-President, took the Chair.

104. Next door to Algeria is Bizerta, where France is maintaining a military base against the will of a State which is a Member of the United Nations—fully independent and fully sovereign. This is naked colonialism and imperialism, capsuled in a military base. France claims that it maintains Bizerta as a naval base to defend France and the free world. I simply say that this is a baseless base. There is nothing to show that there is a legitimate right for France to have a naval base on the territory of another State and against the wish of its people. You cannot maintain a military base in Tunisia against the determined opposition of Tunisia. President Bourguiba of Tunisia—and I speak within earshot of President Mongi Slim—has gallantly demanded of France simply to get out of Bizerta, to

get out of his territory and his homeland. Tunisia does not wish to become a battlefield in either a cold or a shooting war. Tunisia is neither a satellite nor a vassal of France. Let France defend France, but from France. Let President De Gaulle defend France from Europe, if you please, but not from Africa—from Marseilles, and not from Bizerta. If war is to take place—which God forbid—why should Bizerta be a target, why should Tunisia be a battlefield and, indeed, why should the whole continent of Africa be a graveyard?

105. In South Africa a whole people is persecuted. Racial discrimination is the declared policy of the Government of the Union of South Africa. I am afraid that this is no Government, no union and not Africa. I say that with all due respect. It is a Government, but for the white to rule the black; it is a union, but of discrimination and persecution. It is not African, for Africa can never be a party to such a disgrace, whether based on religion or race. Portugal has resisted no less than fifteen resolutions passed by the General Assembly; and with the sole exception of Israel among the Members of the United Nations, no other State has had a similar record of defiance, of resistance to the wishes of the international community as embodied in resolutions adopted by the United Nations. The situation in South Africa is most appalling. Not only is it deplorable; it has become humanly intolerable. Recently South Africa has been declared a Republic—but a republic without the backing of the public and, indeed, a republic to torture, torment and persecute its public. Numerous resolutions adopted against South Africa have proved to be fruitless, and it is high time to unseat South Africa in the United Nations. This is the only sanction which will eradicate racial discrimination and uproot persecution from the soil of Africa. Perhaps a Government in exile can be set up to represent the people of South Africa, to regain their independence and to rejoin the United Nations. It would be an historic day for the United Nations and a moment of rejoicing for all mankind.

106. Turning to Asia, we find ourselves confronted with the problem of the fringes of the Arabian Peninsula. To keep their hold, the British, in their most recent strategy, have set up an "oil wall" around this ancient cradle of the Arab people. From Aden, on the Red Sea, to the southern territories of Yemen and to the coasts of Oman, a steel curtain has been erected by the British, with military bases scattered here and there. Liberation wars in the area are now in full swing, and the acts of repression by the British are in full swing too. Scarcely a day passes without fighting, without bombing from the air and without destruction of open towns and defenceless villages. The story of British aggression against the people of Oman is too well known to be related in detail at this time. In 1957, the question was brought before the Security Council under the fire of British jet fighters as it were. Last year, the item was brought to the General Assembly in a train of British tanks and artillery, so to speak. The problem will be discussed in due time. But this very week, let me state, when the United Kingdom delegation was talking of disarmament in the First Committee and talking of human rights or the principle of self-determination in other Committees, British armies were wreaking havoc and destruction on the people of Oman. The official information received most recently has revealed the landing of new British troops, new military raids,

new imprisonments of Omani leaders and, what is most tragic, the imposition of a curfew on the people of Oman in their homeland by the British authorities.

107. I wonder on what authority the British are in Oman; I would be grateful if the representative of the United Kingdom would come to this rostrum and tell the Assembly on what authority the British are in Oman. Their very presence, let alone their military aggression, is a violation of the provisions of the Charter and of their obligations as a permanent member of the Security Council. What authority entitles them to impose a curfew on a territory which they do not possess, and on a people not their own? If any curfew is to be imposed, it should be imposed on the British armed forces, a curfew forbidding them ever to leave the United Kingdom, a curfew now and forever, so that the people of Oman, as well as the rest of the world, may have peace and tranquillity forever. This is the curfew which the United Kingdom can impose, a curfew to retain its forces in the British Isles and never to permit them to leave. Then the people of Oman, as well as the peoples of Africa and Asia can remain at peace in their own country. This is the curfew which the United Kingdom should impose, upon its own forces but not upon the people of Oman.

108. With regard to West Irian, at this present session the Netherlands is attempting to maintain colonialism under the guise of decolonization. Last year, the Netherlands abstained from voting on the resolution containing the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples; at this session the Netherlands rests its case on the very resolution on which it previously abstained, and it has now presented to the Assembly a draft resolution [A/L.354] based on that resolution. This in itself is most revealing and is an indication of the purpose behind the draft resolution now presented by the Netherlands, as was also the statement this afternoon by the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands in speaking of "Netherlands New Guinea". I wonder how it is that it belongs to the Netherlands and the Netherlands is anxious to grant it independence?

109. The substance of the draft resolution is more devastating than its terms. It calls for investigation into the conditions in the Territory; it refers to a plebiscite and a United Nations Trusteeship. Such measures are not acceptable. They run counter to the resolution of the General Assembly on the basis of which the measures are invoked. Independence is no substitute for unity or territorial integrity. Self-determination can by no means mean self-termination, and should not be interpreted as such. West Irian is part and parcel of Indonesia, and no plebiscite is admissible in such a case. To the Netherlands, the idea of a plebiscite for West Irian is acceptable because West Irian is not its country. It is easy to speak of a plebiscite when the territory involved is not one's own country. Would the Netherlands agree to a plebiscite with regard to a province within the Netherlands, a province which is part and parcel of the Netherlands? That explains why Indonesia does not accept the proposal, for how can anyone accept the partition of his homeland and the disunity of his people?

110. Instead of concocting such an elaborate, intricate and unacceptable plan, the Netherlands would do better to negotiate with Indonesia on the matter of handing over the child to its mother. The United Na-

tions is no mother to those who already have a mother prepared to care, to love, and to sacrifice. By such a means the Netherlands would gain the friendship not only of the great Indonesian people, under the leadership of their distinguished President, but would also gain the respect and friendship of all the peoples of Asia and Africa.

111. Finally, I come to another aspect of colonialism. I mean Zionism in its ugliest form and manifestation. And here I beg to assure the Assembly that I shall not speak from the passions of an Arab or the emotions of a refugee, I shall not speak words of my own; I shall not spell out my own ideas or reiterate my own statements. I shall let the Zionist leaders speak in their own words and from their own ideas.

112. In his inaugural speech at the Zionist Congress held in London in 1900, Theodore Herzl, the father of Zionism, said: "English, with her eyes roaming over all the seas, will understand us and our aims." He was addressing his words to England, at that time the greatest of the imperialist countries.

