

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



888th
PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 5 October 1960,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
Speech by Mr. Alvarez Plata (Bolivia)	431
Speech by Mr. Menzies, Prime Minister of Australia	434
Speech by Mr. Delgado (Philippines)	437
Speech by Mr. Mazurov (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)	442
Statement by the representative of Guate- mala	451
Statement by the representative of Indonesia	451
Statement by the representative of the Netherlands	454

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

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. ALVAREZ PLATA (Bolivia) (translated from Spanish): The Bolivian delegation wishes to add its congratulations to those which the President has already received from the representatives here assembled; his appointment is no more than a recognition of his valuable and outstanding services to the international community.

2. The problems which demand the attention of the Assembly are many and difficult. At the same time, all of them are of the utmost importance since their consequences involve all mankind; they include such matters as peace and disarmament, human rights, the end of discrimination and the social well-being of mankind. However, without detracting from the world-wide importance of the fundamental items which will be considered at this session, there are some of special importance to many of the States represented here, the solution of which ought now to be emerging from the stage of theoretical discussion in order to be embodied in satisfactory decisions, in accordance with the spirit of the Charter, relating to the vast and vital needs of the under-developed countries. Under-development is the principal problem of the countries of Latin America, as well as Africa, Asia and Oceania. To conquer under-development and secure a civilized standard of living is the aspiration of millions of human beings now engaged in political and economic movements which they hope will lead them to this much desired goal. Revolutionary processes of this kind, which disturb and change old systems, need to be interpreted to the international community, because of their tremendous human significance. These transformations cannot be ignored or checked. They are legitimate outbreaks against centuries-old injustices in the social order.

3. The Bolivian delegation firmly supports what the United Nations is striving to achieve under its technical assistance and economic aid programmes. However, at this stage in the life of our Organization, it is obliged to associate itself with the comments of several of the delegations here present regarding the limited resources available and the methods by which these resources are distributed, which occasionally makes it more difficult to reap their full benefit. Perhaps the time has come to undertake a review and readjustment of the policy of international co-operation, with a view to making it more co-ordinated and dynamic, in accordance with the requirements of the developing countries, whose rate of economic need is faster than the rate at which they are receiving assistance.

4. We believe that until there are new plans to expand and develop the resources of the under-developed countries, there will be a chronic state of economic and political malaise, with attendant anarchy fomenting subversion. Self-development is impossible without capital. Hence, both the plans of the United States Government and Operation Pan America proposed by President Kubitschek of Brazil are ambitious attempts to solve this particular problem.

5. We believe that it is time now to put into effect the recommendation adopted at the Seventh Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics^{1/} in a resolution submitted by the Bolivian delegation proposing the establishment of a system to protect the economy of the Latin American countries against constant fluctuations in commodity prices on the international market and increases in the prices of manufactured goods consumed by the under-developed countries. We believe that until an objective solution is found to this problem which is fundamental to all our countries, there will be no positive progress in the search for solutions to remedy the unfairness of the present system.

6. In this connexion, it should be borne in mind that the level of development in Latin America is far from even. While some countries have made modest progress, others, hampered by structural defects in their geo-economy, have not even achieved the degree of under-development attained by other backward countries in other parts of the world. The Bogotá Conference^{2/} therefore agreed to establish a scale of priority for countries which are in a truly critical situation and others—including Bolivia—which are land-locked and without access to the sea.

7. The development of the Latin American countries is a long-standing problem which has unfortunately not been faced in the last nineteen years. Franklin

^{1/} Meeting held at San José, Costa Rica, August 1960.

^{2/} Third Meeting of the Special Committee of the Council of the Organization of American States to Study the Formulation of New Measures for Economic Co-operation (Committee of 21), convened at Bogotá, Colombia, 5-13 September 1960.

D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, suggested certain solutions which were postponed because of the Second World War. Of all of the under-developed areas in the world, this area is the closest to entering the stage of industrialization. The Economic Commission for Latin America has made a detailed study of the vulnerability of Latin American exports, and the shrinkage of Latin America's markets at a time when the continent is undergoing the greatest population explosion in the world. The Bolivian delegation believes that we must seek out solutions within the system that are commensurate with the pressing problems of Latin American economic life. For all these reasons, and bearing in mind the spirit of the United Nations Charter, the Bolivian delegation trusts that the Organization of American States will take continuing and positive action in regard to the community's problems without waiting for temporary or passing crises to awaken its concern.

8. I should like to dwell here for a moment on Bolivia's experience at the last United Nations Tin Conference, held in New York in May 1960. The delegation of Bolivia, which was virtually isolated by the nature of the topic under discussion, as the only country in Latin America producing tin on a large scale, was unable to get any support for its just demands for remunerative prices based on the imperative vital factors in the producing countries. While expressing our gratitude to the Mexican delegation at that Conference for its constant support for the Bolivian delegation's position, I should nevertheless like to draw attention to the need for joint action by the members of the Organization of American States and all the under-developed countries with similar problems in matters relating to the defence of commodity prices on the international export market even when they are not themselves producers and are not therefore directly concerned.

9. Bolivia, like other countries of the continent, welcomed the United States Government's decision announced at the Bogotá Conference, to inaugurate a new era in the assistance extended by that country to the other members of the regional organization. When the initial sum was divulged, the Latin American countries formed the impression that this was only a beginning in effective collaboration and that in future there would be new operations designed to resolve systematically the structural problems of economic development.

10. Eight years ago, the Bolivian delegation came before the United Nations Assembly at a time when dramatic changes were being initiated in the economic, social and political structure of Bolivia as a result of the 1952 revolution. It fell to our delegation to explain for the first time the causes, background and future plans of this national revolution, at a time when the accomplishment of such reforms was looked upon with suspicion and incomprehension. The Bolivian revolution, which began and ended in response to national historic realities, was not at any time supported by outside elements. It was Bolivian in the fullest sense of the word, and thus remained free of any influence other than the supreme interest of the country and the welfare of its inhabitants. We can say now, before the Assembly, that all the purposes of our revolution have been achieved and its programmes are in full course of completion.

11. Eight years have gone by under the revolutionary régime; we have passed through three stages of constitutional government and today we can say with pride that our revolutionary nationalism is an evolutionary process which is approaching maturity; its basis is in the collective conscience, its aims are social health and labour solidarity, it respects different creeds and races as well as foreign enterprise and property wherever these are not in conflict with the national interest. It is a new conciliatory and Christian humanism. Here the individual and the State are not mutually destructive: they are integrated and able to live in harmony.

12. Revolutionary nationalism makes the constituent parts of the community complementary; it means agreement between the classes; equality of opportunity for all; an economy of participation in which all may progress in accordance with their capacities without prejudice to the rights of others. To us Bolivians, nationalism does not mean xenophobia or class hatred; it is based on the juridical and social order in harmony with economic and political factors. The nationalist revolution has created in Bolivia a new status in economic and social relations whose expression is the national State, the organ of the people and not the sectional instrument of any group or social class. As the President of Bolivia, Dr. Víctor Paz Estenssoro, has said,

"...the Nationalist Revolutionary Movement is a happy combination of workers, peasants and members of the middle class, closely allied by their common interest, in opposition to the political and economic despotism of the mine-owners and feudal land-owners, which has changed the physiognomy and character of Bolivia and brought justice for all, whereby privilege has vanished and only ability is recognized. From slaves, it has made freemen, and it has set free gigantic productive energies over the face of the land."

13. One of the most outstanding aspects of the Bolivian revolution is that it has given human dignity to all the indigenous peasants of Bolivia, a status they did not enjoy formerly because of the pitiless exploitation to which they were exposed. Today the peasants are free and enjoy all the same rights and are subject to the same obligations as the rest of our citizens. Two million of them have become land-owners through the application of the Land Reform Act. What is our purpose in this? We believe that besides having satisfied an ancient yearning for justice, by transforming the anachronistic feudal system of land tenure and forming a more equitable redistribution of the land among those who work on it, we have raised the Bolivian level of production.

14. The social importance of land reform is such today that it has been recognized even by the Assembly, which will discuss it this year as an item on its agenda [74]. My delegation is in a position to make an important contribution to the discussion of this very important item, because of our first-hand experience based on the application of principles which harmonize the interests of the State, the interests of those who work on the land and even the interests of those progressive landowners who have joined in this process of transformation under the new regulations laid down by the Land Reform Act.

15. My Government is interested in promoting the industrialization of Bolivia and in making use of the tremendous economic potential which lies in its undeveloped natural resources. In order to achieve this purpose, we require international co-operation, but co-operation of a kind that will enable us to assist the basic industries which are destined under the Government's plans to increase public wealth.

In his speech, the President of Bolivia added the following:

"The international co-operation afforded by the great Powers, to every part of the world, is of sound inspiration and consonant with the interdependence of contemporary life; it made possible the construction of the European countries after the Second World War and it is now assisting the underdeveloped countries of three continents to proceed stage by stage in their economic development. We would not be sincere if, while reiterating our gratitude and that of the whole Bolivian people for this valuable assistance, we did not at the same time stress our firm belief that international assistance would yield more immediate and beneficial results if it was increased and above all if it was directed into specific development projects."

16. I do not wish to trespass longer upon the Assembly's attention by drawing up a balance-sheet of the revolutionary accomplishments of the Bolivian Government. The delegations here present are fully informed regarding the process of revolution in Bolivia and its results. Many States have given us proof of their respect and understanding for the social and political movement in which we are engaged. Some of them, indeed, such as the United States, have given us direct support through technical assistance and economic co-operation that has not in any way involved any political commitment or any influence on the internal or external life of Bolivia—something that our revolutionary Government and our people, both jealous of their sovereignty and independence, would never permit.

17. These special characteristics of the Bolivian process have clearly determined our international position since 1952. We believe that the maintenance of a keen sense of justice against all forms of imperialism which enslave weaker nations economically or politically is compatible with the profound democratic and peace-loving convictions which inform our existence; therefore, now as before, my delegation regards with the deepest sympathy all processes of liberation and is on the side of all nations which are struggling to raise their peoples to higher levels of justice and social well-being.

18. The desire for peace is innate in man. We have seen how all countries, through their representatives, have expressed here their determination to bring it about. The representatives of the two Powers which lead the world today have also reiterated their determination to preserve peace through disarmament. There is therefore a basis, a general consensus, which must be given due recognition for it expresses not only the thought and the position of representatives but also of the people whom they represent. The problems of disarmament do not arise out of its essential nature. They arise out of the process of putting it into effect, the procedures which one nation or another wishes to apply in order to achieve the aim.

19. Various proposals have been made. The problem is naturally complex, but in our view it requires above all a state of mind in the great Powers which will facilitate an understanding. Whether this is small or large is not important, provided that in some way it opens up the possibility of agreement which will enable mankind to recover its faith in the security of its destiny.

20. Through the Trusteeship Council, the Trust Territories are fast emerging into independence. Bolivia was elected to the Council last year and has been contributing to its noble task by advocating a system of principles covering equitable land distribution, universal suffrage and the improvement of economic, educational and health conditions in those Territories. In the rapid process of liberating the Non-Self-Governing Territories, the Administering Powers have in some specific cases been unable to provide the new nations with viable economies.

21. This state of affairs, which is also met with in the colonies that are not under trusteeship, means that the colonial Powers' unfulfilled obligations must become an international charge. The Bolivian delegation believes that these Powers still have residual obligations, and that the first source of international co-operation for the new States must consist of action initiated by the colonial Powers under the supervision of the United Nations.

22. The situation in the Congo (Leopoldville) is a constant source of concern to all those countries which, like Bolivia, have faced the exertions, sacrifices and paradoxes of emancipation in the relatively recent past. We refute those who allege that such a crisis is the product of premature liberty, lack of political maturity and other affronts to the dignity of this great African people, by affirming that the path towards complete sovereignty, towards order and constitutional government, is always complex and painful and marked by advances and retreats which seem to complicate and hamper its course. Nevertheless, what prevails in the end is the determination to be free.

23. Freedom too can flare up and leave us blind for a time. But what we must do—and this is one of the reasons why the United Nations was created—is to prevent this transition from being an object of political interference and manoeuvres contrary to the interests of the infant country. While the constant announcement of scientific advances raises optimism and confidence among countries which are constantly threatened by disease, shortage of arable land, and backwardness, and makes them think of prodigious conquests, when they hear of man's ventures into the microcosm of bacteria and those projects which will lift him out of this planet into the unknown universe, and while the common man takes comfort from this knowledge, at the same time he cannot forget that this same science is working actively towards the discovery of new and yet more sinister instruments of destruction.

24. The first astonishment of the people at this incongruity, incompletely justified by political reasons—has yielded not only to uneasiness, but to rightful indignation, which arises not out of ideological positions or political alliances or even mere helplessness, but out of the sacredness of humanity.

25. The right to destroy cannot be argued about. If man has been given the mission to create, he must

refuse himself the right to destroy. At this session of the Assembly we should try by every means in our power, to bring about a ban on nuclear tests and prevent the dissemination of nuclear weapons.

26. Before leaving the theme of peace and disarmament, my delegation wishes to express its lively hope that the conflicts which are today embittering and disturbing various neighbouring countries in different parts of the world, holding up their progress and wasting their energies, will be settled by the participants in a spirit of justice, not only because it is their duty to do so, but because it is the duty of the whole international order, now that the international community is growing so much larger.

27. I should like to say, in connexion with the part played by the Secretary-General, that that part has always been governed by the wishes of the Assembly and the requirements of the Charter which are in practice a reflexion of the majority view of the Member States. That is the spirit in which we have judged the latest activities of the Secretary-General, without reservations of any kind.

28. Last year's session of the United Nations General Assembly was described as the "Assembly of Peace". Certain ominous signs would seem to indicate—and this impression has not yet been dispelled—that the current session of the Assembly, if it had a name, would bear that of insecurity, mistrust and the cold war. We would seem to have arrived at a very desperate point, with no solution in sight. However, there is in Spanish literature a very old proverb: "The darkest hour comes just before the dawn".

29. Perhaps out of this session of the Assembly, so full of confusion, will be born that tranquillity which the world so much desires. We hope so indeed. This is what mankind demands.

30. Mr. MENZIES, Prime Minister of Australia: I join in the congratulations which have been extended to the new President and to the new Member nations. Each of them, in a sense, needs our sympathy, our understanding, and our disinterested help.

