

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

Official Records



THIRD SPECIAL SESSION

1005th  
**PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 25 August 1961,  
at 3 p.m.

New York

**CONTENTS**

	Page
Agenda item 3:	
Appointment of the Credentials Committee ( <i>concluded</i> )	
Report of the Credentials Committee .....	113
Agenda item 7:	
Consideration of the grave situation in Tunisia obtain- ing since 19 July 1961 ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	118

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

**AGENDA ITEM 3**

**Appointment of the Credentials Committee  
(concluded)**

REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE (A/4854)

1. The PRESIDENT: A number of delegations have asked to explain their vote on the report [A/4854] of the Credentials Committee prior to voting. Therefore, I now call on those delegations.

2. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) (*translated from French*): The delegation of the Republic of Guinea believes it should give a brief explanation of the way in which it will shortly vote on the report of the Credentials Committee [A/4854].

3. As regards the representation of China, we wish to reaffirm our Government's position, namely, that the interests of our Organization even more than those of the Chinese people demand that justice be done to this people and to the Organization by restoring without delay to the sole representative of the people and the Government of the People's Republic of China the rightful seat to which he is entitled in the various organs of the United Nations.

4. On the question of the representation of Hungary, the Government of the Republic of Guinea thinks it extremely dangerous for the United Nations to proceed from subjective considerations in denying the legitimacy of the Government represented here. If such a method were to become the rule, how many delegations could legitimately sit in the United Nations without dispute? We would ask all representatives to reflect on this grave question.

5. The Government of the Republic of Guinea also earnestly desires a prompt settlement of the Laos situation and hopes that soon, very soon, a neutralist government will, with the approval of all the people of Laos, control the destiny of that country and will without delay accredit a delegation to the United Nations so that it may come here to swell the growing body of States which practise a genuine policy of non-alignment.

6. The Government of the Republic of Guinea wishes, in conclusion, to express its satisfaction at the fact that

the new Congolese Government, the successor to the legal Government of Patrice Lumumba, clearly expressed in the statement it made before the Parliament upon taking office its willingness and its determination to conduct a policy of non-alignment. This policy was unanimously approved by both Chambers of the Congolese Parliament, which thus sanctioned one of the major objectives of the struggle which the Government and its numerous friends have been ceaselessly waging in the Congo and elsewhere in the interests of the African peoples and of world peace.

7. Subject to these reservations, the delegation of the Republic of Guinea will vote in favour of the report of the Credentials Committee.

8. U THANT (Burma): My delegation wishes to put on record that the Government of the Union of Burma recognizes only the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. Therefore, my delegation holds that the credentials of the present representatives of China are not valid.

9. The Government of the Union of Burma has also recognized the Government of Hungary, and therefore we hold that the credentials of the present representatives of Hungary are quite in order.

10. With these two reservations, we will vote for the adoption of the report [A/4854] of the Credentials Committee.

11. Mr. LAPIAN (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee, with the following reservations.

12. The Government of the Republic of Indonesia recognizes the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate Government of China. Therefore, we can only accept credentials which are issued by the authorities in Peiping. Credentials issued for the representatives of China by authorities other than these are not valid and, therefore, are not acceptable to the Indonesian delegation.

13. As regards the credentials submitted for the representative of Hungary, the Indonesian delegation considers them fully in order and that they should be accepted by all Members of the Assembly.

14. Our approval of the report [A/4854] of the Credentials Committee should therefore not be interpreted as a modification of the Indonesian position on the question of the representation of China and Hungary.

15. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan): The delegation of Afghanistan also supports the draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee, but wishes to make the following reservations.

16. The Government of Afghanistan recognizes as the only legitimate Government of China the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, with which it has not only diplomatic relations but a com-

mon border. We also recognize the credentials of the present Government of the Hungarian People's Republic with which we have friendly and cordial relations. I wished to make those two reservations for the record.

17. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): With reference to the vote on the report of the Credentials Committee, the USSR delegation deems it necessary to make the following statement.

18. Although in the Credentials Committee we did not oppose the adoption of its report, we stated there, and feel it necessary to stress once again, that that by no means signifies that we are in agreement with all the Committee's conclusions.

19. In the first place, we cannot accept a situation in which the seat of great China is still occupied not by its lawful representatives—the representatives of the People's Republic of China—but by private individuals who represent absolutely nobody.

20. It is common knowledge that full responsibility for this abnormal and inadmissible situation rests with the United States, which is compelling its allies and other countries dependent upon it to follow its example and is trying to impose its will upon the United Nations.

