



CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

General debate (*continued*)

	Page
Speech by Mr. Kiselev (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)	1
Speech by Mr. Wachuku (Nigeria)	6
Speech by Mr. Masumbuko (Burundi)	14
Statement by the representative of Indonesia	18
Statements by the representative of India	20
Statement by the representative of Pakistan	23
Statement by the representative of Malaysia	27

President: Mr. Carlos SOSA RODRIGUEZ
(Venezuela).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (translated from Russian): This session is meeting at a time when there are real prospects for a further relaxation of international tension. The whole world breathed a sigh of relief when the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water was signed on 5 August 1963 in Moscow. This news was greeted with joy by the people of all nations. The Moscow Treaty is not only an expression of concern for the health of all mankind. It is concrete proof that co-ordinated decisions can be reached among States in the interests of universal peace; it is a victory for the policy of peaceful coexistence.

2. The alternative—war or peaceful coexistence—has become the basic problem of world politics. The choice now is either a continuance of the "cold war" and the arms race, leading ultimately to the outbreak of thermo-nuclear war, or universal recognition of the principles of peaceful coexistence and the building of an enduring peace on this basis. There is no doubt that, in this crucial period in which we are living, the desire of all peoples is for peace, not war. This being so, the United Nations must do everything possible to satisfy or, at least, to help satisfy this desire for peace. The Moscow Treaty, which has already been ratified by over 100 States, is the first step in this direction. It is gratifying to note that a direct interest in this historic event was shown by the Secretary-General of our Organization, U Thant, who was present at the signing of the Treaty in Moscow.

3. It is the urgent task of this session of the General Assembly to continue resolutely along the way shown by the Moscow Treaty. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR is glad to note that the majority of States have embarked or are embarking upon a course of peaceful coexistence and co-operation. We are proud that the

convoy of peace moving through the melting ice of the "cold war" is headed by the powerful ice-breaker of the Soviet Union.

4. The peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union, which is aimed at ensuring peaceful coexistence among States, accurately reflects the aspirations and hopes of the people. The Soviet Union, advancing the only reasonable programme for peaceful coexistence, proposes that all States should compete not in an arms race but in raising the levels of living, in the construction not of military bases and missile launching pads but of houses and schools, in the expansion not of the "cold war" but of mutually profitable trade and cultural exchanges.

5. The main task now facing all peace-loving nations is the prevention of thermo-nuclear war and the strengthening of peaceful coexistence among States with different social systems. The Byelorussian SSR, together with the other socialist countries, is adopting concrete measures for the fulfilment of this noble task.

6. The Government of socialist Byelorussia is faithful to the policy of peaceful coexistence proclaimed by the great Lenin. We realize that the existing contradictions between States cannot disappear in a day because these contradictions are not imaginary but real. We shall never repudiate our socialist ideology; we shall continue to fight for the glowing ideals of mankind—a truly free life with an abundance of material and cultural values. However, we would not dream of forcing our beliefs upon our ideological opponents. The free will of the people, and that alone, is the course along which we wish to steer the ship of history towards the shores of peace, labour, freedom, equality, brotherhood and happiness for all.

7. The preservation of universal peace is the first indispensable condition for the progress of mankind. The efforts of the Governments of all States should be directed towards preventing the outbreak of a new war and ensuring that war is forever banished from human society. The only correct and sure way to achieve this is through general and complete disarmament, a programme for which was proposed four years ago from this rostrum by the head of the Soviet Government, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev [799th meeting].^{1/} The thoughts of hundreds of millions of people are now turned towards the implementation of this programme.

8. The whole world knows that the Soviet Union is sincerely and consistently pressing for general and complete disarmament under strict international control. The corresponding agreement would have been signed long ago had it not been for the stubborn resistance of certain Western countries whose policies are still dominated by reactionary forces with a stake in the maintenance of international tension.

^{1/} Official records of the General Assembly, Fourteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 70, document A/4219.

9. Our delegation has carefully studied the report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament [A/5488], which met at intervals throughout the year at Geneva. The Committee has already held hundreds of meetings, but there is still no sign of any progress in its work. Discussions are continuing on the very roots of the disarmament problem. It can be seen from the records of the Eighteen-Nation Committee that the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom differ so widely in their approach to the basic articles of a treaty on general and complete disarmament that they have failed to reach agreement on a single one of the basic issues under discussion despite all the efforts by the socialist and neutral countries to achieve mutually acceptable solutions.

10. Unfortunately, the heaps of lethal weapons continue to grow higher at a dizzying pace. If the United Nations proves unable to halt this process, there may be a catastrophic landslide which will result in the death of hundreds of millions of people and the destruction of vast material and cultural resources. The arms race, in whatever countries and on whatever scale it is conducted, poisons the international atmosphere; introduces discord, suspicion and open hostility in relations among States; and, like a weight around the neck, drags mankind away from peace and concord into the abyss of war.

11. The disarmament problem has, as we all know, been discussed in the United Nations for seventeen years. As a participant in all eighteen sessions of the General Assembly, I must bitterly note that during this time armaments have not been reduced by a single cartridge, and military budgets have not been cut by a single dollar; on the contrary, conventional and nuclear armaments have increased to dangerous proportions, and military budgets have recently risen to unprecedented levels.

12. The representatives of many States who have spoken before me in the general debate, including the representatives of the Soviet Union, Brazil, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Burma, Romania, Libya, Cambodia and other States, have rightly devoted considerable attention to the problem of disarmament. They noted with concern that the discussion of this important problem has now been going on for many years but that there are still no positive results. They rightly pointed out that disarmament is the only alternative to the lethal warfare with nuclear missiles which is threatening mankind. Hundreds of millions of people are striving to avert war and exercise timely restraint over the rabid forces of aggression. Disarmament is not only a vital necessity but a genuinely feasible task. It has rightly been said that the path to a world without weapons is not strewn with roses and that this task can be fulfilled only by the stubborn efforts of millions of people in all countries.

13. We are glad to note that more Western leaders are speaking in favour of the idea of disarmament. We welcome the statement made here from this rostrum by the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, on the possibility of moving "up the steep and difficult path toward comprehensive disarmament" [1209th meeting]. We welcome the statements in favour of the idea of disarmament made by the representatives of other countries, and we feel that now is the time to move on from good words to good deeds.

14. An excellent opportunity for this is provided by the new proposal of the Soviet Union for convening, in

the first half of 1964, a conference of heads of Government of the States represented on the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament [1208th meeting, para. 130].

15. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR is pleased, on behalf of its Government, to support the other constructive proposals of the Soviet Union made in the General Assembly on 19 September 1963 by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. Andrei Andreevich Gromyko [*ibid.*, para. 137]. First and foremost, the Soviet Government is ready to agree that a limited number of intercontinental anti-missile and anti-aircraft missiles should remain in the hands of the Soviet Union and the United States on their own territories until the end of the third stage—that is, until the completion of the entire disarmament programme. This is a new step to meet the Western Powers and shows the sincere desire of the Soviet Union to banish thermo-nuclear war from human existence. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR is convinced that it will now be more difficult for the Western opponents of disarmament to obstruct a mutually acceptable settlement of the disarmament problem without unmasking themselves as the enemies of a practical solution to this problem.

16. Wars and the preparation for them absorb incalculable reserves of human energy and channel it, in the ultimate analysis, into death and human suffering and into the destruction of material wealth. The nations want to put an end to the arms race and achieve general and complete disarmament. The formulation of an economic programme for disarmament,^{2/} which was proposed by the Soviet Union at the last session, therefore still remains a topical question in which all States should be interested. The people must know what benefits will accrue to mankind from disarmament.

17. When the resources at present devoted to military objectives are converted to peaceful uses, mankind will in a short space of time effect gigantic reforms; it will improve living standards, accelerate economic processes in the under-developed countries, banish hunger and poverty, conquer insidious diseases and open up new prospects for technical and scientific progress.

18. Our delegation acts in the belief that the inevitability of a thermo-nuclear world war is a fiction and that the disarmament problem would be completely solved if all States allowed their conduct to be governed by the higher interests of mankind. We accordingly consider that the United Nations should devote serious attention to the practical formulation of an economic programme for general and complete disarmament. It is quite obvious that it would also be in the interests of peace to implement the Soviet Union proposals on the freezing or, better still, the reduction of military budgets.

19. On behalf of the Government of the Byelorussian SSR, I hereby state that our Republic has been and will continue to be in favour of denuclearized zones in Africa, Asia and Latin America, the Mediterranean, the regions of the Pacific Ocean, Central and Northern Europe, the Baltic and Balkan regions and other areas. Every proposal for denuclearized zones is inspired by the noble desire to help the cause of general and complete disarmament. We believe that denuclearized

^{2/} *Ibid.*, Seventeenth Session, Annexes, agenda items 33 and 94, document A/5233.

zones which have been set up in proper legal form should be guaranteed by the nuclear Powers.

20. The Byelorussian people are disturbed that there is as yet no unity in the world on the question of the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons. The United Nations has adopted a number of quite good resolutions on this subject, but events show that little can be done by resolutions alone. There has still been no repudiation of the dangerous plans for the establishment of a so-called NATO multilateral nuclear force. It is well known that these plans can set off a chain reaction. By 1970, many States will have the technical facilities for producing their own nuclear weapons. It is difficult to over-estimate the consequences for the whole world of the spread of nuclear weapons. We should not forget that, with the invention of nuclear weapons, the means of destruction have become tens of thousands of times more powerful.

21. The Byelorussian people well know the sorrow brought by war. In the Second World War, we lost 1.5 million people out of a population of 10 million and more than half of our national wealth; in almost every family there was some one who did not return from the war. This is why the Byelorussian people are firmly opposed to the arms race and to the preparation for a new world war.

22. Peace is a general and indivisible good. There can be no stable peace so long as the hotbeds of aggression, violence and injustice continue to flourish. The Byelorussian people feel mounting anxiety at the continuing militarization of the Federal Republic of Germany, which is creating an unstable situation in Europe. The famous Potsdam Agreement of 2 August 1945, which was signed by representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union, is being violated and openly flouted. These decisions were made in order to ensure that Germany would take the road of peace and international friendship. Instead of pursuing a policy of peace and friendship, one of the two German States, the Federal Republic of Germany, is preparing for aggression and openly declares non-recognition of the frontiers established by the peoples in the course of the liberation struggle against Hitlerism. In the attempt to make the dangerous plans for the creation of a NATO multilateral nuclear force a reality, the Federal Republic of Germany is above all concerned to gain possession of atomic weapons and with their aid to redraw the map of Europe. Only those who hide their heads in the sands of anti-communism can fail to see this.

23. However, there are observers in the West whose sobriety cannot be denied. The English conservative newspaper Sunday Express stated on 18 November 1963 that in practice nuclear weapons for NATO would mean nuclear weapons for West Germany and that a great quantity of such weapons would ultimately come under the direct control of the German generals. It added that since the Germans had started wars twice in the present century, it would be insanity to give them such terrible weapons, with whose aid they might press their territorial claims and start yet another war. This, gentlemen, was written by a conservative English newspaper.

24. In their eagerness to acquire nuclear weapons through NATO, the Bonn revenge-seekers are making the maximum use of their military alliance with France. In this connexion the Soviet Government made the following statement on 5 February 1963:

"However nuclear weapons were to fall into the hands of the 'Bundeswehr', whether directly or indirectly, the Soviet Union would consider this an immediate threat to its vital national interests and would be obliged to take immediately the necessary steps dictated by such a situation."^{3/}

25. The Soviet nation, which together with other peace-loving peoples sacrificed millions of lives to achieve victory over fascism, will take all steps to prevent the "Bundeswehr" from getting atomic weapons.

26. Atomic weapons in the hands of the Federal Republic of Germany would constitute a serious threat to the whole of mankind. The experience of the twentieth century offers convincing testimony of this. That is why all peace-loving peoples must check the West German revenge-seekers before it is too late. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany does not conceal its aggressive intentions towards the peace-loving German Democratic Republic. It declines all proposals for the conclusion of a German Peace Treaty and rejects the Rapacki Plan for the creation of an atom-free zone in central Europe [697th meeting], the urgency of which was again emphasized here on 23 September by Mr. Václav David, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic [1211th meeting]. The Federal Republic of Germany was and is opposed to any kind of understanding on the most important international questions and to friendly relations between the great Powers.

27. It is now clear as never before that the only way to put an end to the abnormal situation in West Germany and West Berlin is to conclude the peaceful settlement with Germany for which the people have been waiting these past eighteen years. The signing of a peace treaty with the two German States—the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic—and the declaration of West Berlin as a free city would correspond to the basic interests not only of the people of Europe but of the people of the entire world.

28. Impelled by its concern for world peace, the Government of the Byelorussian SSR strongly supports the proposals of the Soviet Union for improving relations between States and building up international trust. The Moscow Treaty on the partial prohibition of nuclear weapons tests is a happy precursor of the great changes in international life which the people demand. The Treaty does not remove the danger of war, does not end the arms race and does not guarantee our security, but it does point to the path we must take in order to protect the basic interests of mankind.

29. To take this path means, first of all, to conclude a non-aggression pact between the parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, and to take drastic measures for preventing surprise attack and reducing the number of foreign troops in the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic. Such steps would be an important prerequisite to agreement on the basic question—general and complete disarmament.

30. In view of the importance of steps to reduce international tension, our delegation supports the proposal of the Romanian People's Republic, put forward here on 25 September by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Manescu, for the inclusion in this session's agenda of an item entitled "Action on the regional level with a view to improving good neighbourly relations among

^{3/} Pravda, 8 February 1963.

European States having different social and political systems" [see A/5557].

31. The Moscow Treaty has created the necessary conditions for preventing an arms race in outer space. If outer space is really to serve the great objectives of progress in the interests of all mankind, new constructive steps are necessary. In the opinion of the Byelorussian delegation, the Soviet Union's recent proposal for an agreement to prohibit the placing in orbit of objects carrying nuclear weapons [1208th meeting, paras. 184 and 185] represents a real step towards making outer space a sphere of peace and co-operation. We wholeheartedly support this proposal, impelled as it is by concern for the welfare of mankind.

32. The past year has not brought the full implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)]. As many as seventy territories, with a population of some 50 million people, are still in a state of colonial slavery. The colonialists are doing everything in their power to retard the inexorable march of the people towards freedom and independence so that they may continue to plunder and exploit the inhabitants of the colonies. In an attempt to adapt themselves to the requirements of the times, the colonialists are making wide use of more refined neo-colonial methods of maintaining their rule. The most diverse techniques and methods may be found in the arsenal of modern neo-colonialism: the policy of "divide and rule" is combined with a policy of "unite and rule"; the will of the colonial peoples is falsified by means of rigged "elections"; puppets are installed; and ethnic and tribal dissensions are stirred up.

33. Terrorization and repression of the indigenous population continues to flourish in the colonies as before. The colonialists of Portugal and the Republic of South Africa have made themselves particularly notorious in this respect. The Portuguese colonies are thirty times the area of the metropolitan country. The Salazar régime is continuing to wage bloody colonial war in Angola, inflicting a genocide and "scorched earth" policy on the indigenous population. The methods of this shameful war are being increasingly applied by that régime in Mozambique, Portuguese Guinea, Cape Verde and other colonies. On 28 March 1963 the Hindustan Times reported that in the past few years over 100,000 Africans have been murdered in the colonies by Portuguese troops. There is thus direct evidence of real genocide.

34. It is clear that without the support of the leading NATO countries, Salazar would not be able to continue the struggle against the Angolan people. In our opinion, the General Assembly should adopt the strongest possible sanctions against the fascist-like Portuguese colonialists.

35. We may observe a similar situation in the Republic of South Africa. The question of the racial conflict in the Republic of South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid, that is, domination of the white colonialists over the majority of the country's population, has been brought before the United Nations as many as eleven times, and twenty-seven resolutions have been adopted with a view to compelling the Government of the Republic of South Africa to abandon its policy of racial discrimination.

36. But how does the Government of the Republic of South Africa react to these resolutions? In a new year's address on 31 December 1962, Prime Minister

Verwoerd savagely abused the United Nations, saying that the United Nations was overloaded with insignificant little countries which in fact ran things to suit themselves—the reference being to the countries of Asia and Africa. Then he went on to say that the Republic of South Africa, like most countries with a solid reputation, had learned not to take the United Nations seriously.

37. We demand that the United Nations bring this unbridled racist to his senses. We can no longer tolerate a situation in which 11 million Africans, constituting over three-quarters of the population of the Republic of South Africa, continue to suffer terror and savage repression.

38. The Byelorussian delegation, today as in the past, strongly condemns the racist policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa as violating the most elementary principles of humanity and justice, and insists that sanctions be applied against that country, including the breaking off of diplomatic relations and the cessation of trade.