31. I have heard only some of the speeches, for I arrived from Australia only on 30 September, but I have read most of the earlier speeches, and have endeavoured to sense the feeling of the debate.

32. Each representative, of course, must try to make his individual contribution to our discussion from the point of view of his own country. I should therefore present myself to you—I am afraid, for the second time today—as the Prime Minister of a nation which grew out of six colonies, a nation of relatively small numbers—something over ten millions—but of considerable productive and trading development, and a lively interest in the world. Australia is indeed, in terms of international trade, one of the first seven trading nations in the world. This being so, it will be seen at once that the continuance and expansion of peaceful trade is, from an economic point of view, vital to us. The proportion of our trade which sails the seas is immeasurably greater than that of countries of high population and resources, which could, if they wished, live to themselves much more successfully than we could. We therefore not only have, as human beings, a passionate desire for peace; we have, as a nation, a great vested interest in its preservation. It would seem to most of us a happy circumstance that

sentiment and interest should coincide. "Here", we would say, "is the perfect marriage."

33. Future generations, if human follies do not destroy them in advance, may well, with the clear "hindsight" of history, wonder how it came about that the twentieth century was so marred by war, and how it was that, in 1960, representatives of almost 100 nations could not make peace. "Surely", they will say, "if each nation had peace as its heart's desire, and also wanted peace as the condition of prosperity, nothing could have stood in the way." Can we all honestly look into our own hearts and minds and answer those implicit questions?

34. As a newcomer to the Assembly, I have been shocked at the evidence that there are some who have no peace in their hearts, and who appear to believe that by threats of aggression, by violent propaganda, by actual conquest if necessary, they will extend the substance of their material wealth and the boundaries of their economic influence.

35. I thought that President Eisenhower, when he addressed the Assembly [868th meeting], made a statesmanlike, constructive, generous speech. In a conference in which there appears to be a disposition in the minds of some to play for the ideological support—if I may use that horrible expression—of the new Member nations, and to bring them within what I believe are called "spheres of influence" for purposes of aggrandisement, the President of the United States took a high line. He said, in effect—I am not quoting his words—and I most respectfully agree, that we are not to look at our new colleagues as if they were voters to be collected, or as pawns in a vast international game; we are to look at them as independent, co-equal, and free. The new nations have not won their freedom only in order to barter it away. It is offensive to them to regard them as potential satellites.

36. Let me, for my own country, address some words directly to the representatives of these nations. They have not failed to observe that there are those here who seek to inflame their minds with a spirit of resentment, and to make them believe that their best friends are those who produce with monotonous but fierce regularity slogans about "colonialism" and "imperialism". It is, I believe, a simple but sometimes forgotten truth that the greatest enemy to present joy and high hope is the cultivation of retrospective bitterness. I beg of all these representatives to put bitterness out of their minds. So far as they are concerned, the past has gone. The dead past should bury its dead. It is the present and the future that matter. Most of them know that political independence can be won more swiftly than economic independence. And yet both are essential to true nationhood. Under these circumstances, nations which are older in self-government should not be looking at the new nations as people whose support should be canvassed, but as people who need objective assistance, with no strings, if the material prosperity of their people is to be improved.

37. It is one of the significant things in contemporary history that the advanced industrial nations are, because of their scientific and technological advantages, improving their standards at a phenomenal rate; while less advanced countries, lacking the same techniques on the same scale, are advancing at a slower rate. This is not one of the facts of life which one may observe and, having observed, forget. Its significance is

that the gap between the advanced and the relatively unadvanced tends, unless we do something about it, to grow wider every year. It is not a state of affairs which civilized and humane thinking can long tolerate.

38. If in the Assembly, and in the nations here represented, we will constantly remember that our trust is for humanity and that, indeed, the United Nations itself has no other reason for existence, we will more and more concentrate our efforts on providing economic and technical help for new nations to the very limit of our capacity; not because we want, to put it quite crudely, to buy them into our own ideas of things, not only because we really and passionately believe in independence and freedom, but also because we believe that our fellow human beings everywhere are entitled to decent conditions of life, and have enough sense to know that independence and freedom are mere words unless the ordinary people of free countries have a chance of a better life tomorrow. This point of view seemed to me to underlie the temperate and persuasive speech of Mr. Macmillan and other speeches made by democratic leaders.

39. But there are others who have so far misunderstood the spirit of the United Nations as to resort to open or veiled threats, blatant and, in some instances, lying propaganda, a clearly expressed desire to divide and conquer. They should learn that "threatened men live long", and that free nations, however small, are not susceptible to bullying. I will permit myself the luxury of developing this theme, though quite briefly, in the particular and in the general.

40. In his speech [869th meeting] the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union made his usual great play about "colonialism". As Mr. Macmillan reminded us in his speech [877th meeting], the answer to much of his story is to be found in the presence in the Assembly of many new nations, once colonies and now independent. Mr. Khrushchev said, among other things:

"Peoples which oppress others cannot be free. Every free people must help those who are still oppressed to gain their freedom and independence" [869th meeting, para. 225].

41. This was, in one sense, a most encouraging observation. It made me wonder whether we were perhaps about to see a beginning of an era in which the nations of Europe which were once independent and are now under Soviet Communist control were going to receive the blessings of independence. What a glorious vista of freedom would be opened up by such a policy! How much it would do to relieve the causes of tension and to promote peace!

42. I venture to say that it is an act of complete hypocrisy for a communist leader to denounce colonialism as if it were an evil characteristic of the Western Powers, when the facts are that the greatest colonial Power now existing is the Soviet Union itself.

43. Further, in the course of this session of the Assembly, Mr. Khrushchev was good enough to make some references to my own country as a member of a group of countries and to our position in relation to the Territories of Papua and New Guinea. He calls upon us to give immediate independence and self-government to these Territories. As a piece of rhetoric, this no doubt has its points—we can all

admire rhetoric; we hear a good deal of it. But it exhibits a disturbing want of knowledge of these Territories and of the present stage of their development. Nobody who knows anything about these Territories and their indigenous people can doubt for a moment that for us in Australia to abandon our responsibilities forthwith would be an almost criminal act.

44. Here is a country which not so long ago was to a real extent in a state of savagery. It passed through the most gruesome experiences during the last war. It came out of that war without organized administration and, in a sense, without hope. It is not a nation in the accepted term. Its people have no real structure of association except through our administration. Its groups are isolated among mountains, forests, rivers and swamps. It is estimated that there are more than 200 different languages—not dialects, but languages. The work to be done to create and foster a sense and organism of community is therefore enormous. But, with a high sense of responsibility, Australia has attacked its human task in this unique area.

45. Since the war, some form of civilized order has been established over many thousands of square miles which were previously unexplored. We have built up an extensive administration service from nothing to a total of thousands of public servants, local members of the public service and administration indigenous employees. We have created five main ports with modern equipment. We have built 5,000 miles of road, over 100 airfields. We have established and improved postal and telecommunications services. We have built four large base hospitals, 100 subsidiary hospitals, 12,000 aid posts and medical centres. 778 infants' and welfare clinics. We have trained hundreds of doctors and nurses, thousands of native medical assistants. We have established 4,000 schools, which are attended by 200,000 pupils. We have established large stock stations and a great forestry industry.

46. I could go on almost indefinitely. All this has been done in a few years since the war. The achievement has not been without cost. We are a very strange colonial Power, if I understand the sense in which that term is used. We have put many, many more millions into Papua and New Guinea than have ever come out, or ever will come out. Like the Netherlands, whose representative spoke yesterday [886th meeting] about its side of New Guinea, we regard ourselves as having a duty to produce as soon as it is practicable an opportunity for complete self-determination for the people of Papua and New Guinea. We have established many local government councils in order to provide training in administration. We have set up a legislative council on which only the other day we substantially increased the number of indigenous representatives.

47. And yet Mr. Khrushchev includes us in his diatribe against foreign administrators who despise and loot the local population. I have said enough to show exactly what that amounts to. His further extravaganzas about the overseer's lash and the executioner's axe must relate to areas with which he is rather more intimately familiar than he is with Papua and New Guinea.

48. I must say with complete clarity that we do not need to be lectured on such matters by a man who has no record whatever of having brought any colonial people into freedom and self-government. We indeed are proud to be in the great British tradition of the

twentieth century—a tradition which has by sensible degrees and enlightened administration brought the blessings of self-government and a seat in the councils of the world to many former colonies.

49. I turn now to another consideration. Why has this session of the General Assembly become so significant a forum? Why has it attracted the attendance of what I imagine must be the greatest number of Heads of State and Heads of Government in its history? These are very interesting questions, and I should like to try to answer them.

50. The dominating fact is that the peace of the world is under threat, and, as Mr. Nehru pointed out on Monday [882nd meeting], peace is the paramount problem. We are not living in a time of peace. The cold war is intensifying. The hearts and minds of men and women are distressed. Most representatives have come here hoping that tensions might be reduced; that some ray of light might come through some opening door; that the new nations here represented for the first time—here because they have achieved an independent freedom and are, as I hope and believe, determined to maintain it—would make a fresh contribution, not to recriminations but to achievement.

51. Running through all these ideas is the wide-spread world feeling that the United Nations represents the great hope, that it is better to debate freely about grievances and occasions of difference than to make war about them. But what has happened so far? A highly organized group, threateningly lead, has developed an attack in at least four directions.

52. First, it has engaged in a colossal war of propaganda, singularly uninhibited by facts and marked by gross falsity of argument. The old slogans have been used ad nauseam. On Monday last [882nd meeting], Mr. Khrushchev talked in a somewhat macabre fashion about corpses. But I point out that the whole of his heated propaganda about "imperialism", of which his own country is without doubt itself the chief current practitioner, has been designed to put pressure on the newly free nations to move into the unfree communist orbit; to foment bitterness in their minds about the past; to disinter the corpses of old grievances and sorrows; to persuade our new colleagues, if he can, to forgo the joy and hopes of their new and independent nationhood.

53. Second, he has engaged in an attack upon the Secretary-General, the distinguished choice of the United Nations, a man with whose opinion anybody has a right to disagree, but whose ability and integrity are beyond challenge. He has the complete confidence of Australia. Mr. Khrushchev has, without a shred of evidence, called him, the Secretary-General, the biased representative of Western capitalism—a thing I have never heard of before—and has asked [869th meeting] for his replacement by a triumvirate of Secretaries-General. In this triumvirate there will be what I will describe in the modern jargon as an "in-built" veto; a triumvirate whose work would be clearly doomed to frustration and fatuity, leading to the consequent collapse of the United Nations executive machinery.

54. Since the result of his proposal could be no other than this, it must be presumed that he intends it. There is an old maxim of the English law that a man is presumed to intend the reasonable consequences of

his acts. It is a trite saying, but it is worth thinking about.

55. Third, Mr. Khrushchev has sought to convert the United Nations into the "dis-United Nations" by dividing the nations—as ancient Gaul was divided, according to Julius Caesar—into three parts, which he conveniently, though perhaps not very accurately, describes as the communist world, the free democratic world—or as he might prefer to call it so as not to step outside the slogan line: the capitalist world—and the neutral world.

56. Neutralism is, of course, one of those rather rotund words which does not readily admit of definition. If, when we say that a nation is neutral, we mean that it will not under any circumstances take arms in any conflict which does not concern the protection of its own immediate boundaries, it seems to be a notion hard to reconcile with the Charter of the United Nations which contemplates under certain circumstances the use of combined force in terms of the Charter itself.

57. Mr. Nehru, the distinguished leader of India, has not, I think, used the word "neutral" in this sense. I hope I accurately represent him. He and his Government maintain large defences in their own country, and they are active supporters of the Charter. What he has consistently made clear—to my mind, at any rate—is that he stands for non-alignment, in the sense that he will not engage in any special military or quasi-military alliance.

58. My own country does not subscribe to this view, though it respects it, since we are party, for example, to the South-East Asia Treaty with the military associations which are either expressed or implied in it. But we do not quarrel with others about these matters. I would think it impossible to believe that some of the greatest leaders of so-called "neutral" countries would regard themselves as being neutral in the great conflict of ideas.

59. The real point that I want to emphasize is that you cannot make the United Nations effective by converting it into the "dis-United Nations"; by converting all of us into pledged advocates of groups of conflicting or supposedly conflicting interests in this Assembly, in the Security Council, in the whole operation of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Unity must be the aim. Common action for peace must be the procedure.

60. Fourth, in short, Mr. Khrushchev has on this occasion, so far from working towards an easing of the cold war, for the very existence of which his country carries a grievous and major responsibility, set out to exacerbate the cold war by fomenting tension, by encouraging bitterness and by seeking to paralyse or confuse the minds of the free peoples.

61. I speak for a small nation with a love of peace, without nuclear weapons, with a burning desire to develop itself, a task which consumes every ounce of energy it possesses, and to raise its standards of living; with no aggression in its heart; utterly independent, though, of course, with strong historic and present ties with its sister nations of the Commonwealth.

62. In Australia we are, as you may have gathered from what I have said, resolutely opposed to communism. It will never prevail in an unconquered Aus-

tralia. It runs counter to all our traditions, our instincts and our hopes. But there is a distinction to be made. Free democracies are not aggressive. No free nation or combination of free nations desires either to send political missionaries into the Soviet Union—a courtesy which, of course, we would be glad to have reciprocated—or to resort to the futile arbitrament of war. In this true sense, we stand for peaceful coexistence. We believe that communist countries have as much right to their own system as we have to ours. This means that for other countries, emerging from colonial rule, we believe in self-determination, uninfluenced by threat or guile or purchase.

63. This is an appropriate occasion on which to remind representatives that Australia is situated in a part of the world in which the immediate threat of aggression comes from Communist China, a nation of vast resources of manpower, and with leaders deeply devoted to the Marxist principles.

64. It is small wonder that such nations as Pakistan and the Philippines, Thailand, the United Kingdom, the United States, France, New Zealand and Australia have banded themselves together for mutual assistance and to do their best to avoid a further exposure of the area to communist control. The South-East Asia Treaty is palpably one of non-aggression. It deserves the careful thought of representatives, because it will recall to their minds the fact that communism is not expansionist in the west and south-west only.