21. The illegal exclusion of the People's Republic of China from participation in the work of the United Nations is highly detrimental to the latter and greatly hampers the solution of international problems, the settlement of which is of crucial importance for international peace and security.

22. The legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations must be restored to it at long last. We think that the first step in that direction could be the rejection of the credentials of the group of persons who call themselves "the representatives of the Republic of China".

23. Furthermore, the Soviet delegation objects strongly to the unworthy attempt by the United States delegation to call in question the credentials of the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic. Needless to say, the adoption of this wholly unfounded proposal by the General Assembly can do nothing but harm to the United Nations itself. It is inadmissible that the United States for its own selfish ends should use the United Nations to bring pressure to bear on sovereign States Members of the United Nations.

24. The USSR delegation also deems it necessary to state that the group of persons claiming to speak for Laos at the third special session of the United Nations General Assembly in fact represent rebels who have risen against the legitimate Government of that State.

25. The Soviet Union, together with many other States, considers that the only lawful representatives of Laos in the United Nations can be a representative of the Laotian Government headed by Prince Souvanna Phouma.

26. Mr. CAIMEROM MEASKETH (Cambodia) (*translated from French*): In announcing that it will vote for the report of the Credentials Committee [A/4854], my delegation wishes to express the following reservation.

27. The Royal Government of Cambodia maintains diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China and recognizes the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China as the only Government capable of legally representing the Chinese people.

28. Mr. MALALASEKERA (Ceylon): The delegation of Ceylon supports the report [A/4854] of the Credentials Committee, subject, as on previous occasions, to the following two reservations.

29. The first reservation relates to the representation of China in the Assembly. The Government of Ceylon recognizes the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate Government of China. We therefore consider that the only representatives of China entitled to representation in the United Nations are the representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

30. Our second reservation with regard to the Credentials Committee's report relates to the representation of Hungary in the United Nations. My delegation considers that Hungary, with which Ceylon has diplomatic relations, is properly represented in the United Nations.

31. With those two reservations, my delegation supports the report of the Credentials Committee.

32. Mr. CERNIK (Czechoslovak Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The Czechoslovak delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution [A/4854] submitted to the General Assembly by the Credentials Committee.

33. The Czechoslovak delegation nevertheless has serious reservations concerning the Committee's report. In the first place, it most emphatically objects to the Committee's decision to accept the credentials of a follower of Chiang Kai-shek who represents no one but himself and who is here solely because of the strenuous efforts made by the United States Government. The wholly untenable character of this situation is becoming increasingly obvious, and we are certain that the time is not far off when the Chinese representative's seat will be occupied by the lawful representative of the People's Republic of China. The credentials issued by the Government of the People's Republic of China are the only valid credentials. It is high time to give serious thought to the fact that, without the active participation of the People's Republic of China, no solutions can be expected to the most urgent and important international problems of concern not only to Asia and the Far East but also to the world as a whole. The policy of discrimination towards the People's Republic of China which is being imposed upon the United Nations by the United States with a stubbornness worthy of a better cause is hurting to the United Nations rather than the People's Republic of China and for that reason should long ago have been discarded.

34. The Czechoslovak delegation likewise strongly protests against the fact that the Credentials Committee—again under pressure from the United States delegation—questions the validity of the credentials of the representatives of the Hungarian People's Republic although it has no grounds for doing so. The delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic has submitted credentials issued by Hungary's legal Government in accordance with all the constitutional provisions. The credentials in question therefore fulfil all the conditions necessary for their acceptance.

35. The fact that the Credentials Committee decided to take no decision regarding the validity of these credentials serves merely to promote the provocative policy of the enemies of peace who oppose the coexistence of States having different social systems; it does not in any way promote the strengthening of peaceful co-operation

between peoples, which is the main purpose of the United Nations.

36. The Czechoslovak delegation would also like to say a few words concerning the credentials of the representative of Laos. It cannot in any way regard the Laotian delegation's credentials as valid because they have been issued not by the legal government of Laos but by a government which, against the Laotian people's will and contrary to the Constitution of Laos, has usurped the right to represent that State.

37. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America): The United States supports and will vote in favour of approving the report [A/4854] of the Credentials Committee.

38. With regard to the statements concerning the credentials of the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China, my Government's position has been stated many times in various organs of the United Nations, and I need not, therefore, reiterate it at length here today. In the view of my Government the credentials of the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China are fully in accord with the provisions of rule 27 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. The United States supports the continued seating of the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China in the United Nations.