113. On 18 May 1901, Herzl, in his first interview with the Ottoman Sultan, offered £1,600,000 to secure a charter for Jewish colonization in Palestine. The Sultan, a sovereign of great integrity, rejected the offer and refused the bribe in these noble words:

"Advise Dr. Herzl to take no further steps in this matter. I cannot alienate a single square foot of land, for it is not mine, but my people's. My people fought for their land, the Holy Land Palestine, and fertilized it with their blood. Let the Jews keep their millions. If my empire is dismembered they will perhaps receive Palestine gratis, but it must be our corpses which will be cut up. I cannot agree to vivisection."

114. On 27 October 1902, the same Herzl interviewed the British Colonial Secretary, Joseph Chamberlain, asking him to allow Jewish colonization in Cyprus. Not in Palestine this time, but in Cyprus—just because the whole idea is one of imperialism anywhere. But the British Minister refused the idea. The next day Herzl met with Lord Lansdowne, the Foreign Secretary, and proposed Jewish colonization in the Sinai Peninsula. Herzl went to Cairo to negotiate with Lord Cromer,^{5/} but the Egyptian Government rejected this scheme completely. In fact, Lord Shaftesbury of Great Britain had proposed as far back as 1840—and this is a very interesting point for our friends from Asia and Africa—a scheme for Jewish colonization as a means of utilizing the "wealth of the Jewish people" for the economic development of backward areas. On a later occasion, Lord Lansdowne offered the Zionists a tract of land in the highlands of British East Africa. I repeat, British East Africa.

115. On 8 February 1920, referring to the future success of Zionism, Mr. Churchill—the greatest, or the last, architect of the British Empire—said the following:

"If, in our lifetime, be created, by the banks of the Jordan, a Jewish State, under the protection of the British Crown, which might comprise three or four millions of Jews, an event will have occurred which would be especially in harmony with the truest interests of the British Empire."

That is to say, the truest British interests in that area.

116. In fact, the Encyclopaedia Britannica, in its latest edition, has linked Jewish colonization in

^{5/} British agent and Consul-General, adviser to the Khedive Tewfik.

Palestine with "the permanent security of the approaches to the Suez Canal". As a matter of historic record, the Zionist movement, which is nothing but imperialism and colonialism, has appealed to all major Powers with one language—the language of colonialism. To each Power it has spoken one and the same language.

117. To the United States, Zionism was explained as a movement of development to drain marshes, to irrigate the desert and to bring progress to the whole area. And, let it be noted, these are the very same arguments of colonialism in its march in Africa and in Asia.

118. To Great Britain, the Zionist movement was advocated as a movement "to defend the Suez Canal and the route to India".

119. To France, the Zionist movement was explained in most exciting and interesting terms—and this is the Zionist plan:

"The country we propose to occupy shall include lower Egypt, southern Syria and southern Lebanon. This position ... will render us ... masters of the commerce of India, Arabia and South and East Africa ... France cannot but desire to see the road to India and China occupied by a people that will follow her to the death ... What people could be more suited to this purpose than the Jews, who were from the beginning of history destined for the same aim? Frenchmen and Jew, there is no doubt that they were created for one another."

120. To Germany, the Zionist leaders advanced their programme in the following terms:

"We wish to establish, on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, a modern culture and commercial centre which will be both directly and indirectly a prop of Germanism. Palestine, by Jewish immigration, could become a political and commercial base, a German-Turkish Gibraltar on the frontiers of the Anglo-Arab Ocean."

121. To the Soviet Union, and as recently as 1944, Ben Horin, a well-known Israeli leader, spoke in the following terms:

"By (encouraging Jewish immigration) Soviet Russia might not only gain the everlasting gratitude of many Jewish groups throughout the world ... but would also create for itself an excellent position in the Middle East."

122. Thus it will be seen how the Zionist movement has explained its motives, once to France, once to the United States, once to the United Kingdom, once to Germany and, lastly, to the Soviet Union. Thus Zionism has moved from one lap into another as an imperialist movement. It has appealed to all. But it was the British who, on 2 November 1917, in an attempt to gain the support of Zionism in its war effort of the First World War, communicated—to whom? To Rothschild, one of the greatest pillars of colonization—a declaration to facilitate Jewish colonization in the Holy Land. Immediately after the First World War, against the will of the native people and at the point of British bayonets, Jewish colonization started.

123. As a result some 700,000 Jewish colonizers have been admitted to the country. Zionism has established two institutions, known as the Keren Kayemet and Keren Baysod, to finance colonization, just like many financing institutions in Algeria established by

France, and just like many financing institutions in the Congo established by the Belgians. The result, as testified by Sir John Simpson, the official expert of the United Kingdom, was that many thousands and thousands of native peasants became landless. They became landless as the result of this Jewish colonization. Later, with the emergence of Israel and through terror and atrocities, 1,200,000 Arabs—Moslem and Christian—were made landless. In fact they were made not only landless, but also homeless. They became refugees and have now been living in exile for the last fourteen years.

124. This is Zionism as revealed by its authors, by its supporters and by its achievements. Zionism has brought about the partition of Palestine and the expulsion of its people—the two greatest evils the Holy Land has ever experienced in its long history.

125. But what is amazing is that such a movement of imperialism should have its headquarters in the United States—the United States, the greatest and the first rebel against colonialism and imperialism, the United States with its glorious record of anti-colonialism. Zionism is housed and financed in the United States. The United States seems to be at the present moment a stock-market for Zionist bonds and the like. Whether they like it or not, this is imperialism on behalf of the United States. The reason is quite simple. To aid and abet Zionism is nothing but imperialism in its most obnoxious form and its most ugly manifestation. Peace-loving peoples, and indeed all fighters for freedom, are entitled to ask the United States to outlaw Zionism and to ban its activity, if the United States is anxious to regain its record of anti-colonialism.

126. But exposing colonialism is one thing and achieving liberation is another. The fifteenth session was one of declaration. We must make this session one of action, and the proposal of the Soviet Union to establish a commission to supervise implementation is to be welcomed as the starting point of action. We wholeheartedly support the establishment of a United Nations commission to put teeth into the resolution on decolonization. But we have certain reservations to make on the draft resolution of the Soviet Union [A/L.355]. The Soviet Union is proposing a representation of the "three main groups". That is the term used in the draft resolution of the Soviet Union. It is proposing three main groups to be represented in that commission. We do not favour such an approach for this particular question. Those engaged in colonialism directly or indirectly must be excluded from the commission. A convict cannot be a judge, nor can a perpetrator be a prosecutor. Otherwise the trial would be ridiculous and the prosecution a mockery. With a commission excluding imperialists and their collaborators, the stage would be set for clean action and genuine implementation.