39. The Byelorussian people are convinced that colonialism's final hour has struck. This conviction has been strengthened by the display of unity on the part of the African countries which, with the backing of all anti-colonial forces, are fighting and intend to go on fighting to carry out the decisions taken at the historic Conference of Heads of African States and Governments which was held in May 1963 at Addis Ababa. The Byelorussian delegation takes this opportunity to declare its full solidarity with the national liberation movement.

40. We shall everywhere support any effective measures against the colonialists, any measures to promote the sovereign right of peoples to independent political and economic development. We demand that by 1965 the last vestiges of the shameful colonial system be definitively wiped from the face of the earth. The destruction of colonialism will enable the politically independent peoples to join forces in the struggle for economic development and independence.

41. The events of the past few months in South Viet-Nam have attracted universal attention and aroused the indignation of world public opinion. The whole world knows that the bloody régime of Ngo-Dinh-Diem has transformed that country into a vast concentration camp. Grossly violating the norms of international law in its attempt to crush the struggle of the people of South Viet-Nam for national independence, democracy, peace and the unification of the country, the Ngo-dinh-Diem régime is subjecting a peaceful population to bombing, is using poison gas and is destroying the peasants' rice fields. Some 350,000 people are languishing in the prisons of South Viet-Nam, including more than 6,000 children. Tens of thousands of innocent people have been murdered.

42. The roster of crimes of the anti-people's clique of Ngo-dinh-Diem has been lengthened in the past few months by further acts of violence and carnage. This time the Saigon dictator has attacked the Buddhist clergy. This is how the brutal excesses of the army and police against the Buddhists were described in the French bourgeois newspaper Combat on 26 August 1963:

"They plundered these holy places in the literal sense of the word; they desecrated the altars; they beat the monks unmercifully and, having bound them, threw them into trucks and transported them to the cemetery more roughly than cattle being led to slaughter. In order to cover up his profanation of

Buddhism, a two-thousand-year-old religion which is professed by almost the entire population of Viet-Nam, Ngo-dinh-Diem concocted the charge that the Buddhist clergy are acting in concert with the Communists."

43. The whole world knows why Ngo-dinh-Diem has embarked on the repression of the Buddhists. The ground is slipping away under the feet of this Saigon hangman. The people of Viet-Nam keenly desire to throw off the chains of this evil clique of adventurers. Ngo-dinh-Diem is using terror in order to maintain himself in power and preserve his thoroughly corrupt régime, but terror is powerless against a people who crave freedom and democracy. The Vietnamese people are demanding an end to United States interference in their internal affairs. They demand that the economic and military assistance being given to the Ngo-dinh-Diem clique be ended.

44. The Byelorussian SSR emphatically condemns the oppression of the peaceful population of South Viet-Nam and supports the just demands of the Vietnamese people for the peaceful unification of their country, the immediate withdrawal of United States troops from their territory and the opportunity to determine their own future.

45. The experience of history shows that the successful development of mutually advantageous economic and trade relations is possible only when the international situation is stable and peace has been firmly established. Conversely, active economic and trade relations between States based on the principles of equal rights and mutual benefit create the conditions for a durable peace and for the solution of international disputes by peaceful means. The Head of the Soviet Government, Mr. Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, said in March 1958:

"Trade has a more than economic significance. Trade is the most normal way of establishing good relations between countries. Trade and economic ties create a good basis for the consolidation of international political relations."

46. There can be no doubt that the expansion of trade, and in particular trade between countries with different social and economic systems and between countries at different levels of economic development, plays an important part in ensuring progress and improving the well-being of all peoples, contributes to the strengthening of peace, and is one of the most effective means of accelerating the economic development of the less developed countries which have only recently freed themselves from the political shackles of colonialism.

47. However, the world situation in so far as economic relations and co-operation are concerned can hardly be considered satisfactory. Exclusive trade and political groupings which discriminate against non-Member States still exist. The dangerous doctrine of anti-communism, which has done great harm to the friendly exchange among nations of the fruits of their labour, hangs like a black cloud over economic co-operation. Is it possible to regard as normal a situation in which trade partners refuse to live up to their obligations and sacrifice to the one-eyed monster of anti-communism the economic interests of their people? Despite the demands of business circles in the Western countries, reactionary forces continue to uphold a policy of trade restrictions in relation to the countries of the socialist camp.

48. What nations need is not trade in general but trade on mutually advantageous terms: trade without discrimination and without artificial political, economic and administrative barriers, trade by which the full sovereignty of both parties is recognized and interference by either in the internal affairs of the other is outlawed. In adopting the resolution on the convening of an international conference on trade and development [resolution 1785 (XVII)], the United Nations gave voice to a universal desire, for the people expect that this conference will mark the first steps towards bringing order into world trade. It is the responsibility of this session to ensure that these steps are really taken in the interests of all mankind.

49. Now that there are good prospects for closer co-operation among all countries, it is essential that the reactionary forces obstructing the peaceful coexistence of peoples should be kept in check. In this regard, an important responsibility falls upon the United Nations, which must work much better and much more effectively and actively than in the past.

50. The United Nations must not be allowed to become either a passive recorder of international events or a tool in the hands of any particular group using it to further its own interests. The United Nations was created for all peoples and should express the hopes of all peoples.

51. An important step towards making the United Nations more effective would be its complete universalization. It is intolerable that the People's Republic of China should still be prevented from taking part in the work of the United Nations. We are strongly in favour of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. The General Assembly should cast out from its ranks the Chiang Kai-shek representatives who represent no one but themselves.

52. While the great Powers bear a special responsibility to history, peaceful coexistence makes the same demands on all States, both large and small. Among the most important of these demands is respect for the sovereignty of States, for the right of peoples to the free choice of their political and social system.

53. Unfortunately, far too many States are failing to comply with this demand. We are continually reminded of this by the tragic conflicts that have sprung up in the world and that keep alive the hotbeds of tension. Our Organization should draw a lesson from the events of last year when a great Power's disregard of the sovereign rights of a small country brought the world to the brink of catastrophe, of a general thermo-nuclear war.

54. In this connexion, our delegation again wishes to draw the attention of the world community to the dangerous manoeuvres still being perpetrated against the Cuban people. Events have shown that not only have there been provocative statements in regard to Cuba, like the recent statement of the American Legion at Miami, but also that deeds have been committed which violate Cuba's sovereignty and infringe its rights. We are convinced that the facts of life will force Cuba's enemies ultimately to realize that all subversive activities and discrimination are futile against the Cuban revolution which enjoys the support of all peoples.

55. The road to development and social reform chosen by Cuba is a domestic affair of the Cuban people, and no one has any right to interfere in its affairs. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR demands that the

acts of economic and military aggression against Cuba be stopped.

56. The Byelorussian people firmly believe in the great possibilities of the human mind. The constructive changes taking place in the world today have divided the whole of mankind into an overwhelming majority in favour of peace and progress and a puny handful of mad politicians who, like scorpions, are ready to commit murder and suicide.

57. It is the duty of all honest men to check the forces of aggression and war and to strengthen peaceful coexistence among peoples, thus enabling mankind to solve all its problems. Reason demands of us to show more patience, greater self-restraint, a stronger desire for co-operation and greater concern for the fate of the entire world.

58. To prevent a new world war and ensure peaceful coexistence is the duty of the United Nations and of all peoples.

59. Mr. WACHUKU (Nigeria): Mr. President, I want, before saying anything further, to congratulate you, together with the Vice-President and all other officers of this General Assembly, on your well-deserved elevation to the high offices of this great Organization. Knowing you, Sir, for three years now, I am sure the Organization, the Assembly and its work, will be very well and ably directed, and I am equally sure that the Assembly, in this eighteenth session, will bear very fruitful results.

60. I want also to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Secretary-General and the permanent staff of the United Nations. During the session that has just ended we had some moments of excitement; indeed, there was a time when we were asking whether the world was not on the verge of complete annihilation. But due to the skillful intervention of the Secretary-General and of Members of this great Organization, and thanks to the good-will and sanity that prevailed and to the fact that the two most powerful nations in the Organization rose to the occasion and showed a great sense of leadership and appreciation of the yearning of all men and women of this globe, disaster was averted. I think we should all congratulate ourselves for showing that we had the capacity, as human beings, to apply the brakes and to pull ourselves back from the yawning chasm into which it would have been our lot to fall.

61. Tomorrow, 1 October 1963, will mark the third year of independence of Nigeria, as a free and independent African State in the twentieth century. On that day, tomorrow, Nigeria will become a republic and, consequently, will change its status, but not necessarily its stature.

62. Although Nigeria has been for only three years an independent African nation of the twentieth century, it is not as young as all that. The area of the African continent called Nigeria has a tradition and a cultural heritage that goes further than 2,000 years and, consequently, the country came to independence with a certain amount of majority and a certain amount of realism in the conduct of its affairs.

63. By becoming independent and assuming new status, Nigeria, in order to fulfil its destiny on the continent of Africa, will naturally have to think again and to review its record of the past three years so as to have a clear vision of the direction in which it must move. Consequently, at this eighteenth session of the General Assembly, before I enter into the discussion

of the more pressing problems that face us as Africans, it may be necessary for me to remind this Assembly of the role which our country has played during these three years as a Member of the Organization of the principles that have guided it and of how it has been consistent with those principles, which were enunciated here on 7 October 1960 [893rd meeting] by the Prime Minister of the Federation of Nigeria, Alhaji Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa.

64. In these three years Nigeria has played some part in international affairs and in world affairs consistent with its resources and talent. It has also played some part in African affairs—and the role played in African affairs has had repercussions and ramifications outside Africa. Nigeria looks to the future with hope and expectation.

65. I want to say here that the Federation of Nigeria, having accepted obligations under the Charter, has done everything possible within its power to discharge its obligation honourably and honestly. Nigeria has tried, as its record shows, to fulfil whatever obligations might be imposed upon it by virtue of its membership of this Organization.

66. Now, consistent with the statement that my Prime Minister made on 7 October 1960, on the occasion of the admission of Nigeria to the General Assembly and to this Organization, we have made our views known and expressed our opinions, when necessary, very strongly, based on conviction. If I may remind this Assembly, at that time the Prime Minister said: "Each representative should be strong enough to resist all efforts to deflect him from the path of truth as he sees it" [893rd meeting, para. 200]. All along, the Nigerian delegation in this Assembly has never hesitated to state the truth as we saw it, fearlessly and boldly, but politely—although our politeness sometimes may be hurtful in some quarters.

Mr. Tarazi (Syrian Arab Republic), Vice-President, took the Chair.

67. Now it becomes necessary for me to make a statement as a result of some rumours that have been circulating in connexion with African States. I have heard it said that the African States have come to the eighteenth session to wreck this Organization. I want to say categorically that that is not true. It is true that, since the seventeenth session of the Assembly, certain changes have taken place and African States have taken certain courses of action in order to persuade certain Members of this Organization to recognize certain existing facts and such changes as have taken place in our world. But that does not mean that, because of certain actions that have been taken, the African countries, or my own country, have decided in any way to wreck the Organization. May I remind this body again about the statement which was made here by my Prime Minister on 7 October 1960 on our admission. I shall not bother the Assembly very much, but it is there in the printed records of plenary meeting of that year.

68. While he made it clear that he thought of the United Nations "as providing perhaps the only effective machinery for inducing world peace", he further stated:

"I do not think that it was ever the intention of any of those countries which were responsible for the creation of this Organization to turn it into an arena where party politics could be played on the highest level, and where ideological differences would obscure the main objective of securing peace among the

nations and stability in the world at large." [*Ibid.*, para. 198.]

69. In that statement it is made clear that, while we recognize and support the General Assembly of the United Nations, there are certain facts which must also be recognized, in particular that the Organization is not a place for playing party politics or for peddling ideological conflicts. The United Nations was created as one of the instruments for disarmament and the maintenance of peace. After the First World War, as an effort towards the maintenance of world peace and disarmament, the League of Nations was created. Unfortunately, bad faith ruined that organization and then man learned bitter lessons by destroying so many millions of human beings in many countries. Another effort was made which resulted in the establishment of this Organization. This is a continuing process in the maintenance of world peace. One would have thought that man, having suffered so much, would think twice before trying to lead humanity to the abyss. That is why my Prime Minister made that statement on the very day when Nigeria was admitted to this Organization.

70. We in Africa regard the United Nations as one of the finest institutions that have been created by modern man to bring various States together and to rally international opinion, in order that the world at large might have a centre once a year for exchanging thoughts and for knowing how the various sections of the world are thinking. It may well be that the views expressed here appear to pass unnoticed; but sooner or later somebody somewhere does take note of much that has been said. Even if the United Nations enables us simply to let off steam, to let off bottled energy which might have resulted in something more dangerous, then the Organization serves a useful purpose. I am sure that all the African States are grateful that such an institution does exist, because it helps them steadily to achieve the objectives which the African States and other weaker and younger States have set as their targets.

71. The rumour I mentioned earlier has arisen because it has been stated that the African States want to expel South Africa and Portugal from the United Nations. I think I can say categorically that, as far as I know, the African States are very reasonable States and that they have reasonable representatives. Certainly the African States want to apply the strongest possible pressure on those two States to make them reasonable, but I do not know of any positive decision to expel those two Members from this Organization. Their expulsion would serve no useful purpose at all. It would be a sheer waste of time. It is better to bring them here and keep on whipping them until they have learned their lesson. To throw them outside and leave them in the cold would just relieve them of this real burden. If members of an organization do not want to observe the rules of the organization, the only way you can teach them a lesson is to bring them up every time and expose them to a certain amount of humiliation and indignity, and one day they will learn some sense. So I want to make it clear that my delegation does not know of any agreed plan to expel either Portugal or South Africa from this Organization, and I do not think my country would even support such a plan.

72. South Africa has eleven million people of African descent who are suffering. If we expel South Africa, it means that we are just locking those people up in prison and handing them over to be suppressed and destroyed. At the present time there is a case against South Africa in the International Court, with Ethiopia and Liberia re-

presenting the African States. What is going to happen to that, if we do not wait for the adjudication of the case? If South Africa is expelled, what happens to the people of South West Africa, which it has illegally appropriated? It is not in our interest to expel South Africa at all. It is not in the interest of the majority of African people in South Africa to expel them. It is not even in the interest of the minority to expel them. It is not in the interest of the minority of three million Africans. They say they are Africans, and we in Nigeria accept them as Africans, because their forebears came to Africa and settled. An accident and circumstance of history have made it so. We recognize that fact. These descendants know no other place they may call their home but South Africa. All we say is: "If you say you are Africans, behave as Africans and conduct yourselves as Africans. You are not the only Africans. There are many millions of other Africans. Therefore you must have a basic working relationship that is consistent with human dignity." That is all we require.

73. Therefore I want to emphasize the fact that there is no intention to expel South Africa or Portugal from this Organization. Portugal is living in a world of fiction, and we have to get it out of the cloud cuckoo land in which it has lost itself and bring it back to earth. In dealing with this African aspect of our policies and the conduct of our affairs, perhaps I shall deal more fully with that particular topic.

74. In international relations, Nigeria has done what is required of it as a member of the United Nations Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. I remember that, when addressing that Committee in Geneva, we said that previously it had always been a matter of the great Powers, of one power bloc negotiating with another power bloc, and naturally suspecting one another and never coming to any agreement; but that now, for the first time, this Organization, with the concurrence of the two power blocs, had brought in the non-aligned countries. In Geneva, we suggested that the eight non-aligned countries must hold together and must on no account side with one or the other bloc, but must continue to whisper into the ears of the members of these powerful blocs the voice of reason, a reflection of the yearning of the ordinary people—a yearning for peace, a yearning for understanding.

75. There again, we made it clear that, as far as our delegation was concerned, there was no need for any particular ideological bloc to think that its views or its own ideology could possibly be the ideology that would be acceptable to all humanity. That would be self-deception. Even members of the same family do not think alike. It is much more unlikely that I will accept the view that what may be good for you, in your own area, is necessarily also good for me. Unless the spirit of accommodation is engendered in all, it will be impossible to attain general and complete disarmament.

76. It appears that, through the efforts of the eight and the good sense of the two power blocs, we achieved something. Before the opening of this eighteenth session of the General Assembly, we saw a nuclear test-ban treaty signed in Moscow between the three nuclear Powers—the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States. Demonstrating the spontaneous reaction of the minority of human beings and States in the world, many more States have since signed that treaty. This shows in no uncertain terms that, for once, the great Powers have done what we would like them to do. I want to put it on record that we do congratulate the great Powers for exercising this initiative and realizing

this objective—it does not matter how small it may be—and we wish also to encourage them to attain more.

77. My country thought that the signing of that treaty was so important a move in the right direction that we decided to sign it in three places—and I had the privilege of visiting Moscow, London and Washington to append the name of Nigeria to that treaty.