65. I used the well-known phrase "peaceful coexistence". Perhaps I should make it quite clear that we would welcome "peaceful coexistence" if the communists would only practise it. Nobody denies or regrets the great modern development of the resources of the communist Powers. The technological achievements of the Soviet Union, for example, have excited our admiration. All that we ask is that we be left alone to enjoy our own forms of government and our own type of civilization.

66. I was profoundly interested in what Mr. Nehru said about disarmament, and about the need for establishing contemporaneously arrangements for disarmament and inspection. There are, however, two aspects of this matter, about which he and I have exchanged ideas before today, which are worth mentioning.

67. The first is that the problem of disarmament itself cannot be divided into parts. As has already been said, disarmament and inspection are inseparable. Again it is unthinkable to me that we should imagine that the risks of war would be diminished if the nations disarmed in the nuclear field but not in the field of what are, I believe, politely called "conventional arms". For the fact is that it is only the possession of nuclear weapons, terrible though they are in their possibilities of destruction, horrible as it is to contemplate their further development, which deprives the communist Powers of instant and overwhelming military superiority in the relevant areas. Nuclear, thermo-nuclear and conventional arms must, therefore, all be dealt with together.

68. The second point I want to make on this great problem is that I cannot honestly accept the view that armaments are the major cause of world tension. That view seems to me a serious over-simplification. True, if any Power or combination of Powers has

shown that it is aggressively-minded and seeks to extend its boundaries of control wider and wider, by force if necessary, then the possession by that Power or group of Powers of vast armaments will be a cause of tension. But if the non-aggressive Powers are in the result driven into maintaining and developing great defensive armaments, it is proper to say that their armaments are the results of tension and not its cause.

69. In effect, what we need in the world, just as much as the vastly important disarmament talks, is a serious attempt by negotiation to encourage freedom and understanding, to remove the causes of friction and to persuade nations that aggressive policies and proselytising political religions are the enemies of peace.

70. There are many other matters which I could speak about. But time marches on, and I wish to avoid repetition. I therefore conclude by saying, for Australia, that we subscribe to the sound principle of foreign policy—that no nation should seek to interfere with the domestic affairs of another. This, indeed, is the "good neighbour" principle. If it could be accepted seriously and generally, the world would become a happy place.

Mr. Fekini (Libya), Vice-President, took the Chair.

71. Mr. DELGADO (Philippines): I should like to begin this statement, by expressing the sincere feeling of gratification which the Philippine delegation and I personally share with others over Mr. Boland's election to the presidency of the Assembly. We see in him a worthy embodiment of the sterling qualities of the Irish nation, whose fierce love of liberty the whole world has long held in deep respect and admiration. We hope that with him at the helm the ship of the United Nations will successfully weather the storms of angry debate that have developed here and avoid the shoals of dangerous conflict that lie across its course. May it eventually reach, under his steady hand, the haven of harmony and reconciliation.

72. We also welcome the representatives of the newly independent countries that have recently joined the growing family of the United Nations. Their presence here today is an eloquent tribute to the understanding and good will of the metropolitan Powers concerned as well as to the efforts of the United Nations to promote and defend the freedom of peoples everywhere.

73. The presence among us of many of the world's great leaders has given a new dimension to the deliberations of the General Assembly. Despite some discouraging evidence to the contrary, we remain hopeful that they will apply their personal prestige and broad experience of statesmanship to bring about a heightened sense of sobriety and responsibility in the deliberations of this developing parliament of man and federation of the world.

74. We live in an age of revolutionary change in science and technology and in the social and economic life of nations. We live in a world which is seeking mightily to transcend itself. Such a situation, while productive of hope, is nevertheless fraught with grave dangers which we need to master quickly if we are to survive and realize our larger goals.

75. My country shares the universal desire for a lasting peace and a more abundant life. Peace is

supremely important to all of us because it can mean the difference between survival and annihilation. But it is particularly indispensable to the developing nations like mine, because there are so many things that wait to be done. The economic and social impulse in our lands remains to be fulfilled. We want to educate our children, to stamp out ancient plagues, to till our lands that have lain fallow, to provide useful work for every able-bodied citizen, to produce more food, clothing and shelter for all our people.

76. This is why the Philippines attaches great importance to the purposes and principles of the United Nations. We have pledged ourselves to the pursuit of peace—a peace of dignity, of friendship, of honour and of justice for all mankind. We shall always strive to help the United Nations achieve these goals. But while we are profoundly dedicated to peace, we categorically reject a peace of submission imposed by the powerful upon the weak.

77. In the face of the perils of thermo-nuclear war, our first and foremost duty is to find quickly a practical way to prevent it. There is a role which the smaller nations can perform to this end through the exercise of the power of moral persuasion. Those who in cynical disbelief prefer to speak of the "naked realities of power" would do well to study the record of the General Assembly. Lacking the physical power to impose its decisions, it has yet been able to fashion effective solutions by sheer moral strength to many a grave crisis in recent history. As we meet today, that strength has increased. We strongly hope that it will be used to the fullest in this Assembly in the same responsible manner as before.

78. It is in this spirit that I should like to state the views of my delegation on some of the important questions before the Assembly.

79. We are convened this year in an atmosphere of unprecedented anxiety. If the situation permitted a jest, we would say that the Assembly appears suddenly to have lost its taste for moderate sentiments. No stronger words have been spoken nor more bitter feelings exposed for public inspection than during the past two weeks of debate in this body. We recognize that this has a certain therapeutic value and that its cleansing effect on the raw sources of our emotions should then enable us to consider in a calmer frame of mind the grave problems which confront us. Even as we speak, we hear the familiar but urgent admonition to pause, to consider, to reflect. Our problems are far too grave to be obscured by issues of lesser moment.

80. In our view, two main problems overshadow all others. The first is the question of disarmament, together with the related problem of utilizing the most advanced scientific techniques for peaceful purposes only. The second is the raising of living standards in the less-developed areas of the world. In the solution of the first problem lies our only hope for human survival; in the solution of the second, our only hope of surviving as free men.

81. Last spring we pinned our hopes for a relaxation of tension between the great Powers on the Summit Conference which was to be held in Paris. While it would have been extravagant to expect agreement on general and complete disarmament, we none the less hoped that a beginning would be made toward that ultimate goal. Some positive progress toward disarmament

by stages under adequate international control and inspection, a tacit understanding among the nuclear Powers to suspend further tests, the consideration of proposals on the limitation of conventional armaments, the thorough discussion of the problem of protection against surprise attacks—all these were within the realm of the attainable at the Summit Conference. The existing cold war could have been subjected to the warmer winds of conciliation, accommodation and compromise.

82. Today, the evidence before our eyes offers scant comfort. The dialogue between East and West which was sharply broken in Paris has not been resumed. So long as this condition obtains, the present atmosphere of crisis will persist. Meanwhile, as we mark time on the great issues of peace and survival, some unsuspected action arising from error or miscalculation could plunge the whole world into sudden and total destruction.

83. Clearly a start must be made somewhere. Time, normally a great healer, may in this instance serve merely to harden attitudes and positions. Therefore we shall support any unselfish initiative towards the re-establishment of contact between the great Powers principally involved, which could lead to the resumption of the interrupted negotiations on disarmament. In accordance with this view, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of India, Indonesia, Ghana, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia [see A/4522], together with such amendments as may be acceptable to the majority.

84. We cannot stress too strongly the urgency of this problem. The dangers of the fierce competition in nuclear weapons are not merely potential; they are ever present and terrifyingly real. No one can say with accuracy the extent to which the world's surface, the atmosphere, air and waters have been polluted by deadly radiation arising from past nuclear tests. Nor can anyone surmise, without a shudder, the number of persons now living or still unborn who are doomed to be the innocent victims of our folly.

85. We favour the reopening of discussions as soon as possible in the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament. If for any reason this is no longer practicable, then it might be wise to consider returning the discussions under direct United Nations auspices once more. But we would regard with considerable misgiving the creation of a committee larger than the Ten-Nation Committee. A larger body, in our view, could be expected to exact its own penalties in the form of unwieldy and cumbersome procedures which would tend needlessly to protract debate and to delay rather than to promote agreement.

86. For, after all, it is not the size or even the composition of the negotiating body which determines the viability of an agreement on disarmament. The sole, indispensable condition for such an agreement, as Prime Minister Macmillan has said [877th meeting], is the elimination of fear and suspicion. This can be achieved only through the removal of the fear of surprise attack. This, in turn, is wholly dependent upon equality of sacrifice and equality of security, subject at every stage to verification through a fool-proof system of inspection and controls.

87. The existence of military alliances and foreign bases is a symptom, not a cause, of the prevailing

climate of mutual fear and suspicion which bedevils our world. The Philippines is a party to one of these alliances, as was mentioned by the Prime Minister of Australia, and there are American bases on our territory. We have agreed to these solely out of an overriding concern for our national security and in the free exercise of our national sovereignty.

88. A subject colony for nearly 400 years, invaded and conquered twice within a period of fifty years, and threatened by communist subversion and rebellion within a few years after independence, my country can hardly be said to have a predilection for foreign troops and foreign bases on its territory.

89. For any country, regardless of ideology, foreign bases constitute a constant source of embarrassment and irritation. To show how far this is true, I need only mention the fact that negotiations between my country and the United States to revise our military bases agreements have been going on for more than two years. We would be happy to be without these bases, but in the context of the situation in our part of the world and in the light of our experience of repeated invasions, we also know that we would not be secure without them. Therefore, we accept their existence as an unavoidable necessity. At the same time, we are determined to make certain that their operation does not infringe on our territorial integrity and national sovereignty.

90. Our long struggle against foreign domination was inspired, among other things, by an ingrained antipathy towards foreign troops as such. For four centuries and more we had fought against too many of them—first Spanish, then American, then Japanese. Indeed, our great national leader, the late President Quezon, voicing the anxiety of our people, proposed in the years before the Second World War that an independent Philippine Republic enjoy a status of neutrality guaranteed by the great Powers.

91. But the realities of the post-war world compelled us to renounce our traditional inclinations. We had to forgo our natural distaste for foreign troops and foreign bases in the interest of our national security and the defence of our freedom. Therefore, we wish to affirm with all possible earnestness that our membership in SEATO and the establishment of United States bases in my country are without any aggressive intent whatever but are motivated solely by the purpose of mutual defence. We recognize that we are a part of a deterrent force against the aggressive intentions of international communism. We are fully aware of the penalties, nay the risks, which we incur by being a part of this deterrent force. And we are not unmindful of the advantages enjoyed by the uncommitted countries whose representatives have spoken to us here of the superior virtues of neutralism.

92. But we would ask them honestly to consider this thought: that it is precisely the existence of this deterrent capacity of the free world which keeps communism in check and maintains a certain balance of power in the world—and it is therefore a condition of peace, however precarious for the moment it may be. For it is only in this condition of a balance of power that the neutrals can perform their useful role of mediation, conciliation and compromise. If the free world were to break up its defensive alliances and dismantle its defensive bases in advance of a working agreement on disarmament, the floodgates would be

opened and communism would overwhelm the world, including the neutrals themselves.

93. When the communists stop rattling their atomic rockets and missiles, and we are no longer menaced by communist subversion and attack, there will no longer be any need for defensive military alliances and foreign bases in the Philippines and they shall be completely dismantled and abolished.

94. The point is that we cannot all be neutrals; some of us have to perform the unpleasant and even dangerous duty of helping to keep the scales of power in equilibrium. While the scales remain in balance, the neutrals have the opportunity to play their part as peacemakers. The moment those scales are badly tilted one way or the other, the neutrals are not only out of business, but war then becomes inevitable.

95. I quote from the speech of Mr. Khrushchev on 3 October 1960:

"The real situation in the world today is that the strength of the two greatest Powers—the Soviet Union and the United States—is at least equal, and that if we also take the other socialist countries into account, as well as the former colonial countries, the peaceable States have on their side not only right and justice, but force" [882nd meeting, para. 33].

This is the balance of power of which I have been speaking, and in the judgement of Mr. Khrushchev it is already tilted in favour of his side. If the words of anger and menace which we have heard him speak here have been inspired by his assessment of the present situation, what words and actions are we to expect from him and his allies when they do have an undisputed preponderance of power in the world?

96. Therefore, as the representative of a country that is openly committed to the side of the free world, I should like to say to our uncommitted friends: we have chosen a policy of commitment according to our best lights and by the same right of self-preservation that you claim for yourselves, which we fully respect. We pray that you may succeed in your efforts to reduce tensions and to remove the danger of war. But so long as such danger exists, we deem it our duty to help keep the world in balance in the perilous present, just as you deem it your duty to help fashion a long-range programme for a just and enduring peace which will be acceptable to all.

97. The second most vital problem of our time is the urgent need to raise living standards in the less developed areas of the world. The world economic situation continues to present the picture of a worsening imbalance between those who have and those who have not. Roughly two-thirds of the world's population live in the so-called under-developed or less developed areas. They share among themselves just one-sixth of the world's total income. In contrast, one-sixth of the world's population which inhabits the industrialized and highly developed countries earns two-thirds of the world's total income.

98. It is for the bridging of the gap between the less developed and the highly developed areas that the United Nations must harness its efforts and resources. Whereas in the past the resources of the under-developed areas were mere objects of exploitation by the colonial and industrial Powers, today we have the opportunity through sustained, co-operative effort to

develop such resources for the benefit, in the first instance, of the native inhabitants themselves, and of the rest of the world as a whole.

99. That the rich countries should assist the poor involves not a matter of charity, but a principle of self-interest, of justice and of peace. It is in the self-interest of the rich, industrial Powers to help the less developed countries because their own economies cannot long survive in isolation amidst the backward, impoverished and unproductive economies of their neighbours. And it is simple justice that the colonial Powers, which for centuries have appropriated the wealth of the subject countries, should restore to the latter a portion of the resources that were extracted from them. Finally, it is truer today than ever before that the world cannot exist half slave to hunger and half free from want.

100. It is in this spirit that we welcome the powerful support which President Eisenhower has given to the principle of multilateral economic assistance to the less developed countries on a more substantial scale than has heretofore been possible through the United Nations. For it is a fact that for most recipient countries the existing programmes of technical assistance touch merely the surface of their present need; what they require are development funds for projects whose value and feasibility are no longer in doubt. The carrying out of the United States proposal would be a virtual revolution in the field of economic and financial assistance, and it is fortunate that it has been advanced by the country which has most generously contributed to the existing programmes of economic assistance.