127. It is our prayer that the commission would be able to report progress. We wish the commission well for the success of its mission. No other commission in the United Nations has been entrusted with such a noble mission: to emancipate man and free his freedom. We trust the commission would be able to report total and complete decolonization, so that we can close this bloody chapter of colonialism and begin a rehabilitation of the history of mankind.

128. On the count of unity, we hope the commission would be able to report the unity of Katanga with the

Congo, of West Irian with Indonesia, and of the southern fringes of the Arab peninsula with Yemen.

129. On the count of independence, we hope the commission would report the independence of Algeria, Angola, Oman and South Africa.

130. And last, on the counts of both unity and independence, we hope the commission would be able to report the unity and independence of Palestine, for its legitimate citizens, Moslems, Christians and Jews alike, without any discrimination whatsoever. It may be said that this will really be the end of Israel. That is quite true, but there can be no doubt that that end would promote peace for Palestine and stability for the whole world.

Mr. Sliza (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.

131. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Before passing on to the second item on our agenda I shall call on four speakers who wish to exercise their right of reply.

132. Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): I do not wish to delay the Assembly from passing on to deal with the next important business which we have before us today but some of the remarks which we have just heard from the speaker who has preceded me here at this rostrum were so disgracefully wide of the truth that they cannot be allowed to remain unanswered.

133. The representative of Saudi Arabia speaks with a fervour and a passion which I cannot hope to match. He also speaks with a lack of regard for the facts, which I have no desire to emulate. He saw fit to make certain observations about the policies and the actions of the United Kingdom Government, in particular in relation to the territory of the Sultanate of Muscat and Oman. It is very much to be regretted that the representative of Saudi Arabia should once again have chosen to make these extraordinary allegations. My delegation rejects them utterly and we shall demonstrate their total falsity when we come to debate the relevant item in the Special Political Committee. But for the present I think it is sufficient for me to refer to one short passage from the speech of the representative of Saudi Arabia and refute it directly. May I just remind the Assembly what the representative said at one stage. He said:

"But this very week ... when the United Kingdom delegation was talking of disarmament in the First Committee ... British armies were wreaking havoc and destruction on the people of Oman."

He went on to say: "The official information received most recently has revealed the landing of new British troops ..."

134. There is not one word of truth in that. There are no British forces whatever stationed in this area. The representative went on to say that he would be grateful if the representative of the United Kingdom would stand here at this rostrum, as I am doing now, and state why these things are so and state why they impose a curfew on the people of Oman. They do not. They do not in any form or shape, and I deny and reject it absolutely. That I think is far better than the explanation for which the representative asked. These are the facts. I will not dwell on them. They are there, and available for proof for any who wish to see.

135. I would only refer to one other aspect. The tone and the tenor of the speech to which we have just

listened has in fact been an assault on the colonial record of my country and it is an assault which I reject. I hope to have the opportunity during the next few days of reminding the General Assembly of the real British colonial record, a record of which I am proud—a record which has brought over 600 million people to full self-government during the last fifteen years, the proof of which may be seen by anyone standing at this rostrum, here in this Assembly.

136. These are facts. I do not wish, I do not need, to go into polemics over this. I prefer to rely on facts and I am content, and the British delegation is content, to be judged on those facts. I wish to say no more at this stage. I shall hope to return, as I have said, when I have the opportunity of addressing the Assembly fully on this subject.

137. Mr. COMAY (Israel): Since the representative of Saudi Arabia is quite capable of making an anti-Israel speech on any one of the nine items on the Assembly's agenda, my delegation would have to take up far too much of the Assembly's valuable time if we had to expose every false statement and every fabricated quotation that the Assembly has to hear from him. I shall therefore merely say that the alleged history of Zionism we have heard from him today is a lot of wild nonsense. Zionism was the national liberation movement of the Jewish people. It led to our regaining our independence in our ancient homeland, after the struggle against Great Britain and against the Arab armies that invaded our country and tried unsuccessfully to wipe out our State. Israel is a permanent member of the world community and a permanent feature of the Middle East landscape. Whether the representative of Saudi Arabia likes that fact or not is of no great importance.

138. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands): I wish to make only one point, and that is this: the representative of Saudi Arabia has rejected the proposals which the Netherlands has made in respect of New Guinea. That, of course, is his right, although it is regrettable. But he has rejected them for a reason based on what he called a fact, which is not true. That is not his right, and is much more regrettable. The reason why he rejected our proposals was that he said that we were hypocritical. And why were we hypocritical? Because, he said, last year when the resolution on decolonization was debated and voted on in the Assembly, the Netherlands abstained, and now, suddenly, this year it accepts the resolution. The representative of Saudi Arabia made great play with this argument. He repeated it several times with gestures and with emphasis of voice. He said that last year, we abstained, and now we accept it.

139. When one makes accusations like that, it is generally advisable to take the precaution to make sure of one's facts. If the representative of Saudi Arabia had taken the trouble to look up the records of the fifteenth session where the roll-call voting on that resolution is recorded, he would have seen that the Netherlands did not abstain, but voted in favour of it. Since his whole argument about hypocrisy, and all the drama that he built up about it, was based on this so-called fact, now that the fact proves to be untrue, the whole fabric collapses.

140. The representative of Saudi Arabia saw fit to finish by giving us what he called some good advice. He said that what we should do is to hand over New Guinea to Indonesia. Well, I can assure him that we

will do that, but we will only do that if the Papuan population of New Guinea expresses its wish that we should do so. So long as they have not done that, we will not follow the advice that has been given to us by the representative of Saudi Arabia.

141. Mr. WIRJOPRANOTO (Indonesia): On behalf of our delegation I want to express our thanks to the President for giving me the opportunity to exercise the right of reply.

142. When the Indonesian delegation listened to the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, we had the intention to remain silent because tomorrow the chairman of our delegation would have full opportunity to make clear our position. But today, by keeping silent, this attitude might be wrongly interpreted as being in agreement with the Netherlands position; and we do not agree with the position of the Netherlands.

143. We regret very much that the Netherlands is still not ready to recognize our position, that is, that Irian Barat—West New Guinea—is a part of Indonesia—the former Netherlands Indies, because before the war we had only one Administration and one Governor-General ruling in Indonesia.

144. At this juncture I am not going to elaborate on many points, but there is one point we cannot pass over, and that is in connexion with the concluding part of the speech of the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands. If the President will allow me, I should like to quote it:

"What is important now, and of paramount importance, is the future of Netherlands New Guinea." I should like to say parenthetically that Netherlands New Guinea, for us, does not exist. For us, there is only Indonesian New Guinea. I continue to quote: "On that future no one except the Papuans themselves are entitled to decide. To let them decide for themselves is the only method compatible with the principles of the Charter. It is *inter alia* also the only way to achieve a peaceful and durable settlement."

145. My first remark about this statement is that the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands made a mistake, in fact, a big mistake, by calling the people in West Irian "Papuans". The name "Papuans" is not popular, it is even insulting. What does Papuan mean? Papuan means a people without civilization.