78. In Washington, after signing the treaty, we made a short statement, and I think I should like to read it now for purposes of the record. It reads as follows:

"The nuclear test-ban treaty, viewed in the context of complete and total disarmament, to some people may appear insignificant. On the other hand, if the test-ban treaty is viewed in the context of an outward and practical manifestation of the growing faith and confidence of the great nuclear Powers in the genuine, sincere and good intentions of one another to achieve the goal of total and complete disarmament, this treaty becomes more significant. I would describe it as a right step in the right direction and at the right time.

"I wish, on behalf of my Government and the people of Nigeria, to congratulate the three Powers for this initiative and this achievement. It is because my Government attaches such importance to this achievement, and to encourage those great Powers to do more and have more faith and confidence in themselves and humanity and save the world from annihilation, that my Prime Minister has commissioned me to visit all the three capitals of Moscow, London and Washington to sign the treaty on behalf of the Government and people of Nigeria.

"In signing this treaty today on behalf of my Government, I am constrained to remind the great Powers of what they already know—that is, that we have confidence that, in signing the nuclear test-ban treaty, they remember at all times and have at the back of their minds the sacredness of the pledged word, the sanctity of treaties, and will not give any cause to Nigeria, an independent African State, to regret our signing this treaty."

79. The last portion of that statement is, to us, very important, because we know very well the bitterness that was caused when one Power was accusing the other of breaking the moratorium. We in Nigeria—and I believe I will be supported by the other African States—say that these Powers must remember the sacredness of the pledged word and of treaties once entered into, and there should be no backing out, no excuse for making this treaty a scrap of paper. We do not want to have any bickering at one of the sessions of the General Assembly, with one Power saying that the other has not done what it had agreed to do, and "therefore we are not going to be bound by anything".

80. Now that more than 100 States have been induced, by what appears to be a sign of good faith, to affix their signatures to this nuclear test-ban treaty, let us hope that the great Powers will show us by example that they are really great, and not small.

81. We read in the newspapers that the Foreign Ministers of the three great Powers have been meeting to see whether they can find some further area of agreement. From the speeches we have been hearing and from what we have been reading in the newspapers, it appears that one of the questions causing friction among the three great countries is the question of Berlin. It will be remembered that on a previous occasion when

I spoke from this rostrum I made a suggestion to the great Powers. The suggestion was that they should face the reality that Germany is today divided into two parts, two ideological areas. Whether one may wish to build a stone wall or a bamboo wall or a tin wall in Berlin, the fact is that one set of human beings has adhered to one ideology and another set of human beings, of the same nationality, has adhered to another ideology. On the basis of the lesson of my own country, I think that the only way to bring this country together is to start with federation; later, if good will prevails, the people will work out the final solution. To avoid a conflagration in that country, thought could be given to the solution of converting Berlin and its environs into a federal territory of Germany. One of the two organized States could transfer its headquarters to some other city, just as West Germany has transferred its headquarters to Bonn. Berlin and its environs would then become a federal territory and could be handed over to the United Nations, for a short period at least. Once, as a result of consultations, a feasible federal constitution had been worked out, Berlin and its environs would become the federal capital. Let us see whether peace in that area could be secured in this way.

82. Of course, we come from young States; our views may not make any impression. But we are anxious that no one should use Berlin as a pretext in order to throw hydrogen bombs on us. Thus, anyone who has views or suggestions to put forward for the consideration of the great Powers should put them forward. As we have made absolutely clear, we do not want atom bombs, or any other kind of bombs, falling on our continent. We believe that we are voicing the views of ordinary people all over the world when we say that no human being wants to be bombed out of existence. To bomb human beings is an act of insanity, and the sooner we curb that insane nature in man, the better it will be for humanity.

83. I shall not bother the Assembly with comments on international affairs in general. But there is an aspect of international relations that is very important to my country and my delegation and to all the countries of Africa. I am referring to matters pertaining to Africa.

84. Since Nigeria became independent, on 1 October 1960, its policy has been consistent with that stated to the General Assembly by my Prime Minister. Referring to both international affairs and African affairs, he said:

"Before proceeding to deal in detail with the many questions which are of interest to my country, it is better to state briefly the principles which we have accepted as the basis of our policies in international relations. First, it is the desire of Nigeria—as I have said already—to remain on friendly terms with all nations and to participate actively in the work of the United Nations Organization. Secondly, Nigeria, a large and populous country of over 35 millions, has absolutely no territorial or expansionist intentions. Thirdly, we shall not forget our old friends, and we are proud to have been accepted as a member of the British Commonwealth. But, nevertheless, we do not intend to ally ourselves as a matter of routine with any of the Power blocs. We are committed to uphold the principles upon which the United Nations is founded. Fourthly, Nigeria hopes to work with other African States for the progress of Africa and to assist in bringing all African territories to a state of responsible independence." [893rd meeting, para. 173.]

85. My Prime Minister used the words "responsible independence"; he did not mean "a state of irresponsible independence". That is important, because many of the upheavals in our world, the wars of annihilation, have been caused by States that did not have a responsible independence; they were States with an irresponsible independence, because they would not confine themselves to their territories and to their own needs and requirements; they were interested in territorial expansion, in dominating and exploiting others, in appropriating the property of others. A State with that kind of ambition certainly must be regarded as a State with irresponsible independence.

86. Guided by that principle, my country in 1961 initiated a move, supported by other African countries, which resulted in the first Conference of twenty African States in Monrovia.^{4/} This is very important, because at that time African countries were regarded as immature, inexperienced and even unintelligent. Liberia offered to play host to the twenty African States, which therefore met for the first time in Monrovia, and took political, economic, social and cultural decisions. That Conference gave rise to the term "Monrovia Powers."

87. The circumstances behind that Conference were that before the independence of Nigeria there were groups of States in Africa that called themselves by different names, and there was the yearning of the African people that such a division should not continue to exist. Before May 1961 there had been a series of meetings and conferences at which high-sounding resolutions were passed, but nothing came of them, and the conference at Monrovia marked the beginning of the great events which have led to what we are seeing today.

88. Following that meeting in May, the Heads of States decided that there should be a Conference of Experts of the African and Malagasy States in Dakar in July 1961 to deal with all the economic, social, cultural and other technical matters, and that there should then be held a conference at Lagos.

89. The Lagos Conference continued the succession of meetings, and again the twenty Heads of States met in January 1962 and for the first time agreed upon the principles of a charter that will bind them together. The report of the expert committee that met in Dakar was considered and approved, and there was born the organization called the Inter-African and Malagasy Organization and the beginning of the institution of the Council of Ministers and the Assembly of African States.

90. The principles of the Charter were agreed upon, and the Foreign Ministers were commissioned to meet within three months to finalize the Charter. This they did in May and June 1962, and in December 1962 they met again and the Charter of the Inter-African and Malagasy Organization was signed.

91. In January of this year we suffered a casualty, and then the new Organization was tested. Another conference was summoned under that Charter, and the twenty States answered and arrived at certain decisions and enunciated certain principles. It was in Lagos also that the African States decided that the next meeting of the Heads of States should be held in Addis Ababa. When the Heads of States of the African countries were summoned, the door was left open for all to be there, because it was found that there was a common yearning

in the hearts of all the leaders to come together. So, at Addis Ababa for the first time, with the exception of two States because of circumstances beyond everybody's control, all the States met. There were thirty States represented, and so we have today the Organization of African Unity. Now the thirty-two independent African States are members of that Organization, and for the first time those thirty-two States decided to solve the problem that every African country had decided to solve individually, and they decided to solve it collectively. From this rostrum, we have stated that our independence is meaningless if the rest of Africa is not free. At Addis Ababa, the African countries collectively decided that the problem of decolonizing Africa had become a collective matter and must be solved collectively.

92. I have gone into this question because it is important for this Organization. When people suggest that we want to wreck the United Nations or that we have some ulterior motive in our conduct or course of action, they should understand what has led us to these things.

93. It is not our fault that other States cannot appreciate the necessity of sinking their differences and thinking in terms of their immediate problems. The African States realized that if there is to be peace in this world, while it is all very well to meet in Geneva and talk about general and complete disarmament, disarmament will be impossible if Africa is still in bondage. Those who are trying to disarm in one area are arming to conquer Africa, and the only way to make disarmament complete and effective is to decolonize Africa completely. When there are no more areas for exploitation, when there are no more areas for conquest, when there are no more areas for experimentation on an ideological basis, then everybody will be at peace in his own home. Therefore, the African States have decided that all this ideological experimentation should be confined to their respective areas. The Africans must be given an opportunity to experiment on their own home grounds to show that it is possible for independent States of goodwill to work together.

94. We believe that if we succeed in getting Africans to work together in harmony, we will be opening a new chapter in international relations. Consequently, since the last session and since the Addis Ababa Conference, what has been going on for years in this Assembly and this Organization—the attempts of Africans in the Fourth Committee to become free—has gathered a new momentum and a new impetus. It is no longer a question of the nationalist leaders of South West Africa coming here to ask to be heard as petitioners; it is no longer a question of the nationalists of Angola coming here and asking the Chairman of the Fourth Committee to put their case before the Assembly; it is no longer a question of the nationalists of Northern Rhodesia or Southern Rhodesia coming here and roaming in the lobbies asking for somebody to present their case. It is now the case that the thirty-two African States have decided that their continent must be free and independent, with responsible independence, not irresponsible independence.

95. If this Organization accepts us as Members, genuine Members, entitled to all the rights and privileges, if all the Members of this Organization accept their obligations and agree that this Organization is an instrument of peace and understanding among the various States and among human beings, it is only fair, right and proper that all the countries should give the African States wholehearted support in their just endeavours

^{4/} Conference of the Heads of African and Malagasy States held in Monrovia, 8 to 13 May 1961.

to unite the continent and in their effort to remove all the vestiges of the humiliation of the African people and all the vestiges of colonialism.

96. It will be noticed that I am not speaking with a sense of bitterness. We on the African continent do realize the facts of history. With thirty-two independent African States, we feel that we can afford to have a spirit of accommodation. We feel that we can afford to appeal to a sense of reasonableness on the part of those who are still holding a section of Africa in a state of bondage. But I know from the look of things: today there are thirty-two independent African States. By the end of this year there may be about thirty-four or thirty-five, and by next year there will be many more. Surely that should be enough writing on the wall for anybody to see that the time for colonialism on the continent of Africa is up and that the time is up also for discrimination on the continent of Africa.

97. And so it is Nigeria, my country—I say this because Nigeria has pledged itself to work with the rest of the African countries to achieve the objective—that has been in the forefront, knowing that its territory contains the largest aggregate of the black population in one area in the world. It is its duty, whether it likes it or not—it is an obligation—to do everything possible within its power, in conjunction with the other African States, to see that the continent of Africa is liberated as quickly as possible; there will be no turning back.

98. Sometimes we Nigerians have been accused of not being dynamic, but we in Nigeria believe in peaceful and orderly development. If we can get that we will, but if our patience becomes completely exhausted nobody should blame us. The African people have a forgiving nature. I believe that if this Organization continues to give the States of Africa the support it has given them in the past, I have no doubt that within the shortest possible time the question of decolonization will be solved as quickly as possible.

99. I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Scandinavian countries. I read the other day that the Foreign Ministers of the Scandinavian countries were invited by South Africa to visit that Territory but that they had refused to go, not because they hate South Africa, but because they disagree with its policy. Without saying so, by that act they are showing us that they wholeheartedly support us. They agree with us that the policy of South Africa is wrong and that it must change. I believe that if other countries acted and behaved in that manner, sooner or later South Africa will learn that ostracism, which was started by the Greeks, is still continuing in the twentieth century. They continue to be ostracized. When the Scandinavian Foreign Ministers refuse to answer their invitation, the South Africans must soon learn that there must be something wrong with them. Once they discover what is wrong and remedy the situation, they will find that everybody will accept their invitation. So I am most grateful, and I want to put it on record that my country appreciates very much indeed the co-operation that the Scandinavian countries have been giving to the African cause, and also this latest action as a manifestation of the wholehearted support they are willing to give us.

100. With regard to Portugal and decolonization, we have said here before what our position is and we continue to say it. But the thing that amazes me—I read Mr. Salazar's book as a student in political science and legal science—is that a very brilliant man, who was able to rescue his own country from bankruptcy, acts in this

way. What has happened to him that he cannot now appreciate that by letting Angola, Mozambique and others go as independent countries, Portugal has an opportunity of establishing a firmer relationship between Angola, Mozambique and other African countries, firmer economic, social and cultural relations not only with those territories but with the rest of independent Africa. I think that this will yield him greater dividends. If he would only perform this little act, he would find that he not only has the goodwill of these areas but that he also has the goodwill of the whole continent. I think it is as simple as all that. But I cannot understand why; I do not know what is wrong; something must be very wrong.

101. We have suggested from this rostrum that Portugal must accept the principle of independence. That is simple—self-determination for the people, recognize these people as the legitimate leaders of their people. Whether you like it or not, nationalism has taken root and is bound to win. Once nationalism grows and germinates there is nothing you can do about it; it is bound to win. It may take some years, but it is bound to win and imperialism is bound to lose. They are not bandits, they are nationalists, followed by thousands and millions of their people. So acknowledge that fact. Throw away the fiction of 1884 or 1885, the Berlin Conference and its fiction; throw those things away as they do not apply, and then be prepared to meet these nationalists to discuss the manner in which you transfer power to them so that they remain your partners and friends. Britain has done so, and France has done so although it still has secret intentions of coming back. Portugal should learn that lesson, and it will finally yield it a dividend.

102. I may recall to the memory of Portugal that in the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when Portugal and Spain were the most powerful States, they dealt with the African kingdoms on terms of equality. The King of Dahomey exchanged ambassadors with the court of Portugal; the same thing happened with the King of Benin. The Queen of Angola exchanged ambassadors with them. They dealt in terms of equality. Just because an industrial revolution produced a change in the nineteenth or twentieth century, they have forgotten that part of their history. At that time they had harmonious relationships. Why not go back and think again? Portugal and Spain, particularly Portugal, had a very harmonious relationship with the African States. Before it is too late it is necessary for them to re-think their thoughts.

103. I am using this opportunity to appeal to Dr. Salazar and his cabinet to go back in the archives of Portugal where they will find these documents and treaties of friendship, written by their predecessors, with the Kings and Chiefs of Africa, and with the Queen of Angola, before she was succeeded by a weak King who enabled them to infiltrate. I believe that if Portugal pursues that course it will live to establish a new and happier relationship with the rest of Africa, not only with Angola and Mozambique; as long as Portugal remains an independent Western Europe country on the Iberian Peninsula, we have no quarrel with it.

Mr. Sosa Rodríguez (Venezuela) resumed the Chair.

104. But the moment Portugal tells us that in spite of the Atlantic Ocean and the Strait of Gibraltar which separates Africa from Europe, Angola is a province of Portugal, then, naturally, that is where the quarrel starts. Portugal is just on the same side as Togo in

in West Africa. Have we ever heard anything at any time where Togo would say that Ghana is a part of the province of Togo, or that Dahomey is a province of Togo, or that Nigeria is a province of Togo, or that Niger is a province of Togo? These are areas which are close to Togo. But the moment Togo would say such a thing, there would be a quarrel. The moment Togo remains as an independent African State, a member of the Organization of African Unity, there is brotherhood, friendship and mutual assistance.

105. Surely if Portugal wants to be an African country—I read in one of the documents that it claims it is an African country—it should come forward now and sign the Charter of the Organization of African Unity. We will admit Portugal, then Portugal could come before the Council of Ministers and we would be able to settle the dispute between the nationalists of the Iberian Peninsula and the nationalists of Angola. We would be able to use our good offices to settle the dispute between them. But Portugal cannot continue to be a member of NATO, and not a member of the Organization of African Unity, and then claim that it is an African country, or that it wants to hold Angola and Mozambique in thralldom. That is an impossible situation.

106. Therefore I take this opportunity to appeal to Portugal to think again how to find a way of holding a discussion with the nationalists and the leaders of African thought. Nobody wants to destroy Portugal. We would like to save the bloodshed if it is possible. Nobody wants to destroy Africans, nobody wants to destroy Portuguese. We feel that the Portuguese have contributed something in that area. It may be an accident of history, but we must face realities in our time. Nobody wants to destroy anybody else, unless they just cannot help it.

107. Some people may think that it is a sign of weakness, but Nigeria wants a peaceful and orderly development of Africa. Wherever we can, we wish to avoid the avoidable; unless the African States are compelled to do what they would not like to do normally.

108. With regard to South Africa and the question of apartheid, what is this all about, this discrimination? In diagnosing the case of South Africa we find that it is living in a state of fear, in a kind of neurosis. All the statements that Mr. Verwoerd and Mr. Louw have been making, and some of the Ministers of Justice, are preaching hate; they sing the hymn of hate to children.