101. I turn now to the question of the Congo (Leopoldville). My delegation voted for the resolution [1474 (ES-IV)] on this question which was adopted by the fourth emergency special session. We continue to support the right of the Congolese people to work out their destiny in peace and liberty. This right is, and must be, essentially their own. Furthermore, this is merely the corollary of a larger principle—namely, that the liberated peoples of Africa should be allowed to develop their own democratic institutions and to fashion their own future in the manner best suited to their traditions and their needs.

102. There, in the bustling continent of Africa, the United Nations faces a great challenge and a great opportunity. The challenge is one of assisting the peaceful growth and development of not one, not two, but more than a dozen countries emerging eagerly into freedom with its attendant responsibilities. The opportunity is one of proving that Africa can be insulated against the clash of embattled ideologies and prevented from becoming one more arena of the cold war.

103. My Government views the United Nations efforts in this direction with gratification. It sees also in the resolution on the Congo problem the main outlines of a policy which may be applicable to comparable situations elsewhere that may arise in the future. In the face of an extremely complex and difficult situation, the United Nations forces have been able to restore order to a degree which we hope will soon permit the Congolese people themselves to resolve the personal rivalries and constitutional problems that have so bitterly divided them. Once again, we pay tribute to the scrupulous impartiality with which the Secretary-

General has directed the United Nations activities in the Congo. We hope that he will derive increased strength and courage from the powerful endorsement which he has received from the delegations of those countries that have no selfish interests to serve in that unhappy country.

104. The crisis in the Congo is still far from being solved, however, and the peoples of Africa look to the United Nations for a just and rapid solution. We sustain the view contained in the resolution adopted by the fourth special emergency session to the effect that aid to the Congo should be channelled only through the United Nations. In the same degree that we are resolved to see the last vestiges of Western colonial imperialism eradicated from the Congo, we must make certain that the infiltration there of communist imperialism, whether open or disguised, shall not be permitted. The Congo belongs to the Congolese, and now that they are free, we must help them to resist the onslaughts of a more ruthless form of imperialism than that from which they have just been liberated.

105. As regards the problem of Algeria, we must express regret that the hopeful initiative which President de Gaulle took early this year, when he publicly affirmed his Government's policy of an "Algerian Algeria" through the application of the principle of self-determination, has so far produced no hopeful results. The tragedy of Algeria has so long agitated our hearts and minds that we must press unceasingly for an end to that bloody conflict. The conscience of the French nation itself is being torn cruelly in the face of this six-year-old war whose end is not yet in sight. We must continue to urge a peaceful solution to this problem, such as will fulfil the just aspirations of the Algerian people to freedom and be worthy of the great nation that gave to the world the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen and that only this year, in an unparalleled act of renunciation, recognized the independence of thirteen new States in Africa.

106. No session of the General Assembly has heard more sustained and more vigorous denunciations of Western colonial imperialism than the present one. It is natural that this should be so, for this year, with the recognition of the independence of seventeen countries, we are hearing the death rattle of that imperialism. It is also right and proper that we should heed the warning voiced, among others, by President Sukarno [880th meeting] that we cannot trust this imperialism to die quietly without a further struggle.

107. All the countries that have been freed from the colonial yoke will need constantly to seek out and destroy within their territories the last remnants of colonial imperialism. They will need to be ever on the alert against the reintroduction of colonial influence and domination through economic devices which are calculated to render ineffectual and meaningless the grant of their political independence. And they will need to develop a sense of their own national dignity which will make impossible the continuation of policies based on race prejudice and discrimination, for the pursuit of policies of economic domination and the persistence of practices of racial discrimination are the twin evils against which the peoples of the newly independent countries must exercise unrelenting vigilance.

108. Having said this, we should be naïve indeed to believe that the worries of the newly independent

countries are over. Since subject peoples are familiar with the ways of their former masters, they are well able to recognize the latter's every stratagem to recover the privileges they have renounced. They are therefore prepared to take the necessary steps to combat the devious intentions of their former masters. On the other hand, they are comparative strangers to the more insidious methods by which international communism seeks to subvert their liberties and their institutions. The danger exists, therefore, that they will not be as well prepared to overcome the dangers posed by the new imperialism as they undoubtedly are to combat the menace of the old.

109. Of these twin dangers we in the Philippines are entitled to speak, for we have known them both. And we can only regret that there has been a tendency to speak here of communist imperialism in muted tones as if it were indiscreet to suggest that, in denouncing the evils of Western colonial imperialism in season and out of season, the communists are merely playing the cunning game of the wolf in sheep's clothing.

110. We hold no brief for Western colonial imperialism. We were a Spanish colony for nearly four hundred years, and we fared no worse and no better than the other twenty-odd colonies of Spain during the heyday of its imperial glory. Yet, when we consider the history of those four hundred years during which our people rose in rebellion every two or three years, we can yet candidly admit that amid the long litany of evils which colonialism wrought in our country there has remained a residue of good. Upon the basic oriental elements of our native culture, Spain grafted the values of that Latin civilization of which it was the principal bearer to the New World and which now serves as a precious link between us and the twenty republics of that continent.

111. Above all, it was Spain that gave the peoples of our seven thousand islands, speaking a multitude of languages, a sense of national identity. Philippine nationality was thus forged in the very fire of the fervid colonizing spirit of the Spanish "conquistadores", and, when that fire began to die down at last, it was the turn of Philippine nationalism to arise full-blown and victorious.

112. The story of American rule in the Philippines is well known to all. The Prime Minister of Cuba referred to it in his statement before this Assembly [872nd meeting]. Indeed, it is true that there are significant resemblances between the history of Cuba and that of the Philippines in their relations, first, with Spain and, later, with the United States. But, without denying the expansionist impulse that brought the United States to Cuba and the Philippines at the turn of the century, we Filipinos are more readily able to view our experience in sober and balanced perspective.

113. The United States came to the Philippines in 1898 in the course of the Spanish-American War. At the time of their arrival, we were on the point of winning our revolutionary struggle against Spain. Our troops were knocking at the very gates of Manila. The United States offered to assist us and we accepted them as allies. Later, however, they decided to occupy our country on the ground that we needed to learn how to govern ourselves. We fought them bitterly for four years, because we believed that we were well able to

govern ourselves, having already established a revolutionary government of our own under a Constitution every bit as modern and liberal as the United States Constitution itself. In the end, we bowed to superior force, and we laid down our arms. In 1916, the United States Congress passed a law promising to grant independence to the Philippines as soon as a stable government was established. In response to the unremitting clamour of our people for independence, the United States Congress passed another law in 1934 definitely committing the United States to grant our independence after a transition period of ten years following the establishment of a fully autonomous Commonwealth. On 4 July 1946, shortly after the end of the war in the Pacific, the promise was fulfilled to the letter, and the Philippines became independent. By this unprecedented act, the United States set in motion a peaceful procedure for the grant of independence to subject peoples that other colonial Powers were later obliged to follow.

114. Was United States colonial rule more virtuous than most? That may be a matter of opinion, but the fact of the matter is that the United States, during the forty years of its domination of the Philippines, did initiate a number of policies unorthodox for colonialism. They helped us to establish a public school system so that, by the end of the United States régime, the Philippines had one of the highest literacy rates of any country in Asia. They set up a programme for the advanced education of hundreds of Filipino students in American universities—a policy which anticipated by fifty years the present Fulbright programme of exchange of students. They constructed hospitals and stamped out epidemic diseases. They built roads and bridges and developed agriculture and industry. They permitted our people the full enjoyment of civil liberties. They developed and strengthened our democratic institutions. By introducing English common law to our country, they enabled us to fashion a legal system which is unique in its judicious blending of the best in Roman civil law with the best in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence.

115. Of course, the motive of economic gain was not lacking. United States investment capital came to set up essential public utilities and help us develop our natural resources. But the truth is that United States investments never reached our country in amounts sufficient for our needs and requirements. Since independence, we have been unable to attract United States capital in sufficient amounts despite special inducements of various kinds. Fortunately, Filipino capital has begun to fill the vacuum and, as the process continues, our own citizens are gaining control of an ever increasing portion of the national economy. This process is being encouraged by a surging spirit of economic nationalism which has taken hold of our people as they realize that their political independence will mean nothing unless it is buttressed by economic freedom and self-sufficiency. This is the new spirit of nationalism which today animates the administration of President Garcia.

116. We are confident that our relations with the United States, now that we are independent, will continue to be inspired by a spirit of mutual respect and consideration. The Americans are no saints, but this you can say of them: as "imperialists" they proved to be more inept than their rivals in the game; they allowed us too many liberties; and now that we are

independent, they know better than to disregard our opinions or to ignore our rights. Here is one little interesting detail: you can discuss, argue and talk back to the Americans, as we have discussed, argued and talked back to them during all the years of our subjection, and since then—without being slapped down or getting shot at dawn. One wonders, sometimes, what would happen to a Latvian or an Estonian or a Lithuanian who talked back to Mr. Khrushchev. We know, of course, what happened to the Hungarians who did just that.

117. I would like to address my concluding words to our distinguished Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjöld. Last Monday, we heard with deep emotion his courageous statement to the General Assembly [883rd meeting]. We are grateful to him for his pledge of unflinching fidelity to the ideals of the United Nations and for his assurance of unbending loyalty to our Organization as a whole, but more especially to the small countries that are gathered here. We acknowledge his pledge and return it to him with equal earnestness and fervour. We have implicit faith in his good judgement, in his spirit of fairness and impartiality. As one of the great world statesmen of our time, he incarnates in his person our hopes for a better world and for a United Nations to which the little peoples of the world can repair for their security and salvation. We need him.

118. For him there are many trying days ahead. For his antagonists are among the most powerful ones in the world, and they have promised relentless pursuit. But today, as never before, it is mightily important that the power of righteousness should not resign the battle in the face of outrageous wrong. We humbly beseech the Secretary-General to stand with us till the end so that together we shall give the lie to the ancient dogma of the despots and totalitarians that might is right.

119. Mr. MAZUROV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (translated from Russian): The attention of the world is riveted on this session of the United Nations General Assembly. One reason this session is regarded as an outstanding international event is that the most prominent statesmen from many countries are taking part in the discussion of problems which are of vital importance for all mankind.

120. The lofty and noble principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter impose a grave responsibility upon us, the representatives of various countries of the world. We must not forget that the United Nations was set up "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind".

121. These words from the Preamble of the United Nations Charter express the dearest wishes of the peoples of all lands. The delegations of many peace-loving States are working tirelessly in the United Nations for the attainment of this noble goal. Together with these countries, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic has been defending international peace and security and it will continue to do so.

122. The course of the general debate has shown that the delegations of many States have come here with the sincere intention of doing their share in reaching constructive decisions on questions of disarmament and on other problems with which the United Nations

is faced. Unfortunately, however, not all the delegations are so motivated. The representatives of a number of Western countries who have spoken from this rostrum led us into a maze of polemics, even while their Governments pursue the old policy of the cold war.

123. The well-known old precept that men should be judged by their deeds and not their words can also be applied in assessing government policies. It suffices to turn to the facts, the events of the past year, in order to see who is the genuine standard-bearer of peace and who opposes the fulfilment of the peaceful aspirations of the peoples.

124. The socialist countries, whose foreign policy is predicated on the principle of peaceful coexistence, earnestly endeavour to consolidate peace and prevent another war. The peoples of the world greeted with deep satisfaction the plan of general and complete disarmament [A/4219] which the Soviet Union submitted last year, at the fourteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

125. The peoples had great hopes that 1960 would be marked by the adoption of international decisions that would clear the storm clouds out of the sky. But the Western Powers and, in the first place, the United States, dashed these hopes. The violation of the Soviet Union's air space by spy aircraft of the United States, the premeditated wrecking by the United States Government of the conference of the Heads of Government of the great Powers in Paris, the intrigues of the colonialists in the Congo (Leopoldville), the threat of intervention against the Republic of Cuba, the sabotaging of the work of the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament by the delegations of the Western countries and the plans to equip the West German militarists with nuclear rockets, all testify to the fact that the ruling circles in the United States and in other Western countries have chosen once again to increase international tension.

126. In these circumstances a grave responsibility falls on the United Nations General Assembly at its present session. It must take decisions that would open the way for radical measures in the interests of world peace.

127. At its fifteenth session, the General Assembly must devote particular attention to the question of disarmament, which is universally recognized as the most important and urgent question of our times.

128. Stockpiles of nuclear weapons grow from day to day, and rockets and other means of delivery of atomic and hydrogen bombs are being increasingly perfected. It is known that the United States military clique is preparing not only for atomic but also for bacteriological and chemical warfare. Further developments in that direction may lead to catastrophe. General and complete disarmament is therefore a goal whose attainment is dictated by pressing necessity. Man's creative mind—which is already conquering outer space and which, beyond doubt, will soon lay bare the mysteries of other worlds—must not and cannot put up with the fact that decisive measures which would banish war from the life of society for all time have not yet been taken.

129. All peoples need peace. Only those who have not experienced the horrors of war or who, in pursuit of

their criminal purposes, disregard the interests of the people, do not cherish peace. The Byelorussian people knows full well the calamities that war brings in its train. The Nazi invaders turned Byelorussian towns and villages into ruins and heaps of ashes. War robbed the Byelorussian people of more than half of its national wealth. Industrial output in the Republic was pushed back several decades, down to the 1913 level. However, the heaviest, the irreparable loss was that in human lives. In the years of the Second World War Byelorussia lost more than 2 million people, or over 20 per cent of its population. When we speak of the consequences of war, the Poles and the Czechs, the French and the British, and other peoples who have experienced the horrors of war understand us well.

130. In order to conceal their wicked military plans, the enemies of peace are throwing up a new kind of smoke screen by ascribing aggressive intentions to us. But that is a gross distortion of the truth. The socialist States are the ones which pursue a peaceful foreign policy. The Governments of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries have been working tirelessly in all the international organizations to ensure the easing of international tension and the consolidation of peace among nations.