146. We never call our brothers and sisters in West Irian Papuans. But for 350 years before the war and for sixteen years since the war, the Dutch have been calling our brothers and sisters Papuans; they are still calling them Papuans: people without civilization. That I cannot accept. It is a great mistake.

147. There is something more. The people whom the Netherlands call Papuans are our brothers and sisters from Irian. We all belong to the same nation: the Indonesian nation. For many years we have recognized only one nation: the Indonesian nation. There is only one country: Indonesia. There is only one language: the Indonesian language. There is only one flag: the red and white flag.

148. I would remind the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands of a word that was popular before the war and before our proclamation of independence. The Netherlands called the natives of Indonesia, those who were born in Indonesia, "inlanders". That is a Dutch word; it means "natives". Everyone knows the Nether-

lands delegation knows that we disliked the word "inlander" because we regarded it as an insult. It is an insult to our nation, which had a population of about 70 million before the war and now has a population of 90 million, to call our people "inlanders". We are not able to accept that.

149. But the Netherlands has forgotten one thing. On 17 August 1945 these same inlanders became a different people. We proclaimed our independence. This means that on that date the whole nation, the whole archipelago, "s'est levé en masse"—as the French say—against the rule of the Netherlands colonialists.

150. Like all of us from other islands, our brothers and sisters from Irian are one. We are one because in the past we had the same fate; we suffered; we were exploited. Now we are free. But our brothers and sisters in Irian are not yet free.

151. Without prejudice to our stand on our proclamation of independence, I should like to refer further to the statement of the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands. He said, in effect, that the Papuans, as he calls them—and I would ask my brothers and sisters from Irian to excuse me for using that word, but it was used by the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands—are entitled to decide. That is clear; it is very clear.

152. In our delegation we have people from Irian. If I am not mistaken, there are members of the Netherlands delegation from Irian—the same brothers and sisters. I should like to put one question to the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, through the President. Would he give permission for the members of his delegation from Irian to have a rendezvous with the members of our delegation from Irian? This question that I am putting to the Netherlands Foreign Minister is a very important one, because it relates to the statement which he has made. For our part, we give our members from Irian 100 per cent freedom to have a rendezvous with their brothers from Irian anywhere, at any time, without any conditions. May I expect that the same position will be held by the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands? I have asked a categorical question. May I have a categorical answer? I have asked a simple question. May I expect a simple answer?

153. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) (from the floor): We should like to speak in exercise of our right of reply.

154. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I should prefer it if the other delegations wishing to exercise their right of reply would wait until later to do so, so that the Assembly may now begin consideration of the second item on its agenda.

AGENDA ITEMS 73 AND 72

Continuation of suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and obligation of states to refrain from their renewal (continued)*

The urgent need for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective international control (continued)*

**REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (PART III)
(A/4942/ADD.2)**

In accordance with rule 68 of the Rules of Procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the First Committee.

*Resumed from the 1047th meeting.

155. Mr. ENCKELL (Finland), Rapporteur of the First Committee: This report [A/4942/Add.2] deals specifically with one draft resolution, the adoption of which the Committee has decided to recommend to the General Assembly before it has completed consideration of the two items now before it. After having been debated in the First Committee, partly together with a resolution presented to the General Assembly in part II of the Committee's report, and partly at a two subsequent meetings, this draft resolution, dealing with the urgent need for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective international control, was adopted on 6 November 1961 by the Committee, as presented by the sponsors and after a number of separate votes which left its texts unchanged. I have the honour to recommend for adoption by the General Assembly the draft resolution contained in this report.

156. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Nuclear testing, as regards the aspect of its scientific yield in improving the effectiveness of the destructive potential of the nuclear weapon, is a part of war preparations and, as such, falls within the scope of national security, of the balance of power, and of questions of defence. It may thus be considered, from this aspect, as being primarily a concern of the nuclear Powers, and the power blocs from both sides. But there is another aspect, the aspect of the radio-active fall-out from the explosion itself, which is quite irrespective of the scientific results of the explosion. It is a matter which is connected with the fact of the explosion itself which causes actual harm to human life and health in every part of the globe. This is a matter of primary concern, a grave concern, for humanity as a whole, and consequently not the primary concern of the nuclear Powers only. Every country and every people, whether large or small, and every individual in any such country, is concerned with this matter. In this sense, my delegation has taken a great interest in this item, and we have thus supported every measure tending to put an end to nuclear tests, in an effort within our small power to save present and future generations from the irreparable harm that nuclear tests will work on humanity.

157. That there is such harm, and it is a reality, has been established by ample scientific evidence, both from eminent scientists in the United States and equally eminent scientists in the Soviet Union and forty-two other countries. The draft resolution, submitted by the First Committee in its report [A/4942/Add.2] and now before us, is the third to come before the Assembly in connexion with nuclear tests; and it is the second in respect of arresting all tests and the threat to humanity from this great evil. This week we have had the moratorium resolution [1648 (XV)] which was adopted by a great majority, mainly of non-aligned nations, but the nuclear Powers and their respective allies from both sides voted against the moratorium, and this was not a very hopeful sign as to the anticipated results from it. Moreover, we have clear statements from the Soviet Union that its national security cannot allow it to stop its testing; we have a parallel statement from the United States that it is preparing to resume tests; and the counter-statement from the Soviet Union that if the United States resumes tests it will start a new series of tests. Therefore, we are faced with a situation where we are heading into not merely an arms race, but a nuclear test race, with all that this involves in catastrophic effect upon humanity. The matter is very

serious, because the danger from nuclear tests is not, in itself, a deterrent to a nuclear war. It is a silent means of destroying, sapping and undermining human health, and bringing catastrophe without this being understood or realized. In this sense it is more dangerous, and every nation that is really concerned about the future of humanity—and is not engrossed in matters of cold war—will realize that something will have to be done to stop this great danger.

158. Now we have before us another draft resolution for the renewal of negotiations on a treaty. A treaty is no doubt more important than a moratorium, in the sense that it is more satisfactory, as providing for legally binding effect, and also for controls, but a resolution calling for a treaty is not a treaty itself. It depends, again, on the will of the proposed signatories and participants in the negotiations whether there will be negotiations at all, and whether these negotiations will reach a successful conclusion; and in this sense we have supported strongly the proposal for a moratorium: even if there was going to be a treaty, a moratorium would be necessary to cover the period until that treaty came into effect. But what are the prospects for this treaty? On the merit of the treaty itself, the prospects should have been good because first of all we had at various times—at very different times—statements both from the representatives of the Soviet Union and of the United States that a treaty banning nuclear testing could easily be concluded.