109. What is it all about? They are frightened people. I want to assure them that what they are thinking about is not true. I read some letters in The Times of London where some people suggested that if the majority in South Africa have control of the Government in that area, they are going to exterminate these people or drive them into the sea, or expropriate their property.

110. That is not true. It is just not true. We have been in touch with the leaders and all they want is justice. The rule of law must prevail. They do recognize that the settlers have brought some technical skill. They have been able to bring some development in that area; they accept the fact that they are Africans. Therefore, they must recognize that they are Africans and they must be ready to have the spirit of accommodation in order to work out a system that will be congenial to all concerned. I think that is only fair. But in a situation where a minority wants the majority to go down the mine, because of cheap labour, to bring up gold, diamonds and copper, and where they want them to go

to their farms and cultivate, and bring in the food and cook it and bring it to their table, and where they want them to nurse their children, and at the same time saying that they do not recognize them as human beings, where is the justice in that?

111. These are the things that created the difficulties. It is necessary that the leaders of South Africa should emulate what is happening in the United States today. It will be noticed that we do not come to the rostrum here to condemn the United States, not because there is no discrimination here. Here it is the leader of the Government of the country, and the responsible leaders of the country, who are going out of their way to use the law, all the instruments—social, economic and others—to remedy the situation. How can one come forward and condemn people who have done something to change the situation that was created because of history? Rather than condemn them, one will have a sympathetic understanding of the course they are following and will try to appreciate the difficulty, and to assist in whichever way one can: quietly, gently, without acrimony.

112. But as regards South Africa, the leaders of the new Africa are making all efforts to have the South Africans see reason before it is too late. They do not even remember that they will die some day and that their children will be left with these sins of omission and of commission. How many more years will Mr. Verwoerd live in this world? How many more years will Mr. Louw continue to exist in this world? Yet they forget the children just born and the ones unborn. There is the sin of omission and commission, the fire and brimstone is being heaped on the heads of those innocent ones.

113. Therefore I take this opportunity, on behalf of my country and the organization we represent in Africa, to appeal to South Africa and to the leaders of South Africa to stop being afraid. The ghost that is haunting them is of their own creation, not the creation of the African. The African majority is not going to destroy them. I never heard at any time, in the decolonization Committee,^{5/} that there has been counsel by an African or an African leader, or an African State, to plan to destroy these people. I can say this authoritatively and categorically. They should stop being afraid of their shadows and behave as reasonable men and women.

114. I know that there are some reasonable men and women who have been prevented by the use of law, by the use of arbitrary injustice, from sharing the real and genuine intention of the people of South Africa. That is why we do not want to jettison South Africa. If you expel them, you are throwing them into the Atlantic or the Pacific.

115. I want to say something now, Mr. President, with your permission. I know that this may not be very popular, but, as I said, we should not be afraid to tell the truth. As a student in a university abroad, I used to be Secretary of the Association of Students of African Descent. At that time, on our very continent, there were some people from those areas who said that they were not Africans and who would not associate with us because we were black people. But we carried on,

116. History has been moving on and on, until today those people who at one time, because of difference in colour, said they were not Africans, are acknowledging

^{5/} Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

that they are Africans and are working with their fellow Africans as Africans. Why cannot South Africa do that? Why cannot South Africa learn from Kenya's experience just recently? Those people were given money to settle there and cultivate the area. Those who could not stay went away. But the majority of the settlers in Kenya today have decided to stay, seeing that the Government is changing. And it is gratifying. I went to Nairobi myself and I found a lot of these people fraternizing with the new leaders, and these leaders themselves have of their own volition taken some representatives of this minority and put them in Parliament.

117. Have we not eyes to see? Can we not read? Why is South Africa frightened? Why are the leaders of South Africa making things more difficult for the more responsible opinion in African countries?

118. As I said before, my country tomorrow becomes a Republic, and certainly we are going to pursue the course of independence and the establishment of the dignity of man in the African countries with greater vigour than ever before. There will be no turning back. And if the present leaders of South Africa will not listen to reason, will not hearken to the voice of justice, will not be honest, will not allow their conscience to affect their thinking, then they will go under and the younger generation will find a solution to their problems.

119. But I want to put it on record here: Nobody, as far as I know, is planning the destruction of the settler minority in South Africa. We recognize that they have contributed certain things, that they have aided development. We know that a lot of damage was done in the Rhodesias, both North and South, that a great deal was destroyed by Rhodes and others. Rhodes is regarded in England as a great builder, but I regard him as the architect of African misery. However, that does not make me hate those people who are now settled there. It was not of their own doing; it was part of the history of man. I do not hate the descendants of the settlers and I do not think anyone else hates them. We disagree with them very violently and fundamentally, but that disagreement does not mean hate.

120. Therefore we take this opportunity, from this rostrum, to call upon the leaders of South Africa to think again, and we appeal to those friends of theirs who prefer to arm them instead of talking sense into their heads, to desist from arming them. Let the better nature of man prevail and you will find that the South African minority will enjoy life more abundantly. You will find that the African people, having suffered so much all over the world, has a spirit of accommodation and a forgiving nature. The African has a capacity to laugh at himself and to enjoy a joke. When the African laughs, he laughs; he does not open his mouth and close it suddenly. I do not think I need labour this point, but I have said this because Nigeria, as the country with the largest concentration of black men anywhere in the world, owes a duty to all the black people of the earth to do everything possible to eradicate the humiliation of the black man anywhere in the world. Whether Nigeria likes it or not, it is its duty, it is part of Nigeria's destiny. If Nigeria does not do this, then it has failed in its mission. I am happy to note that the United States, with the largest concentration of black people anywhere outside Africa, is making some effort to eradicate this humiliation of the black man. After all, when you talk of "colour discrimination", "racial discrimination", what does that mean? It means discrimination against the black man, that is all. We must

call a spade a spade, not an instrument for digging. I can take a pick-axe and dig, I can take a hoe and dig, I can take a knife and dig or I can take a piece of wood and dig; but it is not a spade that I am digging with. A spade is a spade; otherwise there would be no distinction between "a spade" and "a shovel".

121. Racial discrimination today means simply discrimination against the black man. I am saying this here and I want it recorded. It does not come to us as an issue here in that form, but unless all countries of the world, in writing, in their constitutions, begin to change these things—this discrimination against the black man—we can talk about disarmament and all the rest but we shall be just wasting our time; for until we are morally disarmed, until these injustices are rectified, the job of disarmament will be only half done; it will not be completely done.

122. The fear of the South Africans is that the black people, who are in a majority, will dominate them. Again we may learn by an example from Nigeria. There are three million white South Africans. They wish to preserve their identity, and so on. Now South Africa is already a federation, though it is not the kind of federation that we have. If they want to be by themselves, if they do not wish to be exterminated, why not set aside one area sufficient for three or four million people, an area with sufficient room for expansion, for this group, dividing the rest of the country into other states each with its own provincial legislature. Then, in a federation, in the federal houses, all will be represented. That would be a solution. They are afraid that this might deprive them of all power; but if they like, there could be a senate in which there would be equal representation, and they would thus be represented in the central legislature. In their own area they would always have complete control. If they want it that way, if they do not want to mix freely, they can do that; that will be a way out if they want to continue to be isolated. But to say that the minority will continue for ever to rule the majority—that is impossible. I would like that to be recorded today.

123. What we want to avoid is violence. Africa has suffered so much violence and destruction that we do not want any more. We would like Africa to be able to use the abundant resources that it has for the good of its sons and daughters, of all races, that have contributed to making Africa what it is in the twentieth century; and to be able to utilize those resources—intellectual, moral and material—for the good of humanity at large. We cannot do this if we continue warring amongst ourselves. We should be able to arrive at the decision that an African is an African regardless of the colour of his skin. I think that is possible, that in the African States the majority have sufficient spirit of accommodation to be able to arrive at that conviction. I want South Africa to think of these things.

124. There is one other matter which is of great concern to African States, and that is the question of representation in the various organs of the United Nations. You will remember, when we became independent, in 1960, in the Special Political Committee [197th meeting] we did not hesitate to demand representation, and we then and there made it clear that we did not like the idea that the two oldest African Member States here had never been called upon to be represented in any important organ of this Organization; and in that year, with the collaboration of the various States, the African-Asian group in particular; we succeeded in having Li-

beria share, with Ireland and Ethiopia, a seat on the Economic and Social Council.

125. We have tried to ask for an amendment of the Charter to increase the number of members in the Security Council—to increase the number, that is all. We do not want a total overhaul of the Charter. Everybody agrees that that would be a good thing except certain Powers that say it would be only if China comes in. We say this is irrelevant to the issue. Then, in the absence of an amendment which would enlarge the Security Council to enable us to have our representation, to reallocate the existing seats. With respect to the 1946 "gentleman's agreement", again the answer is "No". May I ask the Assembly, does this Organization want thirty-two African States just to be vocal Members, with no right to be able to express their views on any particular matter in the important organs of the United Nations? Are we only going to continue to be veranda boys? This matter must be settled at this session one way or the other.

126. Thirty-two independent African States want their own representation in these various organs. We fought last year on principle. At one time we were told that Africa and the Middle East had a seat. We tested that. And this Assembly decided that that seat was a Middle Eastern seat. We have decided not to look to any other seat as belonging to Africa. Africa has none.

127. Today the position is that Europe has three permanent seats and two non-permanent seats. Asia has one permanent seat. The Americas have one permanent seat and two non-permanent seats. The Middle East has one non-permanent seat. The Commonwealth has one non-permanent seat. Africa, with thirty-two States: nil.

128. I read a suggestion which had been made by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union that in order to get two seats for Africa we should take one from the Commonwealth and one from Latin America. I want to say here, as far as I know, speaking for my own delegation, and I think, as far as I know, the Africans do not want to take any seat from Latin America. And let nobody cause any conflict between us and the Latin American countries. We do not want their seats. They have enjoyed their two seats for so long that now we say it is their right, it should be given to them. The Middle Eastern countries have now taken this one as theirs. Asia has one permanent seat. Europe has three permanent seats and two non-permanent seats.

129. I am appealing to the Europeans, both East and West. This division of Eastern Europe and Western Europe is unreal. There is only one Europe—we all learn geography—there is only one Europe. I am appealing to you, Europe, to give us two non-permanent seats. One permanent seat is more powerful than twenty non-permanent seats because it has the right of veto.

130. When everybody agreed in the Security Council the other day, what did the United Kingdom do? It is true it had not been exercising its right of the veto all the time. But that day on Southern Rhodesia, despite what everybody said, the United Kingdom applied the veto, and that was the end of that. All we want is for you to give us these two non-permanent seats and let us have an opportunity to express our views, whether you agree with us or not.

131. Europe is very effectively represented by three permanent seats in the Security Council: one, the United Kingdom; one, France; and one, the Soviet Union. The

group of Powers that associate with the Soviet Union can be adequately represented, as everyone knows in the Assembly, by the Soviet Union. The six Common Market countries, among whom is France, can be adequately represented by France in the Security Council. And the other Free Trade Association countries in Europe can be adequately represented by the United Kingdom because the United Kingdom is a member of the Free Trade Association; surely you have a common meeting ground for deciding your views. Therefore, nobody should give us the excuse, "What of the representation of the others?" You have your areas of representation: Common Market, Free Trade Association; you have the other European communities; and the other free areas are adequately represented.

132. Therefore, I am saying here—I want it on record—that my delegation feels Europe is more than adequately represented in the Security Council. And if they are not prepared to agree to amend the Charter, just to enlarge it to give us our seat, then be gracious enough to surrender those two non-permanent seats to Africa so that we may have a voice in this organ of the United Nations.

133. We do not want any conflict with Latin America. Latin America, like Africa, is one of the underdeveloped areas, or developing countries as they call us; we have a common disability. Why should we go and rob them of their seats? We do not want to take anything from Latin America. They are twenty States. They have occupied the seats. Therefore, no one should play us against anyone.

134. My delegation strongly feels that the "gentleman's agreement", if we are not going to amend the Charter for the purpose of enlarging it, should be changed at this session. If it is not a gentleman's agreement, let it be a lady's agreement. We have ladies in various delegations at this time. If the gentlemen will not agree, I am sure the ladies will agree that Africa is entitled to these seats.

135. I have tried to speak in the vein I have spoken in because a peculiar atmosphere has prevailed during the eighteenth session. It looks as if we are settling down to construction instead of destruction. It looks as if reasonableness is beginning to prevail in this Assembly. I sincerely hope that throughout this session all delegations will forget the fifteenth session and the sixteenth session and remember that, in this jet age, the various continents of the world are drawing together, with the free movement of persons from one area to the other, humanity gradually becoming one. If that is so, I do not see any problem which cannot be solved amicably if there is goodwill to solve it.

136. The only last remark I want to make is one which I am sure everybody in the Assembly knows, and that is with regard to our attitude to the Congo question. The Assembly, in the course of this session or very soon, may be presented with a request to postpone the departure of the United Nations forces from the Congo. I want to say here that my country strongly supports postponement until June 1964. Also, I have the authority of the thirty-two African States in support of that view. The Organization has done excellent work in the Congo. By helping the Congolese people the United Nations has helped Africa. We do not like to see anything that will destroy all that everybody has contributed to build. Many countries made sacrifices, not only in money but in the lives of their peoples; those sacrifices must not be in vain. My delegation will always be grateful to the

Organization—and I am sure that the other African States will be most grateful—for the effort that has been made collectively to bring stability in that area of Africa. I hope that, when this request comes before the General Assembly, even those who opposed it before will not, in the name of Africa and in the interests of Africa and the African States, oppose our legitimate wish and desire. Give support to the request of the Congolese Government, which is an expression of the wishes of the Congolese people, so that the work which we have begun so well should end well, and then we can say: all's well that ends well.

137. Mr. MASUMBUKO (Burundi) (translated from French): While preparing to represent his country at this session of the General Assembly, our Minister for Foreign Affairs had an accident, as a result of which he died in the prime of life. On behalf of His Majesty the Mwami of Burundi, the family of the deceased Minister and the Government, and on my own behalf, I thank the Ministers for Foreign Affairs, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, all delegations accredited to the Organization and all individuals and bodies for their kind expressions of sympathy.

138. I offer my warmest congratulations to you, Mr. President, on your election to your present post. This election is undoubtedly an honour for you and your country, but it is also an honour for the United Nations which has placed at the head of one of its highest organs a person of such great intellectual and moral qualities.

139. Burundi has been independent for only one year. It was in June 1962 in this Assembly that it was decided to cease regarding Burundi, internationally, as a dependent territory. Yet our ties with this great and noble Organization are as old as the Organization itself. In connexion with the 1914-1918 world conflict, the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers, deciding to place German East Africa—of which Burundi was a district—under international control, brought us into relationship with the international organization of the day: the League of Nations. At the time when the League collapsed because it had not been true to its *raison d'être*—the maintenance of peace—the principle of nationalities, in fashion during the nineteenth century, had become the right of men to self-determination. Our country progressed from the status of a Mandated Territory to that of a Trust Territory, and the foreign Administering Power undertook to co-operate fully with the United Nations General Assembly and Trusteeship Council in the discharge of all their functions. All this was settled during the first years following the Second World War. But not until 1962 was it recognized that in our case too it was not for one people to dominate another.

140. I remember the atmosphere which reigned in the lobbies of this Assembly when our accession to independence was being considered. The future of our country was anxiously discussed. On the one hand, the sad example of the Congo was in the delegates' minds, and was recalled by the representative of that country himself, Mr. Matiti [1119th meeting]. On the other hand, Burundi had a representative Government and had nothing to wait for but the termination of the trusteeship. We were encouraged and supported in this advance towards what all peoples aspired to—*independence and progress*. May we here record the full measure of our debt to the States which bestowed upon us this mark of goodwill and understanding.

141. Elsewhere, Algeria had entered a transitional period which was to lead it to independence. The FLN^{6/} was on the point of obtaining what for seven years it had been seeking by every means, including the most agonizing, to secure Rwanda, Uganda, Western Samoa and, after the break-up of the British West Indies Federation, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago were going to proclaim their independence. The Netherlands and Indonesia had ended their thirteen-year-old dispute over West New Guinea. Nyasaland had been given the right to secede from Northern Rhodesia. In short, many people could say that it was the beginning of the end of political and racial supremacy.

142. The chapter of decolonization, in the history of the world, was thus on the point of being closed. One would have liked to say the same about the cold war, but that was not the case; on the contrary, the nuclear tests which were said to have been abandoned were recommended shortly afterwards, as reprisals. The Disarmament Committee^{7/} at Geneva was achieving no results. In Laos, the negotiations between the three princes, representing the so-called pro-Western, pro-communist and neutralist factions respectively, bore no fruits until 23 July 1962 at Geneva.^{8/} The number of incidents at the notorious Berlin wall was increasing, and discussions on this subject were not showing the slightest progress. In addition, there were still Cuba and the Congo which, of course for different reasons, were feeding the fires of the cold war.