131. The reason for which we desire peace is not that the Soviet State is afraid of, or considers itself weaker than, any other State, but that socialism and wars of aggression are incompatible. In our country power is in the hands of the working people, and the working people do not need war. The Soviet people, in conditions of fraternal friendship and close co-operation, are building communism—a new and happy society, giving fulfilment to the fondest dreams of the best sons of mankind: that all men should enjoy true freedom and security and lead a life of creative labour. To speak in metaphor, we are building a fine new house for the working man and we do not want it to be set on fire. Nor do we want the houses of our neighbours to be burned down, for what builder thinks of destruction?

132. In this context I should like to say a few words about my Republic. Before the revolution Byelorussia was an under-developed borderland of Czarist Russia. The Byelorussian people was cruelly oppressed by landlords and capitalists, including foreign exploiters. It even lacked a state structure of its own. As a result of the victory of the October Socialist Revolution in Russia, the Byelorussian people acquired the right to set up its own sovereign State, and proceeded to do so. Under the Soviet Government, with the disinterested help of the Russian, the Ukrainian and the other brother peoples of the Soviet Union, my country has become a Republic with a highly developed national economy. In 1960 Byelorussia will produce thirty-five times more industrial goods than in 1913, and almost four and a half times more than in the pre-war year 1940.

133. Judged by the per caput level of industrial and agricultural output, Byelorussia is far ahead of many capitalist countries of Europe and America. Thus, in terms of output per 1,000 inhabitants, Byelorussia produces more metal-cutting lathes than the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Japan, and more lorries and tractors than the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy.

134. Whereas before the Revolution 80 per cent of our population was illiterate and there were hardly any specialists with higher education, at present more than 100,000 such specialists are employed in the national economy of the Republic. Higher educational establishments in Byelorussia are training more students per 10,000 inhabitants than is the case in any capitalist country of Europe.

135. Our people sees the results of its peaceful creative work in rapidly rising prosperity and in the ever-increasing extent to which its material and cultural requirements are being met. This is clearly borne out by the constant rise in the real wages of manual and non-manual workers and in the income of the peasants, by the reduction in the length of the working day, by the abolition of personal taxation, by the colossal volume of housing construction, by the constant improvement of the free medical services enjoyed by the Soviet people, by the development of the system of general education and by many other measures which the Soviet Government carries out in the interests of the working people.

136. The Byelorussian people, like the peoples of the other Soviet Republics and of the socialist countries, devotes its efforts to peaceful construction. But we are bound to feel concern over the fact that powerful reactionary forces in the Western countries are striving to aggravate international relations and are pursuing a policy of the cold war. It is in that spirit that the Western bloc made preparations for the present session of the General Assembly. The Western Powers refused to heed the appeal made by Nikita S. Khrushchev, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, to the Heads of Government of all States to attend the General Assembly and to take part personally in a serious discussion of the pressing problem of our day. What is more, the United States Government—apparently in order to hamper the work of delegations—reacted by restricting the freedom of movement in New York of Mr. Khrushchev and a number of other high-level representatives. This unprecedented action by the United States Government—which, first and foremost, was damaging to the dignity of the United States itself—in essence constituted an attempt to initiate a new phase of the cold war. Later on, the Heads of Government of certain Western countries were compelled to take part in the work of this session. But, as can be seen from certain statements and proposals, some of them did not come here with good intentions.

137. For instance, both the tone and the substance of the speech made by Mr. Diefenbaker, the Prime Minister of Canada [871st meeting] profoundly outraged us. This senior statesman repeated here from the United Nations rostrum the slander disseminated by war criminals and other dregs of society who were expelled from the Soviet Union and found refuge in the Western countries, including Canada. He alleged here that the peoples of the Soviet Union were not free and even called for the holding of free elections in the Soviet Union—what he regards as "free elections", of course. I do not think that the Prime Minister of Canada is not informed about the state of affairs in the Soviet Union. He is bound to know that the world's most democratic elections to State organs are periodically held in our country in accordance with the Constitution.

138. In so far as the Soviet Government and socialism are concerned, our people voted for them, arms in hand, back in the years of the civil war when it drove out of the country the troops of fourteen imperialist States, including the United States, which had been trying to destroy the new social system in Russia. Likewise, the whole world knows how the Soviet people voted in the Second World War. They defended with honour their socialist fatherland, freedom and democracy, utterly defeating the Nazi hordes.

139. Since the war, too, the peoples of the USSR have been voting unanimously for communism. They have demonstrated a rate of growth of output and of the productivity of free labour, the like of which the world had never seen. It was the Soviet people and no other which inaugurated a new era in mankind's development—that of the conquest of space. This could be done only by men who were genuinely free from the fetters of the old world, by the representatives of the most highly civilized of all societies. This is recognized by the peoples of all countries, and it is only the enemies of peace, the representatives of the capitalist monopolies, who venture to slander the peoples of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries, because that is one of their ways of intensifying the cold war. As regards the Canadian Prime Minister's rude attacks on the socialist countries, it is not hard to guess in whose interests they were made. A Canadian newspaper, *Citizen*, commenting on Mr. Diefenbaker's speech at this session of the General Assembly said: "...we are moving towards a period when Canada's independence of action in international affairs will be even more restricted than in the past...". Quite recently General Pearkes, the Canadian Minister of National Defence, said that Canada was placing four air bases in the northern part of the country at the disposal of the United States Air Force. There you have Canada's independence and the peaceful intentions of its Government.

140. Mr. Menzies, the Prime Minister of Australia, who preceded me today and felt obliged to make a hostile statement about the Soviet Union, also acted in the spirit of the cold war. Without saying anything at this juncture about the substance of his attack, I should like to state the following with regard to his speech: the position of the Western bloc, which rejects the Soviet Union's draft declaration of the grant of independence to colonial countries and peoples [A/4502] must be weak indeed if Mr. Menzies had to speak in defence of imperialism and colonialism and against the interests of colonial and dependent peoples. There was apparently no one else to do this. As regards his arguments about the position of the neutral countries and his assertion that the Western bloc respects their interests, the entire history of the United Nations, including, unfortunately, the present session of the General Assembly, shows the interests of the neutral countries being trampled on by the bloc of the Western countries which follow the lead of the United States and act on its instructions.

141. With regard to the attacks made by the representative of the Philippines, I do not deem it necessary to reply to him because he represents a puppet régime set up in those islands by the United States.

142. The Byelorussian SSR, being a European country, is profoundly interested in the speedy solution of all the problems engendered by tension between European

countries. This relates in particular to the problem of a peaceful settlement with Germany.

143. Twice within the lifetime of a single generation, German troops have invaded the territory of Byelorussia, threatening the very existence of the Byelorussian people. That is why we cannot remain indifferent to the dangerous developments in the Federal Republic of Germany, where the militarists, with the blessing and active assistance of their NATO allies and, first and foremost, the United States, are fanning "revanchist" feelings, creating a vast army and striving to get it equipped with atomic and rocket weapons. Yet it was but a few years ago that the Western Powers and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated solemnly that West Germany would not have a large army and that the Bundeswehr would not be given atomic weapons. These declarations have been forgotten, and the Western Powers have also thrown overboard the official commitments on the subject embodied in the Potsdam Agreement of 1945.

144. The great danger of the Western countries' policy of arming the Federal Republic of Germany lies in the fact that we are dealing with a State whose Government does not recognize the existing frontiers with its neighbours. In these circumstances how can a sensible person believe in the "defensive character" of the West German Army? One must be a complete simpleton or have criminal designs, to put atomic and rocket weapons in the hands of former Nazi generals.

145. In this context it is impossible not to refer to the speech made at this session of the General Assembly by Mr. Macmillan [877th meeting]. It is odd to see the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom in the part of a defender of West Germany's rearmament. It is odd to hear assurances about the "peaceful intentions" of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany coming from the Prime Minister of a country which still bears the scars of the Second World War to remind its people of the calamitous consequences of the policy of appeasing German militarism. It is odd to hear these statements while Federal Chancellor Adenauer, the Ministers of the Bonn Government and other West German officials and politicians are openly proclaiming that the aim of militarist Germany is "revanchism"—the revision of frontiers and the seizure of foreign territory. Judging by Mr. Macmillan's statement, it would appear that the ruling circles in the United Kingdom do not want to heed the lessons of the past. For something rather similar happened once before. Everyone remembers how Mr. Chamberlain sought to appease Hitler and what a high price the British people had to pay for its Government's unwise policy at Munich. Is not the United Kingdom Government pursuing an identical policy towards Germany now? The policy of giving a free hand to militarism and "revanchism" in West Germany creates a threat to peace and to the security of all peoples, including the British people. It is a dangerous policy. In view of the existence of military alliances and the entry of the Federal Republic of Germany into NATO, the reckless policy of the West German Government may start a world conflagration.

146. I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to facts illustrating the revival of nazism in the Federal Republic of Germany and to the activities of

former war criminals there. We deem this to be our duty because it was following a proposal by the Byelorussian SSR in 1946 that the General Assembly adopted resolution [3(I)] on the extradition and punishment of war criminals.

147. Fifteen years after the crushing of Nazi Germany, nazism has again raised its head in the Federal Republic of Germany. The tide of anti-Semitism which swept over West Germany this year furnished further proof of the fact that the old roots of nazism in the Federal Republic of Germany have not been dug out, but, on the contrary, have produced new shoots. Government services in West Germany are at present staffed to a considerable extent by adherents of nazism. Everyone is aware of the evidence exposing as war criminals the former Federal Minister Oberländer and the present State Secretary to the Chancellor, Globke, who, in 1944, was the right-hand man of that hangman, Himmler.

148. We in Byelorussia remember very well the name of Adolf Heusinger, the war criminal who is now in command of the Bundeswehr. Authentic documents paint a fearful picture of the monstrous crimes committed by this Nazi general. During the war Heusinger was chief of the operations department of the German Army High Command, and on his orders the Nazis carried out mass shootings in Byelorussia. In the autumn of 1942, for instance, 45,000 people were shot in the Brest area. It was on his personal orders demanding "the taking of repressive measures with the application of the harshest measures of intimidation" that in September 1942 the Nazis shed the blood of the peaceful inhabitants of the Byelorussian settlement of Slavnoye, brutally killing completely innocent people. Adolf Heusinger took part in the preparation and execution of Hitler's plans for the enslavement of the peoples of Europe. And now this hangman-cum-general is held in high honour once again and his hands are stretching avidly to weapons of mass destruction. The conscience of mankind cannot tolerate this.

149. This situation has arisen in West Germany because the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France began to violate the Potsdam Agreement immediately the war was over. As had been the case after the First World War, United States aid in the amount of several thousand million dollars set German militarism on its feet again. This has been admitted by the former Nazi General Speidel who said on 8 August 1960: "Without this aid we would never have been able to set up, organize and train the armed forces of the Federal Republic". It may well be that these words are music to the ears of certain United States politicians, but the peoples of Europe—and not of Europe alone—resolutely condemn the dangerous policy of reviving German militarism.

150. The Governments of the Western countries perhaps entertain hopes of once again directing eastwards the war machine of German militarism. But the road to the East has been barred to aggressors once and for all. The socialist countries have at their disposal everything needed in order to offer a crushing rebuff to the German militarists and their military allies. We should like to draw the attention of the ruling circles of the Western countries to the fact that German militarism also knows the road to the West. Last September, for instance, in connexion with the

holding of the so-called "Day of the Fatherland" in a number of West German cities, leaders of the Christian Democratic Party, the ruling party in the Federal Republic of Germany, demanded the return of "territories beyond Germany's western frontiers". As we all know, declarations of this kind are neither isolated nor accidental. The Western European countries and their statesmen who are encouraging Adenauer ought to give thought to these statements and look to the security of their own peoples.

151. The stand taken by the socialist countries on the German question is not motivated by a desire for revenge or hatred of the German people. It is dictated by concern for the fate of peace in Europe and in the world. Peace is desired by the German people itself, whose interests are being suitably defended by the German Democratic Republic, a genuinely peace-loving and democratic State. The Government of the German Democratic Republic has consistently put forward proposals for the peaceful settlement of the German question.

152. The document [see A/4504] on the general and complete disarmament of the two German States, issued by the Government of the German Democratic Republic and circulated in the United Nations at the request of the Czechoslovak delegation is further evidence of this fact. The Byelorussian delegation warmly supports these proposals. Delegations should read this document and think its contents over. It has been inspired by the wish of the German Democratic Republic to make a contribution to the bringing about of general and complete disarmament. It suggests an important step—the general and complete disarmament of the two German States, a measure in which not only the peoples of Europe but also those of the other continents are greatly interested.

153. In his speech Mr. Macmillan explained the militarization of the Federal Republic of Germany by asserting that the German Democratic Republic is armed and pursues a policy contrary to peace. This argument is untenable, to put it mildly. The German Democratic Republic advocates the total disarmament of both German States. How can one juggle with the facts to that extent?

154. It is high time the Western countries adopted a reasonable attitude towards Germany and recognized that two German States now exist. We believe that the most sensible course in the present circumstances would be to conclude a peace treaty with the two sovereign German States—the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany—and bring the situation in West Berlin back to normal, in accordance with the USSR Government's proposals. The conclusion of a peace treaty would put an end to remilitarization and "revanchism" in West Germany; it would open up to the German people the prospects of peaceful and democratic development; it would greatly facilitate the solution of the problem of Germany's unification; it would lead to the elimination of a threat of war which is once again emerging in the heart of Europe; and it would consolidate peace and promote the security of peoples.

155. More than once it has proved necessary to draw the General Assembly's attention to the aggressive actions of the United States against the Soviet Union. Today, we are compelled to do so again, because recent events have shown conclusively the serious

threat to world peace created by the acts of aggression rashly committed by the United States Government.

156. The latest provocative intrusions by United States U-2 and RB-47 military aircraft into the air space of the USSR, which are but links in a long chain of similar acts of provocation, are fresh in everybody's memory. In the last two years there have been twenty-five cases of provocative intrusions by United States military aircraft into the air space of the Soviet Union alone; this figure does not include violations of the sovereignty of the People's Republic of China and other States.

157. Quite frankly, we Soviet nationals find it hard to remain calm when we speak of this disgraceful activity by the military clique and the Government of the United States. Yet there are individuals, even here in the United Nations, who try to represent the United States as a peace-loving Power. This shameful role can be played only by minions of the United States.