159. The United States recently declared in the First Committee [1171st meeting] that thirty days would be sufficient to achieve signature of such a treaty. Furthermore, we have it as a fact that seventeen out of twenty-four articles of the draft treaty [A/4772] and two out of the three annexes to it, have been accepted; and the remaining difficulties, we were told, were not great. But, in fact, these negotiations^{6/} started in 1958 in Geneva, and they have been continued for about three years. We are not aware of the various details—we could not be appraised of them from what we saw in the Press and certain books—but we feel that three years was an unduly protracted time for preparing a treaty.

160. It seems to us that there was not sufficient pliability on either side, and there were requirements which were not absolutely necessary. If workably adequate control is possible, it is neither necessary nor wise to strive for the ideally perfect control. Nothing is ideally perfect in this world, and control cannot be an absolutely perfect guarantee. Therefore, to strive for perfection is to seek the unattainable and to end in failure. The negotiations should be resumed, if they are resumed at all, in a spirit of co-operation to the point of giving way in order to attain a good agreement, without necessarily having a perfect agreement. In this sense, if the negotiations are resumed, agreement could be reached soon. But I am afraid that the three years that have been taken have in the meanwhile created certain conditions which have not brought nearer the end of the negotiations. We would appeal to both sides, if they are to resume negotiations, to work for an agreement, even if it is not a perfect agreement.

161. The situation that we are now faced with is this: we have a statement from the Soviet Union that it will

not enter into negotiations. In that case, even the hope that we had of having an agreement reached is again frustrated. And what will happen? The moratorium is thrown out by both sides. The proposal for a new treaty may be thrown out again. Therefore, we are where we started. We have discussed this item for a certain length of time, we close the item, we go to bed—but the tests go on in the same way, and the threat to humanity continues. What can we do when the whole item is closed? Nothing. I think that we could do a lot of things if we knew that the negotiations would continue—and I have already suggested that all the non-committed countries could work toward achieving an end to these tests.

162. Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution requests the negotiating States to report to the United Nations Disarmament Commission by 1 March 1962 on the progress of their negotiations. It thus fixes a date beyond the ending of this session of the Assembly and we shall not know in the meantime what the results are. This paragraph does not speak of the "results" of the negotiations; it speaks of the "progress" of the negotiations. We believe that the General Assembly is entitled to know, before this session closes, what progress there has been in these negotiations. Perhaps there will be a little progress—and we should be very glad to hear of that little progress—and perhaps there will be no progress at all. If there is no progress, it is necessary that the General Assembly should know that, in order to see what other steps can be taken.

163. My delegation has therefore proposed an amendment [A/L.363] which I now formally introduce: that the date 14 December 1961 be substituted for the date 1 March 1962. That will allow one week before the closing of the session of the General Assembly.

164. I had suggested this in the First Committee, but my suggestion did not meet with an immediate response from the sponsors. On the contrary, the closure of the debate came before we could do anything. I therefore thought it best to put this amendment before the General Assembly, in the hope that the Assembly would see the amendment in the light of the interests of humanity and would vote for it.

165. Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): I do not wish to detain the Assembly for more than a moment or two in regard to this matter. I should like to say that I have listened with great interest to the speech of the representative of Cyprus and to the reasons he adduced for the amendment which he has now moved to this draft resolution. I should like to say to him that I was impressed by the force of some of the arguments that he used in this regard. I would also say to him that both the United Kingdom delegation and our co-sponsor of the draft resolution in the First Committee, the United States delegation, had given careful thought to this matter from the moment that we knew that the representative of Cyprus wished to bring it forward. Unfortunately, it was impossible for a procedural reason for this to come forward in Committee. But I would say to the representative of Cyprus, on behalf of the United Kingdom delegation and our co-sponsor, that we welcome this amendment, which we believe strengthens the draft resolution before us, and that we hope the Assembly will accept the amendment in that light and in that spirit.

166. It is our desire to make rapid progress in this field. I do not want to dwell on matters which we have discussed at some length; indeed, it would be im-

^{6/} Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests, opened on 31 October 1958.

proper for me to do so on this occasion. There are only two points that I would like to touch on.

167. First, on the last occasion when we were discussing this matter here, the representative of the Soviet Union made a particular point of the number of explosions that there had been prior to the starting of the new Soviet series on 1 September 1961, and he told us of these numbers. I should just like to mention another figure which has relevance to this: that the total fission yield of all the tests of all the countries that had tested up until 1 September of this year was about 90 megatons. In the series of more than thirty explosions that the Soviet Union has carried out since that date, including one of more than 50 megatons and another of more than 30 megatons, the total force of the explosions—just in the last eight weeks—is a very large proportion of the previous total. That gives some indication of the urgency of the matter, just as it gives some indication of the deplorable scale of the tests carried out by the Soviet Union.

168. This, I think, completely refutes the argument which the representative of the Soviet Union was using to justify this recent series. That series is unjustifiable by any standards. We wish to bring about conditions, as soon as possible, under which this can be stopped—and stopped effectively, under international control. It is for these reasons that we are urging adoption of this resolution.

169. I should like to turn to one other point which was raised in particular in regard to the voting in Committee, when one or two representatives expressed their concern about the inclusion of sub-paragraph (b) and (c) in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee [A/4942/Add.2]. It was suggested that these went into too great detail and that therefore they should be deleted. On this, I will only say that we believe it right that, in passing a resolution about resumption of treaty negotiations to ban all nuclear weapons tests, the Assembly, while avoiding involving itself in the details of control or the detailed clauses of a treaty, should express its views on the absolute minimum of essential principles—principles, not details—which must govern any treaty if that treaty is to be a reality and not a sham.

170. These minimum principles are basically as set out in these two sub-paragraphs. I do not wish to go into detail in regard to them. I think they are clear in themselves. But I would emphasize that they are basic to the principles of any treaty which provides for effective international control and inspection. Therefore, I hope that this will explain the reason for the inclusion of these two sub-paragraphs in this draft resolution.

171. It is our desire that this draft resolution should be adopted and that this will bring about the resumption of the negotiations which I hope would come to a speedy conclusion. It is certainly our desire that this should be so, and it is the desire, I am quite certain, of our co-sponsor, the United States. It is, after all, only with the greatest reluctance that my Government has allowed Soviet actions over the last two months to force us to consider the possibility of resuming tests. It would give us the greatest pleasure, indeed, to abandon such thoughts immediately on the conclusion of a treaty providing for those essential safeguards. It is therefore for this reason also, that we welcome the amendment, which seeks to give a greater sense of urgency to the draft resolution. I hope very

much that the draft resolution will commend itself to the Assembly.

172. Mr. OKAZAKI (Japan): In explaining very briefly its vote on the draft resolution now before us, my delegation wishes to assert once again to the General Assembly our consistent opposition to any nuclear weapons tests, anywhere and at any time.