39. The Credentials Committee's report includes the recommendation that no decision be taken at this third special session regarding the credentials of the representatives of Hungary. Ever since the people's revolution in 1956, the General Assembly has consistently refused to accept credentials submitted by the representatives of the present régime in Hungary. We believe that it is consistent for this Assembly to maintain this position. We believe that the present Hungarian régime leaves no alternative. At the same time we remain anxious and hopeful that the situation with regard to Hungary can find substantial improvement.

40. There can be no question but that the present Government whose representatives are seated here today are the representatives of the legal Government of Laos. The present Government of Laos was duly approved by the National Assembly and invested by the King fully in accordance with constitutional procedures. Accordingly, the United States rejects any allegation concerning the credentials submitted on behalf of the representatives of the Royal Government of Laos.

41. Mr. MACHOWSKI (Poland): While it will vote for the approval of the report [A/4854] submitted by the Credentials Committee, the Polish delegation deems it necessary to make the following reservations.

42. First of all, the Polish delegation cannot recognize the validity of the credentials presented here by the persons who pretend to represent China. We strongly object to the continuation of this fiction of the representation of China so persistently supported in the United Nations by certain delegations for several years. The true representatives of China designated by the only legitimate Government of the Chinese People's Republic should no longer be kept out of United Nations.

43. In the case of Laos, mentioned in paragraphs 11 and 12 of the debated report, the Polish delegation can only recognize the credentials issued by the sole legitimate Government of that country, which is headed by Prince Souvanna Phouma.

44. In conclusion, I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to the regrettable fact of the questioning

by one of the members of the Credentials Committee of the credentials submitted by the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic. This delegation has for years been duly representing the Hungarian Government and nation in the work of consecutive sessions of the General Assembly. We therefore deplore the unjust and unfounded decision of the Credentials Committee in this matter.

45. Mr. CHERMONT (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation will vote in favour of approving the report [A/4854] of the Credentials Committee, with the reservation that the Brazilian Government recognizes the credentials of the representatives of the Hungarian People's Republic.

46. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq): Our approval of the report of the Credentials Committee is subject to two reservations.

47. First, the Government of the Republic of Iraq recognizes the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, and therefore we consider that only the representatives of that Government can legally represent China in the United Nations.

48. Second, my Government recognizes the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic, and we have no doubt therefore regarding the validity of the credentials of the Hungarian delegation at this session of the Assembly.

49. Mr. TSIANG (China): My delegation supports the report [A/4854] of the Credentials Committee.

50. Nevertheless, I wish to stress the regrets of my delegation in regard to that part of the report which relates to the Hungarian delegation. In the opinion of my delegation, the General Assembly should reject the credentials issued by the communist régime in Hungary. As this Assembly knows full well, the present régime is a Soviet creation imposed on the Hungarian people with Soviet bayonets and at the cost of tens of thousands of Hungarian lives.

51. With this one regret, my delegation supports the report, including that part relating to the credentials of the Laotian delegation.

52. I observe that a number of representatives have come to this rostrum to make reservations in regard to the credentials of my delegation. It does not surprise me that the delegation of the Soviet Union should make such a reservation. If the Soviet Union could have its own way, this Assembly would be only the third house of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union.

53. It pains me to observe that a number of Asian delegations have made similar reservations in regard to my delegation. I only wish to remind the Assembly that my Government is among the founding Members of this Organization, and has honourably fulfilled the obligations of membership. I wish further to remind the Assembly that my Government is based on a constitution freely drafted and adopted by the representatives of the whole people of China. There can be no question as to the legitimacy of my Government. I may add that the communist régime in China, on the mainland of China, is un-Chinese in character and un-Chinese in purpose. It came to power on the mainland provinces with the military aid of the Soviet Union. In other words, my country has been a victim of Soviet subversion and aggression. In our opinion, if the United Nations is to remain faithful to its principles, it must uphold and honour the credentials of my delegation.

54. Mr. LORINC (Hungary): The United States "routine" with its impersonal visage has again reappeared in front of us. It has again come to this rostrum to express opinions about the non-existent problem of the mandate of my delegation, a problem which only lives in and feeds on the imagination of the delegation that raised it in the Credentials Committee. This special session has been called for the purpose of stopping aggression, a real problem. We have been told by this very same delegation during the general debate that on the real problem nothing should be done, no document approved. Let us not disturb the aggressor, was the saying of the day. This could be continued. Let us deal with imaginary problems instead of the real ones.

55. Everybody knows that in any and all respects of the General Assembly's requirements our mandate is just as valid as that of the other delegations. Everybody knows that the raising of this issue by the United States is incompatible with the maintenance by the very same country of diplomatic relations with my country. In view of all this, it is just as understandable for everyone that, while protesting against such a sad misuse of the United Nations for selfish purposes, my delegation wishes to concentrate on the real issues and does not at present request the revision of the Credentials Committee's report [A/4854].