158. The whole world, I repeat, the whole world, was alarmed when the United States U-2 aircraft flew over the territory of the Soviet Union and was then shot down. There was no corner of the world, it seemed, where public opinion did not indignantly condemn the United States Government's policy of playing with fire. Even here, in the United States itself, not a few sober voices were raised in protest. But instead of drawing the necessary conclusions from the U-2 venture, the United States repeated it exactly two months later by sending an RB-47 towards the shores of the Soviet Union. As is known, both these piratical raids had a sorry ending for their organizers. But it is permissible to ask what is the intention of the Pentagon and the United States Government in pursuing this policy of provocation. Is it possible that the United States Government does not realize that its policy is extremely dangerous to the cause of peace? One must give its due to the USSR Government, which has been showing concern for the fate of mankind, exercising self-restraint and doing everything in its power to shield the world from the catastrophe of war.

159. The acts of aggression by the United States must put on their guard those present in this hall and ordinary folk in all countries, with whose fate the military clique in the United States is gambling so cruelly. One can imagine what will be left of the sovereignty of many small countries—and they comprise the majority of United Nations Members—if the United States Government, which has proclaimed spying from the air and the violation of the sovereignty of other States to be its official policy and which claims impunity for these criminal acts, is not sternly called to order in good time. All those who are concerned over the fate of peace and the security of peoples cannot fail to condemn the acts of aggression by the United States against the Soviet Union. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR thinks that it is the duty of the General Assembly to compel the United States to respect the United Nations Charter, the rules of international law and the sovereignty of other States, because this policy on the part of the United States increases tension in international relations, presents a threat to the security of peoples and is fraught with the most grievous consequences for the cause of peace.

160. Public opinion throughout the world calls for the ending of the reckless policy of the arms race which is dangerous to the cause of peace, and the stopping of the senseless expenditure of material resources on preparations for war.

161. According to data published in the United States Press, the countries of the West which belong to various aggressive blocs annually spend for military purposes 63,000 million dollars, or more than half the annual income of all the under-developed countries in the world. The expenditures of the United States for direct military purposes average 128 million dollars per day. This sum is almost double the amount allocated by the United States Government for the building of schools in the 1960-1961 fiscal year. The achievement of general and complete disarmament, as proposed by the Soviet Union, would lighten the heavy burden of taxes borne by the workers of the capitalist countries, and would open up limitless prospects for the improvement of standards of living.

162. The idea of general and complete disarmament is being enthusiastically welcomed and supported by the peoples of all countries of the world. It is not so easy now to oppose this idea; that is why everyone is talking about disarmament. Why, then, has no appropriate agreement on disarmament yet been reached? Who is responsible for the breakdown of disarmament negotiations?

163. The representatives of Western countries who have spoken here, President Eisenhower and Mr. Macmillan among them, have clearly tried to shift the blame from the guilty to the innocent by accusing the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries represented on the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament of disrupting the Committee's work. The facts show that it was the Western Powers themselves who reduced the work of the Committee to a deadlock. In order to reach an agreement, the delegations of the USSR and the other socialist countries took a flexible attitude in the Committee and made concessions to the Western Powers on many points. But there was no constructive response from the Western countries. Nor can their latest proposals be considered constructive, for they repeat the old formula for the establishment of control over armaments; and that, as you know, is diametrically opposed to disarmament. It became clear that the Western Powers were using the Ten-Nation Committee as a screen to cover the continuance of the armaments race, and were merely deceiving the peoples into thinking that they were in favour of disarmament. The Soviet Union and the other socialist States could naturally not be parties to such a deception of the peoples, and broke off their work in the Ten-Nation Committee.

164. But the Soviet Union is persistently working to bring about general and complete disarmament. The idea of general and complete disarmament, the most humane idea in the history of mankind, has gained new strength since Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Soviet delegation and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, made his speech to the General Assembly [862nd meeting] on 23 September 1960. The Soviet delegation has submitted for the General Assembly's consideration a number of new proposals, which are set forth in the document, "Basic provisions of a treaty on general and complete disarmament" [A/4505]. These proposals develop further

the idea of general and complete disarmament. They take into account the experience of the negotiations which have been held on the question of disarmament, the constructive suggestions made and the wishes expressed by the official representatives of various countries, and the views of spokesmen of the general public.

165. This detailed programme not only provides for the achievement of general and complete disarmament in three stages, but also ensures that at none of these stages shall any one State acquire military advantages over other States. All disarmament measures from beginning to end will be carried out under strict and effective international control which will be entirely appropriate, both in extent and in kind, to each stage of disarmament.

166. But what have the Western Powers brought to this session of the General Assembly? Let us take a look at their new positions on the disarmament question. However closely we examine the statements made by the representatives of the Western Powers we shall not find in them anything new, anything which shows that the Western Powers are working towards disarmament. The same old control over armaments, the same old inspection without disarmament—such are the elements which characterize the position of the United States, the United Kingdom and certain other Western countries. The primary factor in their approach to disarmament questions is still their desire to obtain espionage information about the socialist countries. In those circumstances, the inescapable conclusion is that for the Western Powers the ideal solution of the question would apparently be the conversion of Mr. Allen Dulles's agency into an international control organ. Surely, the militant rulers of the United States and the other countries members of NATO are asking a great deal!

167. The representative of Italy, in his speech [876th meeting], urged us to bear in mind the inequality existing in the sphere of conventional armed forces. I cannot refrain from pointing out that the basic provisions of a treaty on general and complete disarmament submitted by the Soviet delegation included proposals for reducing the armed forces of all States to agreed levels at the very first stage, the maximum levels suggested for the United States and the USSR being 1.7 million men.

168. Prime Minister Macmillan said many fine things about the need to save mankind from the threat of war, but himself proposed nothing that was really new. It is characteristic that not long before Mr. Macmillan made his statement to the United Nations General Assembly, Mr. Watkinson, the United Kingdom Minister of Defence, had argued for the continuance of the arms race. He said plainly that in the coming decade the United Kingdom would continue to build up its armaments. In this speech again, first place was given to the question of control.

169. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom proposed that a meeting of technical experts should be convened to work out measures for the inspection and control of disarmament. In support of his proposal Mr. Macmillan referred to the experience of the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests held at Geneva. It is true that a conference of experts of the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom produced a joint report, one of the con-

clusions of which was that control over nuclear explosions could be fully ensured. But the ink had barely dried on the signatures to the experts' report when the Western Powers began to cast doubt on its conclusions. And for nearly two years now the United States and the United Kingdom, using all kinds of dubious "technical" and pseudo-scientific arguments, have been hindering the conclusion of an agreement for the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. All this suggests that the proposal made by the United Kingdom Prime Minister is apparently just a new trick on the part of the Western Powers to delude the people into thinking that something is really being done in the sphere of disarmament.

170. The conclusion of an agreement on the discontinuance of nuclear tests and the prohibition of nuclear weapons does not suit the book of the ruling groups in the United States, who are following a policy designed to increase international tension, and they are compelled to use every possible means to conceal their aims. It was with this very intention that President Eisenhower, in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly [868th meeting], proposed that countries should transfer part of their fissionable materials to international stockpiles and should gradually cease production of such materials. It is not difficult, however, to detect the real meaning and the insincerity of this proposal. It must be clear to everyone that the transfer of a certain quantity of fissionable material to an international organization, or even the cessation of the production of such materials, does not rule out the possibility of a nuclear war. After all, the United States has already accumulated a sufficient quantity of nuclear weapons to ensure that even if the production of fissionable materials were stopped, the sword of Damocles would still be hanging over our heads in the form of weapons of mass destruction which might be put into action at any moment upon the whim of some madman. And no inspection will be of any use.

171. The Soviet Union is proposing a clear and precise programme: to prohibit both tests and the production of nuclear weapons, to destroy the means of their delivery and then the weapons themselves, and to abolish military bases on foreign territory. Just that is what the socialist countries are asking. What more radical step could be taken as regards disarmament? But the Western Powers are against these proposals; they even refuse to discuss them in plenary meetings of the General Assembly.

172. Who can still be in doubt that the Western Powers have no serious intention of finding a positive solution to the question of disarmament? The real reason why the United States and its partners sabotaged the disarmament negotiations was that the militarization of the economy and the armaments race brings the monopolies of the imperialist Powers fabulous profits.

173. Take for example the United States, where the profits of the monopolies engaged in armaments production have become truly astronomical. The General Dynamics Corporation, which produces ballistic missiles, submarines, military aircraft and other military equipment, has in the last ten years increased its profits from \$1.8 to \$91.8 million. During the same period the profits of the United Aircraft Corporation have grown from \$16 to \$109 million. In 1947 the profits of the General Electric Company amounted to

\$177 million; now they are more than \$500 million. But even that is not enough for them. The American military production monopolies are demanding larger and larger military orders; are demanding the continuance of the armaments race; and military expenditure in the United States is climbing.

174. At a time when the United States and its allies are preventing a positive settlement of the disarmament question, the General Assembly must make its authoritative voice heard. It must recognize the need for a prompt solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament and ensure the earliest possible preparation and conclusion of a disarmament agreement. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR, for its part, fully approves the basic provisions of a treaty on general and complete disarmament submitted by the Soviet delegation, and urges all delegations to support these proposals. The General Assembly should also recommend the earliest possible completion of the work of drafting an agreement on the discontinuance of nuclear tests, and should call upon Powers possessing nuclear weapons not to carry out any tests of these weapons before the conclusion of the relevant agreement.

175. Our criticism of the work of the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament does not mean that we are fundamentally opposed to the disarmament question's being considered in any committee at all. Experience has shown, however, that with the present composition of the Ten-Nation Committee, no agreement on disarmament questions is possible. We therefore support the Soviet delegation's proposal [A/4509] that the Committee should be augmented by the addition of five neutral countries. We have no doubt that they will play a constructive part in the Committee's work and that this will help to bring about a positive settlement of the question of general and complete disarmament at the earliest possible date.

176. The Byelorussian delegation fully and entirely agrees with Mr. Khrushchev's proposals for the reorganization of the United Nations Secretariat and the elimination of unjust representation in the Security Council. We consider these proposals extremely sound.

177. The fact is that a great deal of time has passed since the adoption of the United Nations Charter and the establishment of the United Nations organs. During this time the world situation—the distribution of forces in the world arena, has radically changed. A powerful camp of socialist countries, with a population numbering 1,000 million, has come into being. Many States in Asia, Africa and other parts of the world have freed themselves from colonial dependence, have started along the road to successful development as States and are following a policy of neutralism. They present a mighty front of neutral States which is having a significant influence on world politics. As for the Western bloc, in recent years it has lost its former position both economically and militarily. But the composition of the Security Council and the structure of the Secretariat have remained unchanged. What is more, the executive organs and staff of the United Nations are made up of supporters of the bloc of Western capitalist countries, and they pursue a policy advantageous to the United States of America.

178. Mr. Hammarskjöld, the Secretary-General, puts on a show here of outraged innocence, but his

lack of objectivity is obvious. It is clear from his behaviour in the Congo (Leopoldville), that he is the servant of the Western countries. If anyone still has any doubts on that score he need only look at the memorandum dated 27 September 1960 submitted by the Congolese Parliamentary delegation, which has been circulated to representatives. The mere fact that the Western countries have raised such a clamour in response to the criticism of Mr. Hammarskjöld, that they have gone all out to keep him in his post, makes it obvious whose interests he serves as Secretary-General. How can we have confidence in a Secretary-General of the United Nations who is not guided in his actions by the principles of the United Nations Charter?

179. Thus, the structure and composition of the executive organs of the United Nations do not correspond to the distribution of forces in the world, to the new situation in the world. The Western Powers ignore that fact. They are still trying to act as masters in the United Nations, as they have done in the past, and since the machinery of the United Nations is in their hands they succeed in imposing their policy on it. This makes it impossible for the United Nations to fulfil its purpose of maintaining international peace and security and settling international disputes, in conformity with the principles of justice and international law.

180. The representatives of the Western countries complained loudly that the Soviet Union's proposals had created a crisis in the United Nations. But the United Nations has long been undergoing a crisis, as a result of the illegal usurpation of power in its executive organs by the United States of America. The Soviet Union, concerned as it is at the state of the world, has submitted proposals which are designed to remove the crisis in the United Nations, to restore the Organization to health. The United Nations ought to be a universal organization, in which only generally agreed decisions should be carried out. The present situation in the United Nations does not meet these requirements. The fact that the People's Republic of China has for ten years been prevented from taking part in the work of the United Nations and that the Mongolian People's Republic has been denied admission to membership is a black spot in the history of the United Nations. It is evidence of the situation that exists in the Organization. The blame for this strange situation rests with the United States, which brings pressure to bear on many States and exercises arbitrary rule in the United Nations.

181. If the United Nations Secretariat remains in the hands of the United States and its military allies, this situation may continue. But in that case there will be no organization in the world which can take agreed decisions, binding on all, on matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. This is a matter of much concern to the delegations of the socialist countries; and many other delegations, too, understand this situation. Thus, when we say that the Secretariat should be reorganized and inequitable representation in the Security Council ended, it is because we believe that the Organization must be strengthened and turned into an international forum which could really put into effect the lofty principles of the United Nations Charter. The Soviet Union's proposals must be seen as an important contribution towards strengthening the Organization and raising its

international prestige, as an important measure towards putting the principles of the United Nations Charter into effect.

182. The sharply negative reaction of the Western Powers to the Soviet Union's proposal shows once again that the time is ripe for the reorganization of the executive organs of the United Nations, and that the Western Powers do not want to lose the advantages they at present enjoy in the United Nations.

183. It is time to stop the United Nations being used as a tool of the Western bloc. The United Nations is an international organization, and the legitimate interests of all its Members should be given equitable weight in its activities. The Soviet Union's proposal is not prompted by any desire on the part of the socialist countries to secure a special position for themselves in the United Nations. What we want is the strengthening of the Organization. The United Nations will be strong only when it reflects the interests of all. All we want is that the positions of all countries, and not of one group of countries only—as is the case at present—should be taken into account in the executive organs of the United Nations and in the Organization itself. We wish the executive machinery of the United Nations to reflect the real position obtaining in the world.