143. Since that time, that is since 1 July 1962, much progress has been made. The most notable instances are the Conferences of Addis Ababa and Moscow.

144. At Addis Ababa, the representatives of thirty-two independent African States decided to unite all the potential energies of Africa in order, first to put an end to the shameful system of foreign domination and exploitation on their soil in particular and in the world in general, and secondly to enable the vast African masses to overcome their technical and economic backwardness. The Conference of Addis Ababa^{9/} is merely the natural outcome of the Africans' struggle to liberate themselves from the fetters of the colonial system, and of their desire to give concrete expression, through African unity, to their philosophy of brotherhood. The sure success of African unity will be the best vindication of the principles of our Charter:^{10/} peace in action, complementarity in equality, and the certainty that Africa, previously disregarded, can be an example to the rest of the world.

145. In Moscow, the representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have just concluded a treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water.

146. With regard to decolonization and the campaign against hunger, the meeting at Addis Ababa is of unprecedented importance. It holds out hope for a substantial reduction in international tension as a result of liberation of a large area of the world. It also, through an attitude based solely on respect for sover-

^{6/} National Liberation Front (FLN).

^{7/} Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

^{8/} Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos and Protocol, signed at Geneva on 23 July 1962.

^{9/} Summit Conference of Independent African States, held from 22 to 25 May 1963.

^{10/} Charter of the Organization of African Unity, signed at Addis Ababa on 25 May 1963.

eighty, brings an entire continent within the scope of international relations.

147. In the field of peaceful coexistence, the meeting in Moscow is a great encouragement on the journey towards a world without war, without fear and perhaps without hunger. It gives hope for the achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament; it also holds out the prospect of a reduction of the ever-increasing gap between levels of living in the developed countries and in the formerly dependent countries, through more extensive aid to the less favoured and the use, for assistance purposes, of the resources liberated by disarmament.

148. Since we have been a Member of this Organization, our contribution to its objectives has been loyal and sincere, although limited by the fact that we are a small country. This is true so far as international peace and security are concerned; it is also true in the field of the rights of peoples and of citizens.

149. With regard to international peace and security, we, like other nations, are obliged to safeguard our country's future. Like others, we know that a conflagration, if it broke out, would not be restricted to regions defined in advance. It is therefore the duty of each nation and each Government to spare no effort to avert a general catastrophe; this is a responsibility which we will not and cannot shirk. This philosophy stems from an essentially active pacifism which is the basis of our international policy, and it will determine our position during this session of the General Assembly.

150. Burundi is convinced that all international questions can be solved according to the provisions of the United Nations Charter. It is sure that there is no dispute which cannot be settled by peaceful means. Every problem will be resolved whenever the parties are sincerely determined to examine it realistically and in accordance with the rules of law. What we primarily require of a solution is that it should be lasting; it must therefore be in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

151. During the session, my delegation will support any proposal for the establishment of genuine peaceful coexistence. In particular, we shall support any proposal for the achievement of complete agreement on the cessation of nuclear tests. We shall side with all those who have proclaimed, once and for all, that science must dispel both the fear of war and the fear of hunger. My delegation will support any resolution for the expansion of membership of the United Nations, on the basis of the principle of universality. My country is opposed to the policy of quarantining other countries. This is the reason for my delegation's attitude in respect of Communist China.

152. The world must not find itself in a situation in which force prevails. The vast majority of people lack the means of subsisting. The race to help our fellow-men could quite well be a source of honour to the contestants, in which case intimidation would cease to be a method habitually resorted to in international relations; shows of force, or any other type of threat, would be consigned to ridicule.

153. As far as the rights of peoples are concerned, the colonial system is the most crushing insult that history has ever addressed to the human race. The man subjected to it is forced to stoop, to cringe and to become just one of the objects, like a towel, which the colonial-

ist uses and abuses. The man who practices it is obliged to pervert himself, to claim that he is a superior being and to postulate the superiority of all his passions and all his creations. This system is based on theories of racial supremacy which have given rise to atrocious practices in the liquidation of human lives. In its development, it has taken the form of a system of oppression, exploitation and domination of one people by another. Today it is denounced by all the working masses, the world over.

154. This description of imperialism and colonialism represents, naturally, one point of view; there may be others. Portugal proves me to be quite right here. In any case, my analysis has the advantage of being not exclusively my own but that of all exploited peoples of the world in general and of the colonial world in particular; it is therefore, in fact, that of the great majority of human beings. It is this analysis, this understanding of human relations which has called forth general indignation and resulted in the colonial revolution; what is more, on the basis of the facts we can say, without fear of being mistaken, that the liquidation of the colonial system is imminent.

155. Unfortunately, there are still vast tracts of Africa where the people live in hourly fear of massacre, pillage and extermination. The representative of Portugal dares to flaunt himself here before the eyes of the world, which we represent, while his Government engages in practices contrary even to the laws of warfare. Portugal is provoking the nations of the world in the extreme. A country like that has no place here; it should have the courage to change its policy or to withdraw before the United Nations is forced to take other steps. Some Africans States have already recognized the patriotic government of Holden Roberto; he should be here to receive the heartfelt tribute paid by all free countries to those valiant fighters whose names will go down in history as defenders of the honour of Angola.

156. At the present moment, there is still one Hitler type of State on this earth, one solitary Government whose political morality consists of hatred, degradation and racial dictatorship—the Republic of South Africa; one Government which consigns nine-tenths of its population to concentration camps and yet dares to send ministers to the United Nations to boast at this world rostrum of the benefits of racialism and the concentration-camp paradise of the Negro. Is there one voice raised here in favour of the presence of an instigator of this kind? My delegation—together with many other delegations here—believes that there is not.

157. Concrete action must be taken against this retrograde State which uses guns to dominate a peace-loving people. The United Nations courts destruction if it merely stands by, and, like the League of Nations, looks on at the massacre of a people by an anti-democratic Government, on the pretext of non-intervention.

158. Although always contrary to the most elementary morality, colonialism, at a certain point in historical time, was accepted in the colonialist world as a system of political administration or as a legal constitutional form. In other words, the rule of force and the negation of fundamental human rights were political norms. Today, this is no longer the case. Under the pressure of the working people of the world, the colonial system was first called into question and then sentenced to death, and today in fact we are witnessing its last dying throes.

159. It is a happy fact that, in the United Nations, the resolutions adopted on colonialism reflect the unswerving will of the peoples for self-determination. The conscience of mankind has rejected colonialism for ever, and its spokesmen have presented the colonial system as an injustice, an anomaly, a source of increasing friction and a constant threat to equilibrium. The proposed solution is the re-establishment of this equilibrium, the restoration of fundamental human rights and national independence. The United Nations has had to learn by experience that, once begun, a colonial revolution enters the course of history and from then on it is futile to attempt to restrain it. Happily, that lesson has now been learnt.

160. However, colonialism has often served as an excuse for intensifying the cold war, thus impairing the authority of the Organization. An outworn form of colonialism practised by certain Powers in defiance of world opinion still lives on. Resolutions intended to make these Powers see reason and justice have been quite simply ignored. Some other Powers have displayed an attitude of duplicity and inconsistency. All these considerations move us to deplore the existence of a retrograde spirit within the Organization and the inability of the United Nations to check it through the application of its fundamental principles and of the Charter.

161. Yet there are other areas in which action by the Organization has had a positive effect on this revolution. The fact that problems have been brought to the international scene has often made it possible to discern factors conducive to a peaceful settlement. Many lives have been spared in Africa and Asia through the good offices of the Organization. Its recommendations have often been of great utility to countries attaining self-government or independence. To sum up, the Organization has been able to create, all through the colonial world, a spirit of mutual understanding which will lead to peace and a new era of co-operation in freedom and equality.

162. The colonial revolution is, in fact, directed against domination by force and against the exploitation of one man by another. It thus constitutes an unparalleled contribution to world peace and stability. Experience has taught us that when the colonialists persist in their policy of domination and inequality, conflicts and wars unfailingly break out in the colonial countries, which inevitably increase international friction. There can, moreover, be no lasting peace without universal freedom, and there can be no universal freedom until the structure of colonialism is completely abolished. Therefore, in order to have peace on earth, it is necessary, as the thirty-two independent African States, including Burundi, have suggested, for the whole world to work to wipe out the last vestiges of colonialism where these still exist.

163. With regard to human rights, it must be said at once that Burundi is one country in the world where the gaols are free of political prisoners. This little democratic country can set an example. Its new Government is fiercely opposed to political imprisonment.

164. Since the fall of the Hitler régime, which made racialism a government policy and a pretext for exterminating millions of human beings, racial prejudice has begun to cause pangs of conscience. All over the world, the idea is spreading that while all men are different from each other, in some respects, and this is one of the fundamental factors in human progress, they are in essence all the same because they all, as human

beings, have the same rights to equal treatment, a decent life and the free development of their physical and intellectual capabilities. The adoption by the United Nations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the adoption by the Council of Europe of the Human Rights Charter^{11/} and the constant practice of the great international organizations bear witness to the vigour and influence of the trends hostile to racialism.

165. But let us have no illusions. The coldly calculated murder of millions of human beings has not succeeded in rooting out racial prejudice, nurtured on mistrust and ill-will against certain ethnic or religious groups simply because they are different in outward appearance or perhaps in their way of life or thought.

166. In the beginning, racialism was a sort of defensive reflex and a means of self-justification. This is particularly true of those peoples who have held others in subjection. In such a situation, it is essential to have a system of rules upholding discrimination for the benefit of the dominant group. It is impossible for a man who must keep a large number of other men under his authority to do so by force alone. He must carry symbols which reinforce the impression of his superiority, although this may not always be real. He needs to find artificial supports to disguise his physical weakness. The subjugated peoples must be cheated into believing that they owe obedience and respect to their conquerors. In short, authority becomes depersonalized, and the subject is won over to the idea that he is obeying not a man but a system, a hierarchy constituting a part, as it were, of the natural order of things.

167. Thus, in its original form, discrimination is not born of racial prejudice. Rather prejudice is born of the practice of discrimination. The pressing and permanent need to justify themselves forces the governing class to invent insignia symbolizing their rank. Skin-colour is the first in a long series of such insignia, others being the nature and degree of civilization.

168. Racial discrimination was born at a time when racial myths were exacerbating hatred among peoples, exalting bellicose patriotism and multiplying wars. Its origin lies in doctrines of racial superiority, which also serve the cause of colonialist expansion and the development of imperialism. Its chief cause is the fear of economic insecurity, the fear of losing prestige. Just as a disease disappears when the virus causing it is killed, so must we, in order to abolish racial discrimination, change the conditions out of which it grew. To eliminate racialism, we must give a more solid foundation to the feeling of personal security. It is a question of education. The Western Powers, and particularly the United States of America which is doing a great deal in this direction, must urge the Republic of South Africa to change its philosophy, lest in the end it sets fire to the African continent and thus threatens the peace of the whole world.

169. Problems of development have brought men to recognize the existence of two zones, the largest of which is marked by a passionate longing for freedom and a desire to catch up economically. It is a part of the world only recently independent or still colonial, a world of hunger and illiteracy. The men who live in it are anxious about the future and nostalgic about the past. Their importance and their future will inevitably grow. One day, their choice and their evolution will determine the course of history. In the meantime,

^{11/} Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, signed at Rome on 4 November 1950.

they turn to the other half of the world, believing that it will help them in their struggle towards speedier economic and cultural development.

170. It is in this context that relations between the unequally developed countries must henceforward be framed. Instead of relations of domination as they were in the past, they must increasingly become relations of solidarity, uniting partners equal in rights and dignity. In order to survive, the profit economy must call upon the assistance of a donor economy. Of course, this goal still seems far off; the resistance of habit and selfishness and the inertia of the established order stand in the way of the bold measures that are needed. Let us hope that the decision is not put off until too late, when it has to be made in haste and confusion, under the pressure of events.

171. In this order of ideas, the United Nations has concentrated its attention on two types of problem: technical assistance and economic development.

172. Technical assistance is one of the foundations of the effort that must be made to enable the underdeveloped countries to provide for their own needs and become less dependent on external aid. The ever-increasing gap between rich and poor countries can be reduced by using present technical knowledge. The acquisition of such knowledge must be encouraged and made easier, and must be kept free from all political considerations. There must be a recognition that in undertaking such action the poor countries risk falling an easy prey to the rich countries. It must be recognized that there is a great temptation for the latter to create a state of dependence which is to their own advantage. In any event, the aid must be such as to introduce not hindrances but elements which are likely to accelerate a prudent course of development. Such at least is the spirit of the new relationship between Burundi and Belgium.

173. Development is a complex problem. It has too many aspects to lend itself to any single approach. It is reflected in an improvement in human life, from both the material and intellectual points of view, whereby men are helped to free themselves from superstition and servitude. In short, it is a transition from a state of mediocrity to a better one.

174. As to the type of development to be sought, much has been said in this Assembly of specialization, integrated development, the paramount importance of industry, and agriculture, financing and many other things. There has even been a discussion of the system most propitious for the development of the less developed countries. Development depends quite as much on the efforts of those countries themselves as on the combined decision of the wealthy countries. Being firmly determined to put an end to their state of poverty, the poorer nations must be able to secure the greatest possible return for the least possible effort from their natural and moral resources as quickly as possible. The wealthier countries must make these efforts less painful by stabilizing commodity prices, removing restrictions on international trade and abolishing all discrimination in this field. In this connexion, the delegation of Burundi looks forward hopefully to the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. ^{12/}

175. In our efforts to raise ourselves to a decent standard of living, our attitude in the United Nations is

governed by both economic and practical considerations. From the economic point of view, our attitude is a reflection of what all the Members of the Organization have affirmed in article 22 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, namely:

"Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality."

From the practical point of view, our attitude is that the infrastructure essential for eventually carrying out projects which economically are reasonably sound can only be built up through non-profit-making investments. The Special Fund provides the answer in this respect. My delegation therefore urges that the Special Fund should be strengthened. Private capital in its traditional form, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development with its present terms of reference, and technical assistance alone cannot provide the answer to our appeal for the liquidation of glaring social inequalities. Our only salvation lies in action which raises the national income or, in other words, helps to increase production. Such results are only achieved by improving methods of production. This in turn can only be done through savings, but savings are non-existence because income is low, and income is low because savings for investment are very low. My delegation believes that the problem of financing infrastructure development—and thus the problem of the Special Fund or of strengthening the Special Fund—must be solved at this session of the General Assembly outside the classic rules of capitalist financing.

176. In essence, the United Nations is a great human experiment directed towards the creation of an international climate favourable to peace and progress. To be successful, the experiment requires proper instruments. Methods which do not produce the required results must be rejected in favour of others which must be found.

177. In any event, Burundi would have preferred the General Assembly to adopt fewer resolutions on Burundi and more on the assistance Burundi is requesting.

178. At San Francisco in 1945, the United Nations Conference on International Organization^{13/} divided the world into agricultural regions, rich or poor, and industrial regions, rich or otherwise. This analysis was still accurate in 1946; it is no longer so in 1963. It was within the framework of this analysis, however, that the United Nations Charter was written. The Charter is based on certain considerations of which some are less pressing now than they were in 1945. Let us not, moreover, forget that certain Powers saw fit to deem themselves peace-loving and that consequently the Charter has been forced to remain inoperative as far as they are concerned up to 1963. Burundi would like to believe that all these countries are really peace-loving. At the same time, it could wish that all the countries of the world shared its opinion.

179. At all events, it is surprising to note that the membership of the organs of the United Nations that was decided upon for a forty-five Member Organization in 1946 remains unchanged today when there are 111 Members. It is somewhat disturbing that the countries

^{12/} The Conference is due to open at Geneva on 23 March 1964.

^{13/} Conference held from 25 April to 26 June 1945.

affected by this situation are those which have always suffered in the history of relations between peoples and civilizations. The situation should be redressed in favour of Africa and Asia, if not by means of an immediate revision of the Charter, at least by creating precedents and making appropriate arrangements.

180. To speak now in general terms, it is high time that the world's capacity to master the forces of nature was matched by a capacity for examining and solving problems relating to the survival and progress of mankind

181. In Burundi we have a saying that Africa is like a tadpole which, as it grows, will become a frog. It is our hope that the present-day world—from the economic point of view so like a tadpole, with an enormous head made up of the rich countries and a tail of poor countries tapering away behind—will grow in the same way. We should like the inequitable world in which we live to have so developed by the end of this decade as to give hope of its final metamorphosis.

182. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): There are no more names on the list of speakers in the general debate for this afternoon. I shall now call on some representatives who have asked to exercise their right of reply.

183. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia): I am taking the floor to answer statements made by the representatives of Malaysia and the United Kingdom on 27 September 1963 [1219th meeting] in reply to my statement delivered the same day. I made it quite clear then that my country felt compelled to withhold recognition of the Federation of Malaysia. However, out of courtesy to the General Assembly and to you, Mr. President and to Ambassador Dato' Ong, whom I personally hold in high esteem, I refer to him as the representative of the Federation of Malaysia. This, of course, should not be construed as a recognition of Malaysia.

184. Although both representatives—worthy of note—stood up in chorus to challenge my statement, I noticed a difference, a natural difference, in the tone in their respective replies. The representative of Malaysia was not as vehement as his colleague from the United Kingdom. I do not think it fitting to use here the word "intemperate" with which Lord Home had characterized my speech. I leave it to the judgement of this august body to decide which statement deserved the adjective "intemperate", that of the representative of the United Kingdom or that of the representative of Indonesia.

185. Coming back to the reply of the representative of Malaysia, I wish first of all to explain why there is disagreement between him and me on who was the father of the concept of Malaysia. Ambassador Dato' Ong explained it was Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman, and the representative of the United Kingdom naturally supported him.

186. Perhaps the two first paragraphs of the introductory section to the report of the Cobbold Commission,^{14/} to which the representative of Malaysia referred several times in his statement, might explain why I disagree. The first paragraph reads:

"The idea of a political association between Malaya, Singapore and the three Borneo territories of North Borneo, Sarawak and Brunei has been discussed for many years."

I repeat, for many years. Now I will quote from the second paragraph:

"On the 27 May 1961, the Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya, Tunku Abdul Rahman, in a speech at a Press luncheon in Singapore, spoke favourably about the possibility of such an association. Tunku Abdul Rahman's constructive proposals were welcomed by the British Government."

There is therefore no denying that Tunku Abdul Rahman's proposals were a favourable reaction to an idea which was hatched by many years of previous discussions. By whom, this Assembly would ask? Should we, out of courtesy, exclude Britain? And why did the British Government welcome those proposals? The answer is simply because they fit perfectly into the scheme of British neo-colonialist policies.

187. And what was, one may ask, the prime objective of that acceptance? We can find it in the introductory section of the Cobbold Commission's report, in paragraph 6 of the statement signed jointly by Prime Minister Macmillan and Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman almost two years ago—to be exact, on 23 November 1961. And I challenge the representative of the United Kingdom to accuse me again of distortion when I quote from that statement:

"The Government of the Federation of Malaysia will afford to the Government of the United Kingdom the right to continue to maintain bases at Singapore for the purpose of assisting in the defence of Malaysia, and for Commonwealth defence"—and this is important—"and for the preservation of peace in South-East Asia."

That is our region. Nobody, Indonesia included, wishes to contest the right of Malaya—there was no Malaysia then—to conclude military agreements with the United Kingdom, and we are also prepared to understand that Malaya, as a member of the Commonwealth, agreed to co-operate in its defence. That is natural.

188. If we were to accept Ambassador Dato' Ong's contention that the idea of the Federation of Malaysia was conveyed by the Prime Minister of Malaya, how could Tunku Abdul Rahman justify his usurpation of the right to act for the peoples of Sarawak, Sabah and Brunei, whose territories did not belong to Malaya and whose wishes had not been ascertained? If we are to accept Ambassador Dato' Ong's contention that the idea of the Federation of Malaysia was conveyed by the Prime Minister of Malaya, how could Malaya justify its commitment made, a priori, almost two years ago that Sarawak, Brunei and Sabah would also be bound to the United Kingdom by a military agreement at the moment they were to be granted independence? Who gave Malaya the right to determine the destiny of peoples and territories not belonging to it? Was there perhaps some pressure from the side of the British, just a little bit of pressure? For Britain to want its colonies to be bound to it by a military agreement immediately after their independence, well, who would not understand it. It is plain neo-colonialism, it is the identification of decolonization with its own military interests, not to speak of its economic and political interests. And is it not great to be in a position to present it as the consequence of a respectable wish of Malaya to establish Malaysia?

189. And most important of all, how could Malaya, and now Malaysia, and I am very sorry about that, justify to its sister-nation in South East Asia, Indonesia, its

^{14/} Report of the Commission of Enquiry, North Borneo and Sarawak, 1962, London, H.M. Stationery Office, Cmnd., 1794.

commitment to "afford to the Government of the United Kingdom . . . to continue to maintain bases at Singapore . . . for the preservation of peace in South-East Asia"—our region—in other words, for the preservation of Pax Britannica in our region? We may understand Malaya's present need to identify Pax Malaysiana with Pax Britannica. That we can understand. But would it not have been an expression of friendly, neighbourly relations for Malaya to have consulted Indonesia first to find out whether this serious intrusion in our region was acceptable to the Indonesian Government? What would happen if Pax Britannica clashed with Pax Indonesiana?

190. In all fairness to Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman, his attitude in Manila convinced us that he wanted a genuinely independent Malaysia. We were convinced, but he established Malaysia in co-operation with the United Kingdom, which undeniably succeeded in identifying the decolonization of Sarawak and Sabah with its military and other interests. That is undeniable.

191. Thus, when in his statement the British Foreign Secretary said straight to me that my attack on British policy was just a transparent cloak which could not conceal that its real target was Malaysia, the representative of the United Kingdom almost hit the target. By listening more closely to my speech, however, he would have discovered that my attack was aimed at the British flavour that is attached to Malaysia. But even with this British flavour, which is honestly a little too strong for us, the Philippines and Indonesia were already prepared to welcome the establishment of Malaysia, if only the genuine wishes of the peoples of Sarawak and Sabah could be ascertained by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the basis of a fresh approach, as required by the Manila Accord.

192. Now there is evidently a basic difference among the countries concerned regarding the interpretation and evaluation of the task of the observers as provided in the Manila agreement. Malaysia and the United Kingdom think that the observers should only witness the work of the United Nations teams, and find out whether the teams were doing their job well. The Philippines and Indonesia, had full confidence in the Secretary-General, but they had serious apprehensions about the role they expected the colonial authorities would play in making the people of Sarawak and Sabah act the way the authorities wanted them to. The reports of the Philippine and Indonesian observers amply justified these apprehensions.

193. In my statement on 27 September 1963 I said:

"Anyone who has lived under colonial conditions knows that it is not difficult for the authorities to make people answer questions exactly in the way required. Very often the mere presence of armed soldiers or police will suffice . . . In General, only those who are members of a militant freedom movement"—and this Africa and Asia know very well—"dare to defy the intimidation of a show of force. With this in mind, the investigators, in adopting a fresh approach towards ascertaining the wishes of the people, should have tried to make reasonably sure . . . that the persons questioned were relatively . . . free from official pressure. And then they should also have tried to see that the hearing took place without any colonial authorities, troops or police present."
[1219th meeting, para. 107.]

194. This is the reason why the assessments mentioned in the Cobbold Commission report, the result

of the recent elections in Sabah and Sarawak and even the report of the United Nations teams—all of them used by Ambassador Dato' Ong to fortify his arguments—could not have convinced us that the genuine wishes of the people of Sabah and Sarawak have been assessed. Therefore, I wish to repeat what I said last Friday:

"I can assure you that my Government, for one, is still in doubt. It is not that we are denying the possibility of the British Borneo peoples being in favour of joining Malaysia . . . For if this were genuinely the case, Indonesia and the Philippines would, as we wrote in the Accord, welcome Malaysia." [Ibid., para. 108.]

But we are not reasonably sure now. In fact, I wished we could be as sure about Sarawak and Sabah as we now are expected to be with regard to Singapore after the elections there.

195. Although the representative of Malaysia so painstakingly tried to use the conclusion of the Secretary-General to justify the proclamation of Malaysia, he nevertheless failed to explain away effectively the fact that the fixing of Malaysia Day for 16 September was done irrespective—I repeat irrespective—of the findings of the United Nations team. To fix 16 September as Malaysia Day on 29 August, while the work of the United Nations team was still in progress, made the investigation totally meaningless.

196. In his conclusions, the Secretary-General himself regretted this fact because, according to him, it has brought only confusion, misunderstanding and resentment. It is rather incongruous that the representative of Malaysia is now in such a jubilant mood about the report of the United Nations team and the conclusion of the Secretary-General, whereas the British-Malayan announcement on 29 August 1963 made it meaningless.

197. Permit me now to deal with some allegations made by the representative of the United Kingdom. He alleged that I used "rather devious and furtive and oblique methods" to impugn the integrity of the Secretary-General and his teams. If the British Foreign Secretary would take the trouble to read my written statement, he would find out that these big words are the unhappy fruits of bad listening. And if he would also inquire at the right place whether my statement was felt as an effort to impugn one's integrity, the British nobleman would perhaps consider a withdrawal of his allegation.

198. Now a word about the imposition of federations on people against their will. We of course congratulate Australia, Canada and Nigeria that their federations were welcomed by their people, perhaps even initiated by their people. But can the representative of the United Kingdom say in honesty that the native majority of the Central African Federation wanted the Federation? No, it was imposed upon them and they wanted to get rid of it as soon as they had the power to do so. And how about the British conceived but rejected—rejected by the people itself—Federation of East Africa? And did Britain not try unsuccessfully to bring into a federation countries like Jamaica and Barbados and Tobago?

199. And can the representative of the United Kingdom deny the similarity of Britain's policy regarding Malaysia with the policy it is carrying out in South Arabia, where it federated several Sultanates, Sheikdoms and Emirates with Aden, its military base in that extremely strategically important area of the world? Is the resentment and hostility of the neighbouring Arab and African countries not serious enough to be a warning to Britain?

200. We appreciate the assurance of the British Foreign Secretary that his country wishes to be friendly with my country at all times. We respect Britain and we reciprocate wholeheartedly the sentiments expressed by Lord Home. But is it not a little too much for Britain to expect from Indonesia that it would differ from all other newly freed countries in its appraisal and rejection of what it considers as neo-colonialism?

201. Finally, the representative of the United Kingdom was quite wrong when he thought that I would be wise enough not to speak about the riots and the assaults on the British Embassy in Djakarta. I am even prepared to speak about the adjective "uncivilized" which was used by the British Foreign Office to characterize these riots. They were riots.

202. First of all I would like to establish that, notwithstanding the violently-aroused sentiments of the people by British neo-colonialism, nobody has been killed. I repeat, nobody has been killed. Can that be said of other riots in the world? The British Government, evidently completely unwarrantedly, evacuated women and children. Yes, there were demonstrations, violent demonstrations.

203. Indeed, my people is not a nation of sheep, and they felt instinctively that their anger should be directed to the British rather than to the Malayan Embassy. My Government has not condoned, but has condemned the burning of the British Embassy as an excessive expression of the people's anger. And let it be equally clear that not one man was killed by the mob, uncontrolled as it became. Very soon the Government had the entire situation completely under control.

204. And what about our behaviour, characterized by the British as uncivilized? Our aroused rioters did not kill, did not even hurt, women and children. What did civilized Britain do during the Suez crisis and earlier in Kenya, to take only two examples? How many women and children were then killed? Perhaps Britain would call it uncivilized for us to compare the spontaneous demonstrations in Djakarta with the calculated war in Suez and their colonial policy of killing Mau Mau people whose greatest crime was their desire for "uhuru", for freedom.

205. But how is Britain to explain the civilized conditions found in the burned-down British Chancery? It came out—and this will certainly surprise you, Mr. President—that without any permit or licence from the Indonesian Government, and entirely against diplomatic rules, military weapons, such as Bren guns, mausers and a considerable quantity of ammunition, were stored in the building. For what purpose?

206. Mrs. PANDIT (India): It is a matter of deep regret to my delegation that the foreign Minister of Pakistan has chosen to make serious allegations against my country, allegations which are full of inaccuracies and mis-statements. During the seventeenth session, also, the delegation of Pakistan made similar allegations which we then refuted. One of the points just raised has been under consideration of another principal organ of the United Nations for several years. I should like to remind the members that it was India who brought the complaint to the United Nations. I would have preferred not to burden the Assembly with another detailed reply but in order to keep the record straight, and lest our silence be misconstrued, I am obliged to answer the allegations that have just been made.

207. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Bhutto, has said that the central issue in Kashmir is that of

self-determination and that both parties had accepted this. I would like to deny categorically here and now this assertion of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. And I would like to add, with all the authority of the Government of India, that the issue in Kashmir is one of aggression, of Pakistani aggression, committed in 1947 and 1948 and which continues to this day.

208. Pakistan would have the world believe that the Kashmir question began with the resolution of January 1949.^{15/} The truth is sometimes embarrassing and this story has an ugly beginning for which reason, no doubt, Pakistan finds it inconvenient to call attention to it. It is necessary for me to crave your indulgence, Mr. President, to remind representatives that the Kashmir story began with attempts by Pakistan to place an economic stranglehold on the state of Jammu and Kashmir immediately after the withdrawal of the British from India.

209. When economic pressure proved unavailing, Pakistan encouraged tribal raiders to pass through its territory and start a reign of plunder, arson, rape and murder with a view to terrorizing the Kashmiris into submitting to Pakistan rule. For those who have no knowledge of that terrain, I would like to explain that it would have been the easiest thing in the world to stop those raiders at the two bridges connecting Pakistani territory with Kashmir. All our appeals to Pakistan to prevent the raiders from coming in having proved unsuccessful, it was India who brought the case to the Security Council. When the case was first argued in the Security Council, the then Foreign Minister of Pakistan made a categorical statement he said:

"... The Pakistan Government emphatically deny that they are giving aid and assistance to the so-called invaders or have committed any act of aggression against India. On the contrary and solely with the object of maintaining friendly relations between the two Dominions, the Pakistan Government have continued to do all in their power to discourage the tribal movement by all means short of war."^{16/}

When, however, the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan arrived in India in July 1948, facts could no longer be suppressed and the same Foreign Minister had then to admit that regular units of the Pakistan army had been fighting in Kashmir since May 1948.

210. The Commission then accepted that the presence of Pakistan troops in Jammu and Kashmir constituted a material change in the situation from that earlier represented by the Government of Pakistan, which was a polite way of saying that Pakistan earlier had misrepresented the situation at the United Nations.

211. We had of course known that the so-called raiders which had entered Kashmir from Pakistan were Pakistani volunteers all along. Later, Sir Owen Dixon, eminent Australian jurist and United Nations representative for India and Pakistan, expressed the view that the entry of hostile elements into the territory of Jammu and Kashmir in October 1947 "was contrary to international law".^{17/} Therefore, after the Commission's finding, India would have been perfectly justified in urg-

^{15/} Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Supplement for January, 1949, document S/1196, para. 15.

^{16/} Ibid., Third Year, Supplement for November 1948, document S/1100, annex 6, document I, para. 3.

^{17/} Ibid., Fifth Year, Supplement for September through December 1950, document S/1791, para. 21.

ing that, her case having been proved, the United Nations should arrange to vacate Pakistan aggression or otherwise India would be forced to do so in self-defence. But in the hope of peace with a people who had been, until a few months earlier, our compatriots, and at the urgings of certain Western Powers, we accepted certain compromises. One of them was a cease fire—and this at the time when Indian forces were advancing; the second was that, if the United Nations was able to ensure Pakistan's complete withdrawal from the State of Jammu and Kashmir, we would accept Pakistan's demand for a plebiscite. It is necessary to make it clear that that plebiscite was spoken of in the limited context of a compromise formula, and this is quite clear in the relevant United Nations resolutions. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan quoted paragraph 1 of the January 1949 resolution, but he conveniently left out paragraph 2 of that resolution. I will, with your permission, read this paragraph out to you:

"A plebiscite will be held when it shall be found by the Commission that the cease-fire and truce arrangements set forth in Parts I and II of the Commission's resolution of 13 August 1948 have been carried out and arrangements for the plebiscite have been completed."^{18/}

212. Now, what are these parts I and II of the Commission's resolution of 13 August 1948 which were a precondition to a plebiscite? Part I deals with the cease fire and part II refers to the truce agreement under which the United Nations was to secure the total withdrawal of Pakistan regulars and "volunteers", and not until this had been completed were arrangements for a plebiscite to be undertaken which would include the withdrawal of the bulk of Indian forces, but not the whole of them. India was sovereign in Jammu and Kashmir and there was no question of India's complete withdrawal.

213. This compromise formula, which is now mixed up by Pakistan with the question of self-determination, was not implemented because Pakistan refused to withdraw its forces from Jammu and Kashmir and tried, in further futile negotiations, to achieve a position of equality with India in Kashmir. After Pakistan sabotaged the compromise formula, India would have again been justified in renewing hostilities, and it was this fear on the part of Pakistan which at that time led them to sign a military pact with the United States of America, in 1954, to strengthen their position—not for defence against communism, but to secure the fruits of their aggression against India. Fifteen years have elapsed since the compromise formula had been arranged. Pakistan deliberately chose not to comply with these resolutions. It is not possible now to proceed on the basis of these resolutions. As Mr. Jarring has stated in his report to the Security Council dated 29 April 1957:

"... the implementation of international agreements of an *ad hoc* character which has not been achieved fairly speedily may become progressively more difficult because the situation with which they were to cope has tended to change."^{19/}

That is precisely what has happened. It is too late for Pakistan now to suggest getting back to the situation which existed in 1948 and 1949.