173. During the debate in the First Committee, the representative of the Soviet Union attempted more than once to cast doubt on the sincerity and consistency of my Government regarding the question of nuclear weapons tests. The most recent of these attempts was made on 6 November 1961. The representative of the Soviet Union alleged that Mr. Ohira, Chief Secretary of the Cabinet of Japan, had stated that he understood the United States position regarding the resumption of tests in the atmosphere. He also said that the Japanese Government had agreed to a certain extent on the resumption of United States atmospheric tests. Needless to say, this is an unwarranted distortion of the position of my Government. The Government of Japan has continually expressed its categorical opposition to any nuclear weapons tests, by whatever country they might be carried out. This position of my Government does remain unchanged.

174. I have already stressed in the First Committee [1181st meeting] the necessity for the United Nations to maintain the consistency of its position at this time of crisis. I pointed out with particular emphasis the responsibility of this Assembly for the success of the Geneva Conference,^{2/} indicating the fact that the Conference was a hard-earned product of the joint efforts of the United Nations as a whole.

175. My delegation is not unaware of the fact that the prospects for the resumption of the Geneva Conference are not too bright. However, we are of the view that if the Conference is in difficulty, we should do more than just express our hope for its success. We should act in order to help the Conference to overcome this crisis.

176. In this connexion, I should like to point out that the few basic principles embodied in the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee [A/4942/Add.2] now before us, namely the avoidance of self-inspection, the denial of a veto in the day-to-day operations of the control system and the need for an impartial single administrator, would afford a sound and useful basis for future negotiations.

177. The Geneva Conference is now in recess, awaiting the outcome of the debate here in the General Assembly. If we express our hope for the success of those negotiations in the most unequivocal terms and endorse the aforementioned principles, it might be possible, even at this juncture, to revive the negotiations, get them off to a fresh start, and possibly impel them to an eventual success.

178. In this spirit, and in accordance with its basic position, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution now before us. If this draft resolution is supported by the overwhelming majority of the Assembly, it will be a clear demonstration of the consistent and unvacillating backing of the Geneva Conference by the United Nations.

179. Mr. DEAN (United States of America): Over the past few weeks we have discussed in detail the urgent

^{2/} Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests, opened at Geneva on 31 October 1958.

need for an international treaty under effective controls to ban nuclear weapons tests. I want to explain very briefly our position on the draft resolution contained in report of the First Committee [A/4942/Add.2].

180. First, it is surely significant that so many members of the Committee were of one mind on the need for a nuclear test ban treaty. Certainly it has been emphasized that a treaty to stop nuclear weapons tests is an urgent necessity and that the large majority of members of the First Committee recognize that to obtain a truly effective cessation of all nuclear tests everywhere, there must be adequate guarantees that all parties have indeed stopped testing and not, as Mr. Khrushchev is quoted as saying yesterday, "Oh yes, we stop at night and we resume in the morning".

181. Secondly, it is these guarantees which the United Kingdom and the United States desire to emphasize in the principles formulated in the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in its report. Self-inspection cannot ensure adequately that all nuclear tests have stopped. Neither can a veto over the daily executive and administrative operations of the Control System established under the treaty. The control machinery should, of course, be subject to the policy directive of a representative body of members parties to the treaty. The use of the system established under the treaty should be strictly limited to the control of the nuclear test ban functions, for which the system was set up. These are among the most important of the general principles which we feel should guide further negotiations for a treaty banning nuclear tests. Thirdly, and many Members of the Assembly have asked this question, let me emphasize that the United States stands ready to sign the draft nuclear test-ban treaty which the United Kingdom and the United States submitted at Geneva, together with our offers of 28 August 1961. If such a treaty were signed, nuclear weapons tests would stop immediately and there could be and would be no further testing.

182. The United States stands ready to sign such a treaty immediately or, if there is some portion of that treaty on which the Soviet Union desires to enter into fruitful negotiations, we stand ready as well to negotiate here in New York or in Geneva in order to arrive at a mutually effective and acceptable treaty, and then sign it and put it into effect at once so that further nuclear weapons tests will be banned.

183. If the Soviet Union will agree to this constructive proposal, there need be no further delay. That is why we urge the Soviet Union to begin again the negotiations for a nuclear test ban treaty which has as its objective the cessation of all nuclear weapons tests in all environments for all time.

184. The representative of Cyprus has introduced an amendment [A/L.363] to the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee, which would ask the negotiating parties to report to the Disarmament Commission some months earlier than the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee. As a sponsor of the draft resolution in the Committee, I should like to indicate that my Government welcomes the amendment of Cyprus. We hope that it will be adopted without objection.

185. Yesterday Mr. Khrushchev was reported to have some interesting statements to the Press in Moscow.

He readily admit that atmospheric testing involves a health hazard but, as we know, this did not stop him, as the Head of the Government of the Soviet Union, from detonating the 50-megaton device and some thirty-odd other nuclear devices in the atmosphere, with all of the attendant fall-out. The Soviet Union has pressed forward with that exercise in political intimidation without any more regard for the dangers of atmospheric pollution than it has shown for the General Assembly's humanitarian appeal to refrain from exploding the 50-megaton weapon. Mr. Khrushchev is reported to have said, "We will stop nuclear tests when the other Powers stop". This is indeed an interesting statement, coming as it does after days of Soviet insistence in the First Committee that a nuclear test-ban treaty makes no sense unless it is part of a treaty on general and complete disarmament. I submit that if Mr. Khrushchev really wants to stop nuclear weapons tests, why does he not sign the treaty or direct his negotiators to sit down at once at the conference table to work out effective nuclear controls so that all tests can stop?

186. Finally, Mr. Khrushchev stated that the Soviet Union preferred atmospheric testing to underground testing because it cost less and it was more efficient. In this connexion, the United States has been willing to encounter delay, to spend more and to cope with the difficulties of underground testing, because of its regard for human life and the widely-held fears of atmospheric fall-out. But the Soviet Union, which had no reason to resume these nuclear tests because it could have had this treaty at any time and could have avoided this atmospheric testing if it had wished to do so, seems to pay no attention to the reactions of this Assembly or to the health of the outside world.

187. I would ask the Members of this Assembly to contrast the position of the two negotiating parties in this serious matter. I should therefore like to state that my Government believes that it is urgent and important that the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee be adopted, and we call upon all Members to lend their support to an effectively-controlled international agreement banning nuclear weapons tests in all environments for all time.

188. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (translated from French): I asked for the floor in order to explain my delegation's vote, and I thank you, Mr. President, for giving it to me.

189. A few moments before the vote was taken on the draft resolution contained in the report [A/4942/Add.2], which has been submitted to us and on which the First Committee has voted, a number of delegations holding views identical with our own on the problem with which the draft resolution deals proposed the deletion of certain phrases or paragraphs. Those phrases related to certain ideas which we did not support, and two paragraphs referred, in connexion with the treaty for international control, to the juridical nature, the instruments and the mechanism of that control.