184. Concerned as we are for the future, we believe that such a reorganization can be regarded as one important step towards bringing about the conditions in which a programme of general and complete disarmament can be carried out. We fully share the opinion of Mr. Khrushchev, the Chairman of the Soviet delegation, that there can be no disarmament without safeguards against the misuse of United Nations armed forces. There can be no disarmament in the absence of a staff which will carry out decisions in the interests of all. We believe that if the Western Powers really want disarmament they must recognize the need to reorganize the United Nations Secretariat and to correct the inequitable situation which has arisen in the Security Council.

185. A real sign of the times is the sudden collapse of the shameful colonial system which not long ago extended, over vast areas of the earth. Since the overthrow of colonialism in Asia, the banner of the national liberation movement has been seized by the long-suffering continent of Africa which had been reduced to the very last stages of impoverishment by the European colonizers and held back several centuries in its social development. Indeed, whatever indicator we take for purposes of comparison, whether it be national income, the level of industrial development, literacy or the provision of medical services, Africa takes the lowest place in the whole world. The dire results which the overlordship of the colonialists has had for the African people are indicated, for example, by the fact that Africa's share in the world's population has shrunk from 20 per cent in the sixteenth century to 8 per cent in the twentieth.

186. The Western Powers accord Africa a special place in their plans. The capitalist monopolies count on the fantastically wealthy African continent to compensate them for the loss of their colonial possessions in Asia. In a report ^{3/} to the United States Senate pre-

pared by the Frances Bolton mission in 1956, it was stated that one of the goals of the United States in Africa was to secure access to the continent's raw materials, in order, particularly, to meet strategic needs. And in Alliance Policy in the Cold War, published in 1959 and edited by Arnold Wolfers, Director of the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, it was stated:

"It could be argued that we should support our European allies in their colonial policies on the assumption that European strength, so necessary to the defense of the West, depended upon the economic and strategic benefits of the colonial system."^{4/}

187. Recent events show that the colonialists are making desperate attempts to hold back the headlong development of the liberation movement on the African continent. But the mighty tide of national liberation is sweeping away the last bastions of colonialism. Already this year, the independent countries of Africa account for three-quarters of the continent's population and two-thirds of its territory.

188. At its present session, the General Assembly has admitted to membership in the United Nations sixteen new States, including fifteen African countries. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR, on behalf of the whole Byelorussian people, warmly welcomes the new African States and the Republic of Cyprus, and asks the delegations of these countries to convey to their peoples our sincere wishes for their successful economic and social progress and the consolidation of their independence.

189. We rejoice at the fact that in 1960 a large group of colonial peoples acquired political independence. But it should not be forgotten that many peoples are still suffering under the yoke of colonial slavery and are struggling for their freedom.

190. True, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom in addressing the General Assembly, said that the Soviet Union's call for the liquidation of colonialism was completely anachronistic. But the whole world knows that the peoples of Kenya, Tanganyika, Rhodesia, South West Africa, Angola, Mozambique and Ruanda-Urundi in Africa, of Goa and West Irian in Asia and of Guiana in America are still languishing under the yoke of colonial slavery, and are deprived of elementary human rights.

191. Who can believe that colonialism is dead, when blood has been flowing for six years now in Algeria, where the French colonialists are trying by fire and sword to break the will of the Algerian people, heroically fighting for the freedom and independence of their fatherland?

192. And does not the policy of the imperialist Powers in the Congo (Leopoldville) tell us that colonialism is still alive, and that it is adapting itself to new conditions, employing new forms and methods of resistance to the national liberation movement of the peoples? In the events in the Congo we see reflected as in a mirror the manifestly colonialist character of the North Atlantic and other blocs of Western States headed by the United States of America.

193. It is the responsibility of the United Nations to take decisive measures to restore the situation in the

^{3/} Bolton, Frances P.: Report of the Special Study Mission to Africa South and East of the Sahara. Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1956.

^{4/} See Alliance Policy in the Cold War, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1959, p. 236.

Republic of the Congo to normal and to establish suitable conditions for the unhindered functioning of the Parliament elected by the people and of the Lumumba Government—the only lawful one. The first condition for the normalization of the situation in the Congo is, as the Congolese Government requests, the immediate withdrawal from the Congo of the troops and military personnel of Belgium and its allies, under whatever cover or pretext they may be there. The only troops which should remain in the Congo are those United Nations military units which are approved by the Lumumba Government. The Congolese people, its Parliament and its lawful Government, are capable of settling their national problems themselves, and will undoubtedly do so successfully if the United States and other western Powers stop interfering in Congolese internal affairs.

194. The duty of the General Assembly is to put an end to colonialism once and for all—to turn over this shameful page in the history of mankind. The Byelorussian delegation fully supports the draft declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [A/4502] submitted by the Soviet delegation for the consideration of the United Nations, and appeals to the delegations of all States to endorse this manifesto, thereby opening a new era in the history of mankind—the era of the complete emancipation of the peoples from colonial dependence.

195. This draft declaration has met with a hostile reception from ruling circles in the Western countries. According to the Press, Mr. Herter, the United States Secretary of State, has bitterly opposed this profoundly democratic document. This reaction on his part merely proves that ruling circles in the United States, reflecting the will of the monopolies, are pursuing a colonialist policy. Mr. Herter's violent reaction to the Soviet delegation's proposal showed that the colonialists are afraid of the peoples' struggle for their independence, and that it is not through any grace of theirs that the enslaved peoples will win their freedom.

196. We frankly state that we are resolutely in favour of the immediate abolition of colonialism, that we are on the side of the peoples which are fighting against shameful colonial enslavement, and that in their noble fight for freedom and independence these peoples can count on the moral and material support of the socialist countries.

197. The peoples which are still in a state of colonial dependence or which have only recently acquired their political freedom know that it is no less important to liberate themselves from the economic shackles of the imperialist monopolies. Cuba's heroic struggle clearly illustrates what a difficult problem the emancipation of the colonies and the under-developed countries from the power and oppression of monopolistic capital is. The peoples which have already won political freedom are now faced with the greater and more difficult task of fighting for their economic freedom.

198. It must be borne in mind that the capitalists never give anyone disinterested help. The peoples of the under-developed countries pay at a very high rate for assistance, for the monopolies extract from their countries profits far exceeding the assistance given. In their endeavour to enslave the peoples the imperialists make use even of the forms of assistance to the under-developed countries which are provided under United Nations auspices.

199. In his address to the General Assembly, President Eisenhower tried to represent the United States as a great champion of the economic and social progress of the under-developed countries. He used every means to advertise the United States plan of assistance to those countries. I feel compelled to point out that in describing the United States aid plan the President said nothing of the need to industrialize the under-developed countries or to develop their agriculture. On the contrary, he spoke only about the disposal of American agricultural surpluses in these countries, and particularly stressed the need for sending them, through the United Nations, administrators and observers of every sort. It is doubtful whether the peoples of the under-developed countries will gain anything from such plans of assistance.

200. President Eisenhower and Mr. Macmillan, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, tried in this Assembly to prove to the representatives of the new countries of Africa how little assistance the USSR and the other socialist countries are giving the under-developed countries. It was a vain attempt. Those to whom those parts of the addresses in question were directed know that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are giving the under-developed countries disinterested assistance in the development of their own economies, their industries, their agriculture, and in the exploitation of their natural resources in the interests of the people. Moreover, the socialist countries do not attach any political conditions to their assistance, but adhere strictly to the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of the under-developed countries. The representatives of the colonial Powers make much of their help to the under-developed countries, but these countries would have far greater resources available for their economic development if the Western Powers returned to their peoples even part of the wealth they stole from them during the long years of their colonial domination.

201. The assistance given to the countries which have freed themselves from colonial oppression should be such as to promote the speediest elimination of their economic backwardness and of the poverty and illiteracy of their peoples, and to remove from every corner of the earth the heavy consequences of long colonialist domination. Such assistance, whether given through the United Nations or on a bilateral basis, should expand and increase.

202. The peoples of all countries in the world are demanding an end to the cold war; they wish to live in conditions of peaceful coexistence and co-operation between countries with different social systems. The question of peaceful coexistence or war has become the crucial issue of world politics.

203. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, which have put forward the only sound programme of peaceful coexistence, propose that all States should compete in raising the levels of living of their peoples, not in the armaments race; in the construction of housing, hospitals and schools, not of military bases and rocket launching pads; in the expansion of mutually profitable trade and cultural exchanges, not in the cold war. This programme is being more and more actively supported by millions of ordinary people in all corners of the globe.

204. Never was the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace and for the

future of the peoples so great as it is at present. The peoples expect from this session of the General Assembly real and decisive measures for the consolidation of international peace and security. We must do everything in our power not to disappoint them.

Mr. Boland (Ireland) resumed the Chair.

205. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Guatemala has expressed a desire to exercise his right of reply, and I now give him the floor.

206. Mr. HERRARTE (Guatemala) (translated from Spanish): In his speech on Tuesday, 27 September 1960 [874th meeting], the Guatemalan Minister for Foreign Affairs complained from this rostrum of the threats of certain elements, sponsored by the Cuban Government, to invade Guatemala. Later, at the same meeting, exercising the right of reply, the Cuban delegation gave assurances that Cuba was not intervening and would not intervene in the domestic affairs of other States.

207. Nevertheless, on the instructions of my Government, I have come before the Assembly to repeat the charge. On the night of 1 October 1960, a frigate flying no flag but bearing the name La Cubana, was sighted in Guatemalan territorial waters on the Atlantic side and refused to respond to orders to halt for inspection by the port authorities of Matías de Gálvez. According to reports received by my Government, the frigate was expected by communist elements in contact with the present Cuban Government, and was using the darkness of the night to reach the Guatemalan coast. The Guatemalan Air Force compelled it to withdraw from territorial waters and on the following day it was sighted close to the island of Cozumel, listing to port. This news item was sent out by the Press cable agencies and was published in The New York Times, though not in full on 4 October.

208. I should observe that this landing was synchronized with certain disturbances which took place on the morning of 2 October in the capital of Guatemala at the instigation of communist leaders acting on flimsy pretexts.

209. The Guatemalan Government, through the General Assembly, wishes to protest most energetically against these further instances of interference by the Cuban Government in the domestic political affairs of Guatemala, all of which constitute aggression and are endangering the free institutions of Guatemala.

210. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Indonesia in exercise of his right of reply.

211. Mr. SOEBANDRIO (Indonesia): Knowing well the pressure of time and work upon this session of the General Assembly, it is with some reluctance that I have requested the right of reply to the statement made yesterday [886th meeting] by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands. The issues raised are so grave that they must be clarified.

212. The Netherlands Foreign Minister has challenged Indonesia to clarify its position and its statements. I am glad to accept this challenge. However, I wish to leave no illusion in the mind of anyone, least of all in the mind of the Netherlands Foreign Minister. By exercising the right of reply, Indonesia does not retreat from the position expressed last week [880th meeting] by President Sukarno on behalf of the Indonesian Government and people. Indonesia makes no

form of apology for the considered words used by our President. Indonesia has no intention of acting otherwise than as explicitly indicated by President Sukarno.

213. The Netherlands Foreign Minister referred to the conflict between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands. This conflict originated in the fact that the Netherlands still refuses to recognize the complete transfer of sovereignty from the Netherlands East Indies to the independent Republic of Indonesia. It was explicitly agreed that this transfer was to cover the whole territory of the Netherlands East Indies. The Netherlands, a decade later, has still not lived up to this agreement. The conflict began as a political conflict, but during the years it has extended itself, by no fault of ours, to economic matters, and now, unfortunately, and again through no fault of ours, the threat of physical issues is raised.

214. The General Assembly has been told by the representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that Indonesia sustains a territorial claim to West Irian. That is not true. Indonesia is not sustaining any territorial claim; we are declaring the right of the Indonesian people to be sovereign and independent within all the territory formerly covered by the Netherlands East Indies. We do not make any claim to any other part of the Indonesian Archipelago. Indonesia explicitly does not make any claim at all to territory such as that in Borneo or Timor which lies within the Indonesian Archipelago but was not part of the Netherlands East Indies. We are not sustaining a territorial claim; we are sustaining a national claim, and that national claim is the right of our nation to be united and independent.

215. In 1950, when the Netherlands recognized our sovereignty, it did not whole-heartedly complete the formal transfer, nor has it yet done so. Indeed, in every part of Indonesia the Netherlands left behind the seeds of unrest and disturbance. I would remind the General Assembly of the military disturbances, caused by the Dutch adventurer Westerling. I would also remind the General Assembly of the separatist movements, originated or encouraged by the Netherlands, such as what is usually called the Republic of the South Moluccas. There was political, economic and military subversion. This was beyond question instigated and encouraged by those Dutch interests which still sought to preserve themselves in our territory and to capitalize on a troubled and turbulent situation. Furthermore, separatism was encouraged not only in the territory of West Irian but also in Java, Sumatra, and other islands.

216. We survived these things, and not only have we survived them, but for the greater part we have eliminated the obstacles to unity and progress left behind by the Netherlands. We have survived, we have eliminated those obstacles and we are growing stronger; and now, anything the Netherlands does against us, be sure that we will meet them on equal terms.

217. I am constantly surprised and amused at the pseudo-scientific arguments advanced concerning alleged ethnological differences between the peoples of West Irian and the peoples of the rest of Indonesia. I am amused by this because during the generations of colonialism the Dutch lost no opportunity of arguing scientifically that all the peoples of the Netherlands East Indies were ethnologically related. Now they are

indeed scraping the bottom of a very empty barrel to controvert their own colonial arguments.

218. It is no part of my intention to enter into the ethnological field. The realities of political life are not dependent upon real or alleged ethnological similarities or differences. If that yardstick is to be applied, then I await with impatience the Netherlands intervention to ensure that all peoples who are ethnologically different be disunited.

219. We are not making any new claim. I would point out that in Indonesian history there have been moments of great glory and power, such as during the Kingdoms of Modjapahit and Sriwijaya when our territory extended far beyond our present frontiers. We never refer to this, and we have no wish to expand to those frontiers. I mention these facts to indicate that the territory of the Netherlands East Indies was not accidentally delimited.