^{18/} *Ibid.*, Fourth Year, Supplement for January 1949, document S/1196, para. 15.

^{19/} *Ibid.*, Twelfth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1957, document S/3821, para. 21.

214. As regards India's sovereignty in Kashmir and the legality of accession, neither India nor Pakistan, nor for that matter the United Kingdom, can question it, as they were all parties to the Indian Independence Act of 1947. The State's accession to India cannot be challenged on the legal plane. India's sovereignty in Kashmir stems from the act of accession and is complete and total. Proposals for a settlement of the question in the interest of harmony cannot ever extinguish that sovereignty. Even this year we made certain proposals to Pakistan to settle the issue, but that cannot mean that our sovereignty in Kashmir was compromised. It is relevant to point out that at the 240th meeting of the Security Council, Mr. Warren Austin, the then representative of the United States, said:

"This is an affair between nations, and with the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India, this foreign sovereignty went over to India and is exercised by India, and that is how India happens to be here as a petitioner."^{20/}

215. It is in the exercise of this sovereignty in Kashmir that India has had to come into conflict with China in north-eastern Kashmir. One has only to compare this exercise of sovereignty with Pakistan's surrender of territory to China from that part of Kashmir which is under its illegal occupation. Their lack of concern for the integrity of Kashmir is also apparent from the fact that they blame us for not agreeing to a similar compromise with China by surrendering Ladakh. It is so easy to be charitable with other people's territory.

216. The principle of self-determination has been accepted by the General Assembly and India has been one of its strongest supporters. It does not, however, apply to the present case, since it is not applicable to a section of a people. It applies to all those territories where, by force of arms or by the vicissitudes of history, people are held under an alien power. If the policy of self-determination were to apply to parts of constitutionally created States, most of them would be broken up. The plea of self-determination in a plural society could mean nothing but disruption. And may I add that most of the new States in Asia and Africa fall into this category. That is why, I venture to suggest, the United Nations tried so hard to prevent the secession of Katanga on the plea of self-determination. Even the older States would not be safe.

217. If religion is the criterion for self-determination, are we to separate Catholics from Protestants in Europe and in America, or Muslims from Christians in the Near East or in Africa? Self-determination cannot be merely a process of disintegration or fragmentation. When self-determination is applied to minorities in a nation-State, often new minorities are created. It is interesting to recall that Prime Minister Suhrawardy of Pakistan declared in 1956 that the creation of Pakistan, despite the presence of 9 million non-Muslims in that country, put an end to the two-nation theory on the basis of which Pakistan was created. He said: "All of us, Muslims and non-Muslims, are Pakistanis first and last." This illustrates that now either Pakistanis do not believe in the two-nation theory or that self-determination is not the right of a new minority.

218. May I crave your indulgence, Mr. President, to draw the attention of the Assembly to certain relevant facts? Did Pakistan permit the people of the Princely States in Pakistan to exercise the right of self-

^{20/} *Ibid.*, Third Year, Nos. 7-15, 240th meeting, p. 371.

determination after the Ruler acceded to Pakistan? As was disclosed in the West Pakistan High Court a few years ago, the accession of the State of Bahawalpur was forced on the Ruler of that State. The Khan of Kalat revolted against accession and was arrested and detained in 1958. In neither case was the principle of self-determination applied. When Pakistan purchased the territory of Gwadur from the Sultan of Muscat, what happened to Pakistan's solicitous regard for the people's right to self-determination? No opportunity was given to the people of Gwadur to say whether in the second half of this, the twentieth century, they wished to be bought like cattle. Is Pakistan prepared to grant the right of self-determination to the Pakhtoons?

219. Self-determination is a democratic process. There has not been a single general election in Pakistan itself since its creation in 1947, even on the comparatively limited franchise which obtained in British days. The President of Pakistan has repeatedly said that the people of Pakistan are not fit to exercise such democratic rights, and after fourteen years of independence the people are now being educated in basic democracy. It is gratifying to find that Pakistan considers Kashmiris to be more fitted for the democratic right of such self-expression, even though they had no experience of it in the earlier British days.

220. Pakistan, by not withdrawing its troops, blocked a plebiscite which would have been the second stage of the implementation of the United Nations resolution. The people of Kashmir, who could not wait for ever, therefore, framed their own Constitution through a Constituent Assembly elected on the basis of universal adult franchise and ratified the Ruler's accession. This is certainly a much more widespread exercise of democratic rights than has ever been practised in Pakistan. During the same period it would be well to note that the Pakistanis, instead of moving forward on the road to democracy, have actually moved backwards and discarded even the limited practice of representative institutions developed under the British.

221. The solicitude of Pakistan for the self-determination of Kashmiris might have been better appreciated had some measure of self-determination been extended to territories under Pakistan's own control. It is ironic that a Government that has denied the democratic rights of universal and direct suffrage to its own people, a Government that says that parliamentary democracy is not suited to the genius of its own people, should advocate self-determination for the people of a neighbouring country which has had elections on a universal adult franchise three times since independence.

222. If Pakistan really believes in the principle of self-determination, why did it invade the state of Kashmir in the first place? The demand for the self-determination of Sudeten Germans was followed by an attack on Czechoslovakia by Nazi Germany. Pakistan chose to follow the reverse procedure: only when aggression in Kashmir failed did Pakistan become a champion of self-determination for the Kashmiris.

223. I come now to the question of Pakistan's fear of India, about which we hear so constantly. I am grateful to the Foreign Minister of Pakistan for saying that:

"No country regrets more deeply than mine the outbreak of border conflict between its two giant neighbours, China and India." [1220th meeting, para. 25.]

This is in refreshing contrast to what has been stated by his colleague, Pakistan's Central Minister for Information, not so very long ago. He said:

"The world had seen that the so-called Sino-Indian war has been no more than a mock fight on which India wanted to cash in for boosting her armies and diverting the attention of her people from internal problems."

It is, therefore, good to know that the Foreign Minister now says that "this conflict has been a matter of deep and direct concern to us. Its repercussions have complicated the problems of our own security". He further expressed his belief that the dispute can be resolved peacefully.

224. As he is well aware, six non-aligned countries did attempt a peaceful solution in a conference in Colombo. India accepted these proposals but China refused to accept them. We have not seen any criticism from Pakistan for this Chinese rejection of the Colombo proposals. The Foreign Minister, however, views "... with deep apprehension ... the radical alteration in the delicate military balance ... by the augmentation of India's military strength" [*Ibid.*]. He says:

"Our fears of the resulting danger to the security of Pakistan are not purely psychological; they are deeply rooted in history and flow from the evidence of India's readiness to resort to military force to settle disputes with its neighbours. Similar fears have also been voiced in other countries of the region." [*Ibid.*]

We have not heard of any such fears expressed by any of our neighbours other than China. The only other country which expressed concern at the augmentation of India's military strength is Pakistan. The Foreign Minister speaks of the delicate military balance of the region and he views with deep apprehension an alteration in this balance. There was no such deep apprehension of the alteration in the delicate military balance of the region by Pakistan when it sought and obtained substantial military aid during the last few years. According to United States press reports the military aid from the United States during this period has been of the order of \$1,300 million. Not even a tenth of that amount has so far come as military aid to India, a country with about five times the population of Pakistan. Yet this aid from friendly countries in our hour of need, for which we are deeply grateful, has made Pakistanis, in the words of an American journalist "hysterically anti-American".

225. Pakistan's security is guaranteed by military pacts with two great Powers who are committed to come to its help in the event of an attack on it. How can a State with such strong guarantees from two great Powers and maintaining, with outside assistance, armed forces out of all proportion to its size and defensive requirements, fear an attack from India which is under threat of a country which has the largest conventional army in the world.

226. That Pakistan's fear of India is obviously not genuine is proved by the fact that Pakistan has consistently refused the standing offer of India for a "no-war" pact to be registered in the United Nations and without prejudice to its position in Kashmir. If Pakistan were really afraid of India, is it not reasonable to expect that it would have welcomed such a no-war declaration?

227. Pakistan obviously wants to settle Indo-Pakistan disputes by recourse to force. India has given the clearest assurances to Pakistan that the arms supplied by the United States and the Commonwealth would not be used against it. That apparently does not satisfy Pakistan. What more can we do to reassure Pakistan? Pakistan has never given any such assurance to us in regard to the massive military aid which it has received over the last ten years. Rather, it resented America's assurance to us that United States military aid would not be allowed to be used against India. As a matter of fact, when Pakistan used American arms in fighting on the Afghan border, President Ayub strongly criticized the United States for having questioned the use of American arms for that purpose. "Do they expect us to put them in cotton wool?" he asked.

228. A country which once claimed to be the greatest crusader against communism, which joined alliances with the avowed object of containing communism and obtained military aid on that ground, apparently has no qualms of conscience now in contracting a marriage of convenience with the People's Republic of China, which is the only country in the world today which believes in the inevitability of war and is prepared to wage aggressive wars in furtherance of its national policy. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan recently informed the Pakistan National Assembly that Pakistan had got some assurance from the largest State of Asia—obviously referring to the People's Republic of China—that it would come to Pakistan's aid in case of a confrontation between Pakistan and India. Apparently, Pakistan has now greater faith in Chinese promises than in the South-East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO). From SEATO to the Sino-Pakistan Agreement is indeed a remarkable metamorphosis. It does not require much imagination to discern in this strange alliance the common objective of keeping India militarily weak in order that it may be unable to resist aggression.

229. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has deliberately misrepresented the facts by saying that India has been expelling tens of thousands of Muslim citizens of India across the border into East Pakistan. The truth is just the opposite. There are about 50 million Muslims now living in India, 3 million of whom are in Kashmir.

230. As the Indian census figures for 1961 will show, during the period 1951 to 1961, there was an increase of 25.6 per cent in the population of Muslims in India against an over-all increase in population in India of 21.5 per cent. Does this show that we are driving out Muslims from India? Not only is no Indian Muslim leaving India; the fact is that Pakistani Muslims in large numbers have been infiltrating into the surrounding Indian States of West Bengal, Assam and Tripura. This is clearly proved by Pakistan census figures. It will be seen from these figures that the Muslim population in East Pakistan increased by 26 per cent during the period 1951 to 1961. It is significant, however, to note the much smaller increase in some of the districts of East Pakistan bordering India. Noakhali had an increase of only 4.7 per cent, Comilla 15.4 per cent, Bakarganj 16.8 per cent and Sylhet indicated a rise of only 13.9 per cent against the over-all provincial increase of 26 per cent. The Indian census figures for the neighbouring border districts of Indian States are complementary and reveal that the population of Muslims in Tripura rose by 68 per cent and that there was an increase of 200 per cent in the Muslim population

of Darjeeling, 74 per cent in Dinajpur, 62 per cent in Malda, 63 per cent in Nadia, 49 per cent in Garo Hills and 88 per cent in Khasi and Jaintia districts. These figures speak for themselves and are indeed very telling when compared with the increase in the Muslim population of 25.6 per cent in India as a whole. Every natural demographic consideration will show that this big increase could only have been possible by large-scale influx from neighbouring districts in East Pakistan, particularly from those districts which, according to the Pakistan census figures, show an abnormally low increase in population.

231. These statistics prove conclusively that there has been no pressure against Muslims in India, but there has been in fact a large infiltration of Pakistani Muslims into India. This has created a difficult economic and political problem for us.

232. As I have already pointed out, the Pakistan census figures show that the population of Muslims in East Pakistan increased by 26 per cent. The population of Hindus, however, remained virtually constant during the entire ten-year period. The total population of Hindus as shown in the 1951 census of Pakistan was 9.2 million. The total population of Hindus in East Pakistan, according to the 1961 census, was 9.4 million. If the Hindu population had increased approximately in the same proportion as the Muslims, there would have been an increase of roughly 2.25 million. How does one explain this lack of increase in the Hindu population? Our records show that about 2.5 million Hindus were forced out from East Pakistan into Indian territories as refugees, and this is the only possible explanation as to why the Hindu population in East Pakistan has remained stationary.

233. The Government of Pakistan, ever since its creation, has followed a communal policy based on the pernicious two-nation theory. It is as a result of this policy that 2.25 million Hindus have been forced to flee East Pakistan during the period 1951 to 1961. This policy has a double advantage for Pakistan. In the first place, it helps Pakistan to get rid of its Hindu population from East Pakistan, the Hindus from West Pakistan having been already practically eliminated. Secondly, it helps to make East Pakistan equal in population to the Western wing. Of Pakistan's 93 million people, 51 million, including 9 million Hindus, live in 55,000 square miles of East Pakistan and 42 million live in 320,000 square miles of West Pakistan. If 9 million Hindus could be squeezed out, the population in the two wings would be equal and would then be a strong argument for West Pakistan's insistence on parity with East Pakistan in the matter of representation in the National Assembly.

234. Mr. President, the Indian Muslim is very well able to look after himself and needs no protection whatsoever from the Government of Pakistan. If that Government must show solicitude for the well-being of Muslims who are not their own nationals, they could more profitably use their good offices with their friends of the Government of the People's Republic of China, not to persecute or drive out Muslims from Sinkiang.

235. Mr. BHUTTO (Pakistan): The Pakistan delegation does not wish to enter into a debate of recrimination and slander. We have done our best, in our own moderate and proper fashion, to try to impress upon this audience the importance of the settlement of the dispute on Kashmir as a fundamental problem, as a problem that affects the peace and stability of Asia. It is my duty, unfortunately, to take this rostrum again

to refute the distortions and allegations that have been made against the Government of Pakistan.

236. First of all, with your permission, I should like to deal with the question of infiltration—a matter which we consider to be a deliberate policy of eviction of Indian Muslim citizens from India into Pakistan. I would declare here before you that the question whether these people are being evicted or whether they are infiltrators can be decided by a United Nations inquiry commission, by an international inquiry commission, by a Commonwealth inquiry commission, or by any third-party commission agreed to by India and Pakistan. These are ascertainable facts. It can be ascertained by any inquiry commission whether these unfortunate, helpless people driven by the Indian bayonet into Pakistan are Indians or Pakistanis. That is a verifiable fact. The submission of the Government of Pakistan to the Government of India has been that it should kindly stop this genocide and permit its citizens, who have a right under the Indian constitution to live in peace and tranquillity on Indian soil, to decide where they want to live. However, these people, because they are Muslims, because the sin they have committed is to have been born with a different religion, are being deliberately driven from their homes and hearths into Pakistan.

237. We have again and again appealed to the Government of India to hold a ministerial conference on the subject, to hold a high level conference on the subject or to allow an inquiry commission to determine the future of these poor, innocent people driven out of their homes, but so far these appeals have fallen on deaf ears. The Government of India has refused to permit a solution of this human problem. These helpless people from the states of Assam and Tripura are being driven out of India into East Pakistan, only because they happen to be born Muslims, although they are Indian citizens and, under the Indian constitution, have the same protection of equal rights as the other citizens of India. I repeat from this rostrum of the United Nations General Assembly that Pakistan is prepared, here and now, to accept an international inquiry commission into the matter, a United Nations inquiry commission, a Commonwealth inquiry commission or any other third-party commission mutually agreed upon by India and Pakistan, to investigate and determine the future of these unfortunate citizens who are being driven from their homes.

238. We are told that this is a convenient attempt by the Government of Pakistan to reduce its own population so as to remove the disparity in population between East Pakistan and West Pakistan, in order to enable equal representation in the National Assembly of Pakistan on the basis of parity between West Pakistan and East Pakistan. That is an admission of the fact that there have been elections in Pakistan, that there is a National Assembly in Pakistan. In fact there have been not only one election but three elections in Pakistan as in the great State of India, for Pakistan and India became independent at precisely the same time.

239. I would now refer to the question of Kashmir. It has been said that the central issue in Kashmir is not that of self-determination but that of the aggression committed by Pakistan in the years 1948 and 1949. That is not a new charge. Indian charges of Pakistan's aggression were heard by the Security Council and rejected when it decided that the question of Kashmir's accession should be decided by the Kashmiris themselves. That decision was accepted by India. Can India

now go back on its acceptance of the United Nations resolutions, which were adopted after a full hearing was given to India's charges? Under what notion of justice can a so-called aggression by Pakistan justify the denial to the Kashmiri people of their natural right to determine their own future? I should like to quote some of the statements of the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, on the question of a plebiscite in Kashmir. The Prime Minister of India said on 27 October 1947:

"I should like to make it clear that the question of aiding Kashmir in this emergency is not designed in any way to influence the State to accede to India. Our view, which we have repeatedly made public, is that the question of accession in any disputed territory or State must be decided in accordance with wishes of the people and we adhere to this view."