190. If those amendments had been made in the draft resolution, the Moroccan delegation would have voted in favour of the draft as a whole. However, as that proposal was rejected, we abstained on the phrases and the paragraphs in question which remained in the text of the draft resolution.

191. I wish to recall, however, that when the draft resolution submitted by India and amended by a number of Latin American countries was brought, first,

before the First Committee and later, after its adoption in that Committee, before the General Assembly [see A/4942/Add.1], the Moroccan delegation voted in favour of that text which does mention control, but appropriate control. We considered that we were not in a position to take a decision on a form of control which, at the present stage of negotiations and as the problem now stands, is not within the Assembly's competence; indeed, the proposal made in the draft resolution submitted to us reflects the viewpoint of one of the parties to the negotiations, a viewpoint which was rejected categorically both at Geneva^{8/} and in the course of the discussion in the First Committee. We did not consider that we should formally give our support to a proposal on which the two parties concerned have not yet reached agreement.

192. Furthermore, the General Assembly is now considering the necessity for control. We were among those who called for such control. So far as the particular form that that control should take is concerned, we consider that our delegation is unable to endorse the form of control which has been proposed and which at present reflects only one of the points of view expressed in the matter.

193. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet Delegation categorically objects to the draft resolution submitted for the General Assembly's approval by the First Committee in its report (A/4942/Add.2). This draft resolution represents an attempt to impose a separate treaty on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests, apart from general and complete disarmament. Under present circumstances when the international situation is deteriorating and the military preparations of the Western Powers are being intensified, the effective way of preventing a dangerous development of events is general and complete disarmament. The United States and its Western allies, however, instead of agreeing on general and complete disarmament, which could really bring about a radical change in the course of world events and orient them towards peace, is suggesting to the United Nations the worthless idea of ending tests without disarmament.

194. It must, however, be realized that in present circumstances, a cessation of tests without disarmament is not a practical proposition. Judge for yourselves—what is the sense of the agreement which the United States is attempting to impose and what point does it have now that the United States has opened its military machine full throttle, has intensified military preparations and is preparing to unleash war? With events taking such a dangerous turn for the cause of peace, the strenuous attempts being made by the United States to impose its proposal for the conclusion of a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests has only one meaning in putting forward such a proposal—its aim is to lull the vigilance of the peoples and divert their attention from the military preparations of the Western Powers and create the impression that the United States, in proposing to the Soviet Union a treaty on the cessation of tests, is heading not towards war but peace. To agree to such a deal with the United States would mean to delude the peoples about the true character of present developments.

195. The United States and its allies are doing everything possible to blunt the vigilance and alertness of

the peoples, to prevent the mobilization of the peace-loving forces so that the war crisis towards which the Western Powers are heading should catch the peoples unawares, so that they would have no time to take any preventive action. There is yet another feature of the current behaviour of the United States which needs to be stressed.

196. The fact is that the United States is pressing its proposal for a treaty so actively simply because in present circumstances this attitude involves no threat of a test-ban treaty being concluded. They know full well that the Soviet Union is categorically opposed to the United States proposal for concluding a treaty on the cessation of testing separately from disarmament. Furthermore, official circles of the United States have been very much aware since last December that the Soviet Government offered to settle the problem of ending nuclear weapons tests within the framework of discussion on general and complete disarmament, that is, to settle the two questions in conjunction with one another. We declared that, if such an approach to the matter were adopted, a final decision could be taken on the question of the cessation for once and for all of all kinds of nuclear weapons tests, that is, tests of all magnitudes, in any environment—underground, in the atmosphere, under water, at great heights and even in outer space. The Soviet Union will not agree at the present time to any separation of the problem of the cessation of testing from disarmament. It is, however, prepared to sign immediately a treaty on general and complete disarmament and thus achieve a radical solution of the problem of ending nuclear weapons tests. The decision lies with the United States.

197. The United States, however, has chosen another course of action. It understands, of course, that the question of the cessation of tests can be settled only by mutual agreement between both the parties in the so-called "nuclear club", that is, the Soviet Union, on the one hand and the Western Powers, on the other. The United States also knows that, in present circumstances, when the Western Powers have intensified the armaments race and their military preparations and when they threaten to launch a war, the Soviet Union is compelled to take steps to strengthen its defences and military capacities, to reinforce its security. It decided, in particular, to carry out tests of new and extremely powerful types of nuclear weapons and to take a number of other measures in reply to the intensive military preparations of the Western Powers.

198. The United States also knows that, in view of this turn of events, there is no possibility of any negotiations with the Soviet Union on a treaty concerning the cessation of nuclear weapons tests, in isolation from the problem of general and complete disarmament. And the United States itself does not believe in the possibility of concluding a treaty on the conditions on which it is insisting. Nevertheless, it has engaged in noisy propaganda in the United Nations about a treaty drafted on its own terms. This is nothing but an obviously dishonest propaganda manoeuvre on the part of the United States.

199. We cannot overlook the fact that the United States, by insisting on the conclusion of a separate treaty on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests in isolation from an agreement on general and complete disarmament, is pursuing the aim of obstructing the Soviet Union's measures for strengthening its defence

^{8/} During the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests, which met on 31 October 1958.

potential and, at the same time, trying to establish military advantages for the NATO aggressive bloc. We have more than once drawn the attention of the United Nations to these intentions of the United States. Now the United States and the United Kingdom want to involve the General Assembly in their sinister machinations, the aim of which is to undermine peace; they want the United Nations to rubber-stamp their completely one-sided proposals which are absolutely unacceptable to the Soviet Union and impossible to implement.

200. The United States clearly wants to use the United Nations in order to put pressure on the Soviet Union and get its agreement to a treaty for the cessation of tests, but without disarmament. But, if we are to deal with the problem correctly and to find the right approach to its solution, the United Nations must bring its pressure to bear on the United States and its NATO allies. Only then will a correct solution of the problem actually be found.

201. It must once again be emphasized that a treaty can be concluded only if both sides mutually desire it. There was a time when we considered that a treaty on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests could be concluded separately from an agreement on the disarmament problem, but that did not prove to be the case.

202. The United States representatives are now telling us that thirty days are sufficient for the conclusion of a treaty, yet we negotiated with them for three years and were quite unable to reach agreement. Now, however, when it has become evident that it is impossible to conclude a treaty outside the framework of general disarmament, they say thirty days is sufficient. This assertion by the United States representative is not only unfounded but is calculated solely to give the discussion of the question a demagogical character.

203. The three years of negotiations in Geneva have brought us to the present dangerous situation. It is now no longer a question of a test-ban treaty which would leave the question of disarmament on one side; it is now a question of general and complete disarmament. Only a solution of this problem can also solve the problem of ending nuclear tests.