220. It has become usual that whenever sovereignty is transferred to a new State there is some doubt whether all parts of the territory should belong to the new State. Attempts at dismemberment are disguised under various cloaks, including the cloak of self-determination. I may cite as a recent example of this the situation in the Congo (Leopoldville). We cannot afford more Congos, more West Irians. I may indeed ask whether the representative of the United Kingdom is prepared for this type of disguised dismemberment, bearing in mind the claims of the Scottish and Welsh nationalists. Or, for that matter, is the United States prepared for this—a country which, a hundred years ago, fought a war on this very question? Obviously, this is a ridiculous proposition. By saying this, I just want to show what kind of erratic conclusion we can draw from the logic of the Netherlands Foreign Minister.

221. If the United Nations wishes to apply the right of dismemberment—which is what the Dutch are actually proposing under the cloak of self-determination—then it must be applied to all nations, old and new. Old established and newly established nations must be measured by the same yardstick.

222. When I speak of applying the same yardstick everywhere, I also cannot refrain from expressing my bewilderment at the exclusive and strangely limited Dutch conception of the right of self-determination. The representative of the Netherlands declared yesterday that Indonesia owed its independent existence to the right of self-determination. I beg to differ. Yes, we exercised the right of self-determination. The whole people of Indonesia exercised this right. But we owe our independent existence to our struggle for national independence. We had to fight for our independent existence because the Dutch refused to recognize the right of self-determination. And what is the record of the Netherlands in other cases? The Netherlands did not support the right of self-determination for the people of Morocco, when that people was struggling for its freedom and submitted its case to the United Nations. The Netherlands did not support in the United Nations the right of the people of Tunisia to self-determination. Yesterday and today, the Netherlands does not support the right of self-determination of the Algerian people and they, like the people of Indonesia, have to wrest their independent existence through bitter struggle.

223. So what is the Dutch conception of the right of self-determination? It is a perversion of that right. It is a denial of that right. It is the indefinite suspension of that right until conditions, according to the Dutch, warrant the exercise of the right of self-determination—that is, in the never-arriving future. For Indonesia, the right of self-determination meant, according to the Netherlands, after hundreds of years. But we did not wait hundreds of years. The whole people of Indonesia have exercised their right of self-determination, and that right cannot be negated now.

224. What about the Netherlands allegiance to the principles of the United Nations? I would not raise this issue except for the fact that the Netherlands Foreign Minister declared yesterday that the President of Indonesia had, in his address before this body, threatened to act in a manner contrary to the principles of the United Nations, thereby undermining its authority and jeopardizing the peace.

225. I believe that I can say, without any contradiction from anyone, that Indonesia has never acted or threatened to act contrary to the principles of the United Nations. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said about the Netherlands. It was the Netherlands which committed an act of aggression against Indonesia, in open defiance of the Security Council. This did not occur so long ago. Certainly, it did not occur so long ago that sensible persons would find it too difficult to conceive of the Netherlands harbouring any idea of aggressive intentions towards Indonesia. The Netherlands Foreign Minister said yesterday that this was fantastic. It was perhaps equally fantastic some years ago, but it happened nevertheless. It is hardly for the Netherlands, which has once defied the United Nations, which continues to refuse to be guided by the United Nations principle of negotiation, to accuse any country, including Indonesia, of acting contrary to the principles of the United Nations.

226. Apart from that, what then is the basic threat to peace? In our world, there is today a sustained, irreversible and world-wide drive of peoples and nations to satisfy their basic demands to grow as free, prosperous entities. Opposed to this drive there is colonialism. It is this opposition, it is this colonialism which creates the threat to peace. This is obviously so in Algeria, for example, and equally obviously so in West Irian. The existence of colonialism in West Irian presents a threat to peace. Whether this threat comes in terms of physical conflict is immaterial. It is a conflict in the hearts and minds of men, and this is the basic threat toward peace.

227. Since 1950, as President Sukarno pointed out, we have tried bilateral negotiations and negotiations within the United Nations. We continued and persevered with these negotiations even when Netherlands subversion within our country was rampant in the economic, military and political fields. We continued the negotiations, with tolerance and hope. We sought to persuade the Netherlands into a lasting friendship and co-operation with Indonesia. But it could come about only if the Netherlands recognized the complete territorial independence of Indonesia. Unfortunately, we failed. We foundered on the rock of Dutch colonial intransigence. We were left with no alternative. We had to take other ways to protect our own interests, to reunite our territory, to outlive Netherlands subversion and to eliminate all the obstacles put in our path by reactionary Netherlands colonial interests.

228. Indeed, we have embarked upon a new course. Now we are meeting political undermining with political force. We are meeting economic undermining with economic force and we will meet physical force with physical force too. This is a national right which cannot be denied. Do not expect us to sit idly by and accept passively hostile Netherlands activities. Do not expect us passively to await a fate dictated by a remote and unrealistic nation. To do so would perhaps ease the mind of the Netherlands Government, but it would mean the end of Indonesia.

229. I say explicitly that Indonesia is determined to meet force with force in any field. This is not a threat; this is a reality which the Netherlands must accept and which the world must accept. Stubbornness has left us no alternative. Statements issued by the Netherlands offices of publicity before the aircraft carrier Karel Doorman was despatched to Indonesian waters can be interpreted as a semi-declaration of war. What are we to do? Stand idly by? That we will not do. I say again, we will meet force with force and in doing so we are within our rights and within the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

230. Do not think that we are not filled with regret and sorrow that this situation should have arisen. It is not our fault. We have much to do in our country and it is tragic that so much of our effort and so much of our money must be used in this way. In fact, we, like every nation, cannot afford not to be peaceful. We cannot afford not to struggle for a higher living standard.

231. In his statement yesterday to the General Assembly, the Netherlands Foreign Minister said that the Netherlands administration in West Irian has no other aim than to prepare the population of the Territory, within the shortest possible time, for the exercise of its right of self-determination. He went on to say that it should decide for itself whether it wishes to be an independent country, or to join up with the eastern part of the island, or to become part of Indonesia, or to opt for any other form of political existence.

232. I say clearly that there is no genuine right of self-determination contemplated by the Netherlands. The fact is that statements about this are used and misused for the purpose of continuing colonialism. The Netherlands Foreign Minister said that the people may decide to become part of Indonesia. The fact is that they decided to do this, and did it, fifteen years ago.

233. Today, those same people are being subjected to conditioning in order to destroy their right of self-determination, freedom of choice and national unity. I refer the President to a statement made recently by a distinguished member of the Dutch Parliament, Mr. Patijn, who said that the promises made by the Netherlands are so vague that they permit the contemplation of a Dutch colonial empire for another thousand years.

234. I would point out also that the reality of the Dutch administration is not by any means like the picture so lightly sketched by the Netherlands Foreign Minister. I do not intend at this moment to embark upon a discussion about these matters, but I will point out that even the Dutch Parliament has been concerned about the deplorable conditions prevailing in West Irian. A Dutch Parliamentary Mission visited

the area last year, and the Dutch administrator was dismissed shortly afterwards.

235. Referring now in more general terms to the ideas advanced by the representative of the Netherlands, I must mention the views expressed by him on the word "revolution". It is indeed elementary knowledge that a large part of the world is in a state of revolution. Any politician or statesman who does not recognize the fact that three-quarters of humanity is at this moment in a state of revolution is blind to history. Only a very small minority in the world is stable. We who are involved in revolution are not opposed to those who are stable. But let them not attempt to prevent the revolutionary changes which are taking place. A revolution is not a question of machine guns clattering in the streets. A revolution is not a matter of killing people. A revolution is a period of rapid and radical change and these changes are based upon human consciousness, human desires and human demands. The world-wide revolution of today is a world-wide demand by humanity for equality of freedom, opportunity, esteem and degree of emancipation. That is the reality. I am not saying that those who are stable should seek change. That is a question for themselves. I would remind those stable areas, however, that technically advanced thinking does not imply a monopoly of wisdom about the new social, political and economic conceptions required for the development of the majority of mankind. In fact, I am amazed at the ignorance and lack of interest in those matters often displayed in the stable quarter of the world.

236. President Sukarno said that we are not perhaps well versed in technical matters but that we are well versed in matters of social, political and economic conception, and in questions of democracy and the application of democracy. That is very true. We have faced so many problems on those fields that they have become part of our very lives. Our knowledge is not academic but severely practical. If we had not learned how to tackle the manifold problems facing us in those fields, we should long ago have collapsed. If there is dislocation, commotion and turbulence, there is not chaos. Only too often the imminent collapse of Indonesia has been prophesied by Netherlands organs of publicity, but in fact we have grown stronger.

237. It is a reality that the greatest struggle within the world today is not a conflict of ideology but a conflict between those seeking and demanding rapid revolutionary change and those opposing such change. It is a conflict between those seeking to restore or maintain the image of a glorious past and those seeking the reality of a glorious present and future.

238. Even if there were no ideological conflict within our world, there would still be confrontation on this field. This confrontation does not only apply to international problems but is a problem even within nations. However, that conflict between the nations declines as living standards become more level and equalitarian. If a nation such as the Netherlands does not understand this, that nation will become isolated. If the views which the statement of Mr. Luns reflects are contrary to reality, then the Netherlands Foreign Minister will be left behind by the new and decisive forces of history.

239. We are proud of solving our problems in a revolutionary way, a revolutionary way which is quickest and best for our people. We are not frustrated but

we are exhilarated by our daily struggle. It has become clear in Indonesia that our problem is not a merely technical problem but is the problem of finding and applying the right concept for every period, however transient that period may be. It is in this field of political, economic and social activity that Indonesia has a genuine contribution to make to the world.

240. I cannot refrain from referring again to the famous statement by George Canning to which the Netherlands Foreign Minister, like President Sukarno, referred. The level of political and ideological confrontation in the Netherlands is such that a political crisis can be caused by a proposal to raise the price of milk by one cent per pint. This delightfully illustrates the contention first expressed by George Canning. Whilst such matters take up the time and energy of Dutch politicians, they have lost the friendship and harmonious co-operation of Indonesia and bid fair to lose the friendship of all Asia and Africa. Has there ever been such a case of penny wise and pound foolish? We need perhaps a new George Canning to make a new aphorism today.

241. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of the Netherlands, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

242. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands): I take it that this is not the occasion to start a discussion about the question of Netherlands New Guinea. Such a discussion has been held no less than four times in the United Nations, and four times in succession the General Assembly has refused to accept the thesis that Indonesia came here to defend. Therefore, I shall not go into all the details of that question and I shall not answer all the points made by the representative of Indonesia. What I wish to do, in just a few words, is to point out a few mistakes and a few things that were incorrect in what he said.

243. In the first place, he started out by mentioning that when we made the agreement with Indonesia by which Indonesia became independent, it was agreed that we would transfer to Indonesia the whole of the territory that had formerly constituted Netherlands East Indies. The Foreign Minister of Indonesia knows just as well as I do that this is not correct. He knows just as well as I do that there was a treaty, called the Act of Transfer of Sovereignty and Recognition^{5/} and that article 2 of that treaty excepted from the transfer to Indonesia the Territory of Netherlands New Guinea with the stipulation that the fate and future of that Territory would be decided later on, to be precise, within a period of one year.

244. That was one error that I wish to point out. The second point that was made by the Foreign Minister of Indonesia was that the Indonesian claim was not a territorial claim but, as he put it, that Indonesia sustained the right of the Indonesian people to be united and independent and that, therefore, Indonesia claimed that the Netherlands should hand over to Indonesia the Territory of Netherlands New Guinea.

245. That argument begs the question because the issue that has kept us divided, and that is still keeping us divided, is that Indonesia takes it for granted that Netherlands New Guinea is a part of Indonesia and

that the population of Netherlands New Guinea wishes to be a part of Indonesia. But that is exactly the point on which we beg to differ because, when Indonesia says that it has already exercised our right of self-determination and the people of Netherlands New Guinea have already exercised that right, what they actually mean is that, when President Sukarno declared the independence of Indonesia in a statement which was made on 17 August 1945, he did that on behalf also of the population of Netherlands New Guinea. But, as has been stated many times before in this hall, there was at that time no communication whatsoever between Netherlands New Guinea and Indonesia. Java had been occupied in the war by the Japanese and at that time was still occupied, and there was not the slightest possibility for anybody there at that moment to ascertain what the wishes of the population in Netherlands New Guinea were. It therefore seems only fair and just to us that those who have so often and so eloquently pleaded here the cause of self-determination, and who have stated that a people should have the right to decide for itself whether it wants to belong to another country or whether it wants to be independent, should also apply that right to the people of Netherlands New Guinea. If Indonesia is right, if those people really do feel that they wish to be part of Indonesia, that will certainly appear at the time when the plebiscite—or whatever the form may be in which the population is consulted—takes place. If the Indonesian thesis is correct, it will appear so at that time. Therefore, I fail to see what objection Indonesia can possibly raise to our preparing this population in the shortest possible time, as indicated by our Foreign Minister, for the exercise of that right which is laid down in the Charter of the Organization and which has been defended by so many countries here.

246. The Foreign Minister of Indonesia, apart from pleading his own case, pointed to what he considered some shortcomings in the thesis of the Netherlands and also in Netherlands actions. He said that, when we talk about the right of self-determination, we do not really mean it. I do not think that I need argue that point at all. All that is needed to refute that statement is to point to the fact that, a few years ago, the General Assembly accepted the new regulation of our Kingdom under which Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles were given complete self-government and were given a status entirely and exactly equal to that of the Kingdom in Europe. I think that is the best proof that we really do take the right of self-determination seriously, for that decision was taken and that new Constitution was introduced after due consultation in due democratic form—not in the form of unanimity that is presupposed, but in a really democratic form by the population there.

247. There are many other points that I should really like to answer, but I shall not do so. There is only one point that I wish to make. The Foreign Minister of Indonesia said that Indonesia would only meet force with force. The Territory of Netherlands New Guinea is larger than the territory of France. In that whole territory, the Netherlands maintains a few thousand troops. I do not think that anybody can really believe that, with such a small contingent of troops, we could have any evil intentions toward Indonesia. And I can certainly state here on behalf of my Government that there is no question of the Netherlands' wishing any harm to Indonesia or ever having the idea of possibly

^{5/} Signed at Amsterdam on 27 December 1949.

attacking Indonesia. Apart from the physical impossibility, there is certainly no intention of our doing so. Therefore, if Indonesia is sincere in saying that it will use force only if we use force, I can assure

the General Assembly that there is no danger, because we shall certainly never do that.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.