The Prime Minister of India also said on 2 November 1947:

"We were anxious not to finalize anything in a moment of crisis and without the fullest opportunity to the people of Kashmir to have their say. It was for them ultimately to decide.

"And here let me make clear that it has been our policy all along that where there is a dispute about the accession of a State to either Dominion, the decision must be made by the people of that State. It was in accordance with this policy that we added a proviso to the Instrument of Accession of Kashmir."

240. The Indian representative in the Security Council said on 15 January 1948:

"The question of the future status of Kashmir vis-à-vis her neighbours and the world at large, and a further question, namely, whether she should withdraw from her accession to India, and either accede to Pakistan or remain independent, with a right to claim admission as a Member of the United Nations—all this we have recognized to be a matter for unfettered decision by the people of Kashmir, after normal life is restored to them."^{21/}

241. The following was stated by the Prime Minister of India in a letter dated 11 September 1951 addressed to the United Nations representatives:

"... the Government of India not only reaffirms its acceptance of the principle that the question of the continuing accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India shall be decided through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite under the auspices of the United Nations, but is anxious that the conditions necessary for such a plebiscite should be created as quickly as possible."^{22/}

242. Then, again, the Prime Minister of India stated in a broadcast to the Indian nation on 2 November 1947:

"We have declared that the fate of Kashmir is ultimately to be decided by the people. That pledge we have given not only to the people of Kashmir but to the world. We will not and cannot back out of it."

243. That is the pledge given by no less a person than the Prime Minister of India to his own people, to the people of Pakistan and to the world at large, both from his own country and in the Security Council of the United Nations. Now we are told that Pakistan has committed aggression in Kashmir. If Pakistan has committed a

^{21/} Ibid., 240th meeting, p. 29.

^{22/} Ibid., Sixth Year, Special Supplement No. 2, document S/2375/Rev.1, annex 3, para. 4.

wrong against the people of Kashmir, let the people of Kashmir themselves decide whether it is Pakistan that has committed any wrong against them or whether it is the people and Government of India which have usurped their territory and committed vandalistic plunder against the people of Kashmir. That is for the Kashmiris themselves to decide. It is not for Pakistan or India to decide whether the Kashmiris want to accede to Pakistan or India.

244. Pakistan does not want Kashmir. We do not say that Kashmir should automatically become a part of Pakistan. We say that the people of Kashmir, like the people of any part of Asia or Africa, should have the right of self-determination, that they should decide their own future in a free and impartial way, in a manner which not only the people of Kashmir want but to which the Governments of both India and Pakistan have agreed in the United Nations by two resolutions of the Security Council.^{23/} These two resolutions of the Security Council are now being repudiated, firstly, on the grounds that this would mean "Katangazation" of India, and that a pluralistic State like India would not like to see the "Katangazation" of its country. Nor would we like to see the break-up of our neighbour. Nobody would like to see the "Balkanization" of a State. But this is not a question of Katanga or of the "Balkanization" of India. After independence, the rulers of the princely states had to decide the future of these states in consultation with the wishes of the people. There is no analogy whatsoever between the "Balkanization" of a country and the exercise of the right of self-determination which has been recognized accepted by the other States concerned and, in this case, agreed to by the Government of India here and before the world at large.

245. However, another reason has been advanced: that conditions have changed. The doctrine of rebus sic stantibus has been invoked by the Government of India in regard to the international agreement of Kashmir. It will be recalled that the doctrine of rebus sic stantibus, which has no respect for agreements solemnly arrived at, which shows contempt for agreements entered into by sovereign States, has usually been advanced by aggressive States, by States like Nazi Germany, which tore up agreements on the pretext that conditions had changed.

246. Is it for India to be a judge of its own cause? If conditions have really changed, it has to be objectively established by an impartial body. Well, let an impartial body objectively ascertain whether conditions have changed. It is not something to be appraised subjectively according to the whim and fancy of the Government of India, which has committed aggression against the people of Jammu and Kashmir and does not permit the people of Jammu and Kashmir to exercise the right of self-determination.

247. Shaikh Muhammed Abdullah, the great leader of Kashmir, languishes in gaol. For the last ten years, this great leader of the people of Kashmir has been rotting in the gaols of India. In that decade, we have seen many nations become free. A decade is a long period. To have the leader of a people in gaol for ten years is far too long. Men die, children enter into maturity—and during all that time this great leader has been rotting in gaol, and the conscience of the world has not been aroused. The world is so conscious of the

voluntary imprisonment of a Cardinal in Hungary that the President of a country has to mention it. When a great leader of Algeria is in gaol for five years, the whole world is aroused. But here is the case of a great leader of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, who has been languishing in gaol for the last ten years—and not a word is uttered, not a whisper is heard.

248. The hands of India are soiled with the blood of the people of Kashmir. Let their conscience be clear on this matter. Let them release Shaikh Abdullah. Let them hold a free and impartial plebiscite.

249. I shall quote from The Times of London on the question of Shaikh Abdullah's detention:

"The trial of Shaikh Abdullah, former Prime Minister of Kashmir, drags on in Jammu, and the hearing of charges of criminal conspiracy is moving more slowly than anybody could have expected—except those who believe that the Government is interested, not in a conviction, but in continued imprisonment for a man who, if released, would still be a potent force in Kashmir. The tenth anniversary of the Shaikh's first arrest was two weeks ago and he has been in gaol ever since except for four months in 1958.

"The charges of conspiracy were formulated after his re-arrest in 1958, but the trial began only a year ago. Then the defence was hopefully calculating that twelve months would see the prosecution case completed, although it was known that the State would produce about 250 witnesses. In fact, the past year has seen only a tenth of that number of witnesses completing their evidence.

"At the beginning of this year, speaking for himself and his colleagues in the dock (there are 24 accused persons), the Shaikh protested against the 'unconscionable prolongation' of the trial. He said that he believed the State had spent about £2,600,000 on the case and that he was unable to meet the mounting costs of defence.

"In June, the senior prosecuting counsel, Mr. N. S. Pande"—not the defence counsel, but the senior prosecuting counsel—"retired from the case. He said that the money for his fees could be better used. The trial, he said, could go on for another five to seven years."

250. All we ask for in Kashmir is that India honour its pledge. India should stand by its pledge, and no pretext should be advanced to interfere with a humanitarian outcome of this dispute. The people of Kashmir, like the people of the rest of Asia and Africa, should be permitted to decide their own future according to their own free will.

251. When and how Pakistan should withdraw its troops, and how many of its troops should be withdrawn, is all that we are willing to submit to any third-party inquiry set up to determine what Pakistan should do and what India should do. In the last fifteen years, we have agreed to all fourteen proposals that have been advanced in this respect, and India has rejected all of them.

252. It has been said that India exercises sovereignty over the state of Jammu and Kashmir, and that this sovereignty is total and complete. It is so total and complete that we had six rounds of negotiations with the Government of India, in which I participated, on the future of the state of Jammu and Kashmir. This is a disputed territory, and it will always remain a disputed territory, until justice is done to the people

^{23/} *Ibid.*, Third Year, Supplement for November, 1948, document S/1100, para. 75 and *ibid.*, Fourth Year, Supplement for January 1949, document S/1196, para. 15.

of Kashmir. We shall never agree to a solution which is based on expediency and on brute force. Justice is bound to be done to the people of Kashmir ultimately.

253. Reference has also been made of India's conflict with China and our concern over this conflict. We are concerned over this conflict, because it affects two States which are our neighbours. We are also affected by it because, as a result of this boundary dispute, India has tried to magnify the whole conflict so as to receive gratuitous armed assistance from the Western Powers. In the last fifteen years, India's policies, even from this rostrum, have always been directed against Western Powers. India has always tried to undermine the interest of the West. And now, all of a sudden, we are accused of metamorphosis—when they themselves have undergone the most grotesque form of a metamorphosis. In fifteen years, from this rostrum and other platforms, India has time and again accused and indicted the West for its policies—and today India says that Pakistan has changed its policies. What change in its policies has Pakistan brought about? We are still members of the two defence alliances; we still adhere to them. It is India that wants the best of both worlds.

254. The world has been kind to India. Time will show that India's inconsistent policies are bound to come to a dead end, because India cannot continue this policy of duplicity indefinitely. We are members of the defence alliances, and we have obligations under them from which we have not withdrawn. India, however, claims still to be a non-aligned country, whereas in fact we know that, as a result of the assistance that it is receiving, its policies are being directed and geared in certain ways—for a certain period of time—which are beneficial to the Government of India.

255. We have been accused of taking advantage of the Sino-Indian conflict. I would ask the Assembly: what advantage has Pakistan taken of that conflict? When the unfortunate conflict broke out and when the Indian armies were on the run—and on the run in such a humiliating fashion—Pakistan could well have taken advantage of the situation. But it was Pakistan that exercised remarkable restraint and took no action at all. I doubt if any other State in that situation would have restrained itself as Pakistan did at that time. And yet this has not been appreciated. We have been told that we are taking advantage of the situation. As I have said, we could have taken advantage of the situation, but did not, because we believe in the peaceful method, in the peaceful solution of international disputes, and not in solutions based on armed conflict.

256. In the last fifteen years, India has committed aggression no less than five times. That is an enviable record: in the last fifteen years, I repeat, India has committed aggression five times to settle its international problems. Yet today Pakistan has been called an aggressor. This is most ironic.

257. We have been accused of having some sort of extraordinary relations with the People's Republic of China. The People's Republic of China is a neighbour of Pakistan. We have a boundary of some 400 miles with the People's Republic of China. We desire good relations with all our neighbours. Is that wrong? Is that a crime? Is it wrong for Pakistan to want to have friendly and harmonious relations with all its neighbours, in the interests of peace in Asia and in the interests of peace in the world? We have good neighbourly relations with Nepal. We have good neighbourly relations with Ceylon. We have good neighbourly relations

with Burma. We have resumed relations with Afghanistan. We would like to have good neighbourly relations with India as well, if India were willing to base its policies on the dictates of justice and equity and were not prone to commit aggression against Pakistan, which it has repeatedly called its "Enemy No. 1". The former Defence Minister of India Mr. Krishna Menon, and other responsible people in India, have referred to Pakistan as "India's Enemy No. 1"—but last October India came into a clash with the People's Republic of China, and not with Pakistan.

258. What has been so extraordinary about Pakistan's relations with the People's Republic of China? We have signed a boundary agreement with the People's Republic of China because we have a boundary with the People's Republic of China. If we had a boundary with Nigeria or with Guatemala, we would sign an agreement with Nigeria or Guatemala. But it so happens that the People's Republic of China has a 400-mile boundary with Pakistan. We signed this agreement as an agreement between two equal sovereign States, in a spirit of compromise and adjustment. But these are not the methods to which India subscribes. India wants things on a take it or leave it basis. That is why India cannot come to any agreement with any of its neighbours. That is why India wants Pakistan to vacate its illusory aggression. That is why India wants the People's Republic of China to vacate its illusory aggression.

259. We have very generously been offered a "no-war pact" with India. Now much has been made of this no-war pact offer to Pakistan. It has just been offered again, I believe. Recently, during his visit to the United States, the President of India proposed that a no-war pact be signed between Pakistan and India and be registered with the United Nations. It is assumed that its registration in the United Nations would give the pact international validity in law and in morality.

260. May we ask the Government of India this question: what sanctity has been attached by India to the United Nations resolutions on Jammu and Kashmir to which India is a party? The respect shown by the Government of India for those resolutions make us highly sceptical about that assurance.

261. Pakistan is a Member of the United Nations, and, as a Member of the Organization, we are enjoined by the Charter of the United Nations to resolve international disputes by peaceful means. Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the United Nations Charter are quite clear. These paragraphs state:

"All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

262. These provisions of the Charter place an obligation on Pakistan and on all other Members of the United Nations to settle their international disputes by peaceful means. Are these not, in effect, a no-war declaration? As a Member of the United Nations for the last sixteen years, and having resolutely carried out in letter and in spirit the resolutions of the United Nations, and believing that the Government of India also, as a Member of the United Nations, is enjoined by this very Charter to settle all disputes by peaceful means, we

wonder why, instead of discharging our obligations by deed, we should only repeat in words what we have already so solemnly affirmed between ourselves and before the world Organization.

263. Recently, on the eve of the final round of talks on Kashmir, when it was clear that the chances of success were remote, and after making it difficult for the problem to be settled by peaceful means on the basis of honour and equity, India proposed a no-war pact. In reality, it meant that Pakistan should accept the cease-fire line as a permanent division of Kashmir. If we were to have agreed to a no-war pact, it would have meant that Pakistan agreed to accept the status quo. Such a settlement can never be described as honourable and equitable. I repeat—Pakistan will not resort to armed conflict at this time, or at any time. But we cannot sign on the dotted line on India's dictation.

264. In many respects, we are not even one-third the size of India—in terms of population and territory, in terms of armed forces, manpower and economic strength. We would never embark on aggression against India, not only because we are a smaller country, but also because it is a cardinal principle of our foreign policy to settle all disputes by peaceful means and through negotiations, in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

265. From our point of view, it would be repugnant to our interests, to our higher principles, to the welfare of our people and to peace and stability in the sub-continent and Asia, to embark on aggression to resolve the Kashmir dispute. We have never taken such action. We were not even tempted to resort to a show of force during India's greatest hour of humiliation and defeat last winter. This is a sufficient demonstration of Pakistan's peaceful intentions. I think that very few countries would have restrained themselves as Pakistan did when India faced this disaster on its frontiers against the People's Republic of China. There can be no better demonstration of Pakistan's peaceful intentions in words and in deeds than the conduct of Pakistan in the last fifteen years.

266. What, on the other hand, has been the conduct of India? What has been the attitude of India in the settlement of its disputes? India has the rare privilege of being the only modern State which in fifteen years has resorted, no less than five times to armed force to settle its international problems.

267. In this respect, let us consider the statements of the leaders of India, I hope that the Assembly will bear with me when I repeat what has been stated by Indian leaders on the method of settling the Kashmir problem.

268. The Prime Minister of India said, on 21 January 1962:

"So far as China and Pakistan are concerned, India is determined to vacate their aggression."

The former Defence Minister of India, Mr. Krishna Menon, stated:

"You are aware that we have not abjured violence in regard to any country who violates our interests" [Hindustan Times, 6 December 1961].

The Congress President, Mr. Sanjiva Reddy, said:

"We have to liberate the occupied areas in Kashmir. We are postponing the issue, but we do not accept the cease-fire line as a permanent solution."—He expected the people in occupied Kashmir to struggle to rid themselves of the usurper and said that—"Within a short period of time the Government of India will choose the correct time to liberate that part of Kashmir which is under Pakistan's control." [Statesman, 5 January 1962.]

These are the remarks of those Indian leaders who have offered Pakistan a no-war pact.

269. We have good relations with all countries, with all the countries in our region. We have tried to resolve our differences by peaceful means with all our neighbours, with all countries with whom we have had differences. Pakistan will continue to promote peace in our region and peace in the world. We shall not resort to force. We shall show that our words can be proved by our actions. It is for the Indian Government to adopt similar policies so that we can live in peace.

270. Our people live in poverty. We want to wipe out the stigma and the vice of poverty. We would like to see co-operation and goodwill between the people of India and the people of Pakistan so that we could harness our resources for the good of our people in the sub-continent, and for the good of people in Asia so that we can march forward towards a better order.

271. It is not the law of God that the people of Asia and Africa shall live in poverty. Let us co-operate and let us bring about the best of our talents in order to eradicate the stigma of poverty, but this can only be done if there is justice in the world, if people are willing to accept the principles of equality, if they are willing to settle their disputes by peaceful means. It is of no avail to try to raise doubts in the minds of our friends. We are steadfast friends. We have remained steadfast friends with those with whom we have had friendship, and over the last fifteen years Pakistan has demonstrated that it lives by its words and its deeds.

272. I pledge here, on behalf of the 100 million people of Pakistan, that the right to self-determination, which is a right which India has agreed to give to the people of Kashmir, will be achieved, and that the people of Kashmir will become the recipients of justice, because that is the law of equity and that is the law of eternity.

273. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India): We have just listened to another long speech by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. The speech was so highly charged with emotion that we do not really know whether he made any new points which would call for a reply. We would therefore like to look into his statement to see whether a further reply will have to be made. I noticed a number of half-truths and mis-statements, and these certainly will require a reply. At this late stage, I would therefore crave your indulgence and ask that we might be permitted to reserve our right of reply to the appropriate moment.

274. Dato' ONG (Malaysia): I do not propose at this late hour to exercise my right of reply to the reply given by the representative of Indonesia to my statement at the 1219th meeting, as I will be making a statement in the general debate before the end of this week.

The meeting rose at 7.35 p.m.