204. In discussing this problem, we cannot disregard the generally accepted rule of international law that any bilateral or multilateral treaty—except of course one concluded between victor and vanquished, where the former dictates his will to a defeated enemy—any treaty between two parties with equal rights is concluded only where there is mutual agreement, agreement between the parties and, of course, only on conditions acceptable to both parties, conditions on which both parties have agreed. This is an elementary requirement for all negotiations on equal terms between sovereign States and may not be disregarded by anyone.

205. Here, however, we are now witnessing the disgraceful spectacle of this elementary rule of international law being grossly transgressed and of an attempt being made to foist on the Soviet Union, against its clearly expressed wish, a treaty which the United States is seeking to obtain in its own selfish interests and on its own terms, which are quite unacceptable to the Soviet Union.

206. The United States wants to impose on us, through the Assembly, a nuclear test-ban treaty separately from general and complete disarmament while, at the same time, it is refusing to conclude a treaty on

general and complete disarmament which the Soviet Union is prepared to sign immediately. A treaty on general and complete disarmament, for the conclusion of which the Soviet Union is pressing, would solve all disarmament problems and would, in addition, offer a radical solution of the problem of the cessation in perpetuity of every type of nuclear weapons tests.

207. It is, however, futile for the United States to count on success in imposing on the Soviet Union a solution that is contrary to the interests of its security, the interests of maintaining and strengthening peace. Such attempts have invariably failed in the past and will suffer an even more resounding failure to-day. At the same time, however, it is obvious that they may create still greater difficulties for the constructive work of the United Nations.

208. We consider it necessary to give a clear and quite explicit warning to the United States and its willing or unwilling allies, who have possibly been the victims of a delusion, that the Soviet Union will not agree to any negotiations on a treaty regarding the cessation of nuclear weapons tests without disarmament, outside the framework of a treaty on general and complete disarmament. But within such a framework we are prepared to discuss with you any questions you like.

209. Such is our attitude to the United Kingdom-United States proposal, which has become the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee, concerning a treaty for the cessation of nuclear weapons tests without a treaty on general and complete disarmament. Patiently and over a long period of time, we have explained to everyone why and for what reasons the United States proposal as a whole is completely unacceptable to us, but, unfortunately, many delegations here are still deaf to these most important and well-founded declarations.

210. I should now like to say a few words about the Cypriot amendment [A/L.363] to the United Kingdom-United States proposal, which is now the draft resolution of the First Committee. This amendment refers to a change in one of the dates given in the draft resolution and not only makes no improvement at all in the United Kingdom-United States draft resolution but on the contrary, makes it even more unacceptable. It is well known that the draft resolution before the General Assembly is, one might say, doomed in advance to failure and sterility; it is a still-born child. The delegations here represented know this full well and yet they are proposing to adopt it. Why? What purpose will this General Assembly decision serve? We must act in this Assembly with a sense of responsibility. Our actions should be aimed not at exacerbating relations and increasing tension, but at fostering in every possible way the search for means of achieving agreement and co-operation and of settling the problems that confront us. Unfortunately, a number of delegations are readily succumbing to persuasion designed to lead the General Assembly along an unsound, fallacious and very dangerous path. The amendment of the Cypriot delegation provides that the General Assembly would revert to a discussion of the test-ban problem and thus waste the General Assembly's time on fruitless discussions in future also. This amendment proposes that, at the very end of the session, the General Assembly should again take up this matter, which will yield no positive results. But in those circumstances what is the point of this comedy? Whose interests does it serve?

211. The United Kingdom representative has said here that action is necessary; he said, that the explosions carried out by the Soviet Union are so powerful that urgent measures of some kind must be taken to change the dangerous situation. Yes, I agree with Mr. Godber that we must act, but how? We must solve the problem of disarmament and not try to divert the attention of the United Nations General Assembly to a narrow problem which settles nothing. The problem of discontinuing tests does not offer a solution either to the problem of the armaments race or of stopping military preparations; it does not remove the threat of war. Nor will the discussion of this question result in the cessation of nuclear weapons tests. The General Assembly's efforts should be directed to solving the problem of complete and general disarmament.

212. The same can also be said of the statement by the representative of Japan. He said that we must act in order to cope with a dangerous situation but he himself supports this sterile proposal—the United Kingdom-United States draft resolution, which is designed merely to intensify the situation still further and which will not in any way solve the disarmament problem or the problem of discontinuing tests. It was a pharisaical statement.

213. The Soviet delegation would stress once again that the nuclear test-ban problem can be solved only in connexion with general and complete disarmament. Only if we follow such an approach can we be sure of adopting a resolution which can be carried into effect under present conditions and which will not be a document inspired by a desire further to envenom the international atmosphere.

214. The Soviet Government is prepared to sign immediately a treaty on general and complete disarmament and thus also settle the problem of banning tests for once and for all. The matter now rests with the United States.

215. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): There are no further speakers on my list and we shall now proceed to vote. In accordance with rule 92 of the Rules of Procedure, I shall put to the vote first the amendment [A/L.363] which Cyprus has proposed to the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee in its report [A/4942/Add.2].

The amendment was adopted by 67 votes to 11, with 16 abstentions.

216. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee [A/4942/Add.2], as amended.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America,

Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran.

Against: Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

Abstaining: Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Syria, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Finland, France, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Iraq.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 71 votes to 11, with 15 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEMS 88 AND 22

The situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (continued)

Assistance to Africa (continued):

(a) A United Nations programme for independence

217. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Before adjourning the meeting I shall call on the representative of the Netherlands who wishes very briefly to exercise his right of reply.

218. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands): I shall be extremely brief. But I felt it necessary to answer the categorical question that the representative of Indonesia has asked us this afternoon. It is to my mind a most extraordinary question, because what he asked was whether the Netherlands delegation would permit the Papuans on the delegation to speak to members of the Indonesian delegation. I must say that I do not understand the question at all because the answer is obviously "naturally". We allow anybody who is a member of our delegation to speak or to refuse to speak to anybody else, and there is no difference at all between the Netherlands members and the Papuan members. That is the only answer I can give him.

219. May I add that the Assembly will notice that I have spoken about Papuans, and I have done so deliberately. The representative of Indonesia said that that was an insulting word. It may be that in Indonesia it is an insult to call somebody a "Papuan", but I can assure him that neither in the Netherlands nor in New Guinea is it an insult. On the contrary, in New Guinea the people there are very proud of the name "Papuan" and they wish to be called Papuans and do not wish to be called anything else. Only very recently the New Guinea Council itself passed a resolution to that effect—that they wished to be called Papuans.

220. Therefore, the remarks that were made on that score just show once more how little my friend Suhardjo Wirjopranoto knows about those people whom he calls his brothers and sisters.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.