56. Let me express the hope that the time is near when the United States delegation will realize that it is not through cold war manoeuvres that results can be achieved in this Organization. It is obvious, I think, why my delegation will vote against the approval of the Credentials Committee's report.

57. Mr. BHADKAMKAR (India): My delegation's approval of the report [A/4854] of the Credentials Committee, is subject, as on past occasions, to the following reservations. The Government of India recognizes the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate Government of China entitled to representation in the United Nations. My delegation also considers that Hungary, with which India has diplomatic, cultural and economic relations, is properly represented in the United Nations. Our approval of the Credentials Committee's report should not be construed as derogating from these positions.

58. Mr. GARCIA-INCHAUSTEGUI (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation will vote in favour of the report of the Credentials Committee [A/4854] with the following reservations.

59. In the first place, our Government maintains cordial relations with the Government of the People's Republic of China. It considers the latter to be the only legitimate Government of China and does not recognize the credentials presented by the so-called representative of the Republic of China.

60. In the second place, our Government also maintains cordial relations with the Hungarian People's Republic. It considers that Government to be the sole legal representative of the Hungarian people, and consequently opposes any attempt to impugn that Government's credentials, which it considers to be valid.

61. Mr. CHAMPASSAK (Laos) (*translated from French*): The Assembly has just heard the Soviet Union representative return to his tendentious allegations concerning my Government. That representative has once again seen fit to question the representation of my delegation at this special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

62. If I speak at this stage of the debate, it is to record my profound astonishment at the attacks on my Government by the Soviet Union representative, and to refute the untruths and the lies to which he had recourse in order to discredit my Government. Last time, at the meeting which marked the end of the second part of the fifteenth session, the same representative asserted from this rostrum that we were "the stooges, the puppets of Boun Oum, who came to power with the aid of foreign bayonets and who have seized and imprisoned the King and the members of the Parliament" [995th meeting, para. 388]. And at yesterday's, Thursday's, meeting of the Credentials Committee, the Soviet Union representative contemptuously referred to the Laotians who refuse to ally themselves with the communists as "mutineers".

63. The repeated allegations of the Soviet Union representative are not even worth denying. The truth is that as recently as last week the Soviet ambassador, Mr. Abramov, was received in audience by His Majesty the King of Laos, at Vientiane, the seat of my Government. He even pronounced himself satisfied after these conversations with His Majesty the King. And if we are really "mutineers", as he claims, could the Soviet Union representative tell us why his Government sent its ambassador to spend several days in the capital of the mutineers?

64. I do not want to recall these facts in order to embitter the debate, but I must say that there can be no peaceful coexistence in lies and slander.

65. After all this, we are wondering what the Soviet Union representative's real motive can be in raising the question of my delegation's competence to represent Laos—its composition having remained unchanged for over a year—at a moment when sincere efforts are being made at Geneva, where the fourteen-Power conference<sup>1</sup> is being held, and at Ban Namone, where negotiations are going on between the three factions in Laos with a view to finding a peaceful solution to the Laotian crisis in accordance with the aspirations of our people. Considerable progress has been recorded in these negotiations, thus bringing us on to the path of neutrality which we all desire.

66. The Soviet Union representative knows very well that the Government which I have the honour to represent here is the sole legal Government which has the confidence both of His Majesty the King and of the National Assembly. This Government, under the premiership of Prince Boun Oum, has discharged all the international obligations arising from the United Nations Charter and has represented Laos at several international conferences. It has on many occasions shown its good faith and its willingness to settle its internal disputes by peaceful means. It has likewise expressed its firm resolve to follow a policy of strict neutrality and to defend its sovereignty, unity and integrity. It is second to none in its defence of these noble principles. It has proved this by the support which it has given to Tunisia in the Bizerta affair, the examination of which will soon be concluded by the General Assembly.

67. If the Government of the Soviet Union has no particular sympathy for my Government and if it does not recognize it, that is its right and there is nothing I can do about it. That it should, however, raise here the question of the legality or the illegality of my Govern-

<sup>1</sup> International Conference for the Settlement of the Laotian Crisis, opening date 16 May 1961.

ment is intolerable, for that is a gross interference in the internal affairs of my country. The Kingdom of Laos has its King, its Constitution, its Parliament, its Government. It is not for the Soviet Union to judge whether this or that Government is or is not legal.

68. The line of argument of the Soviet Union representative does not, moreover, have any basis either in fact or in law. The Government whose defence he has taken up is nothing but a puppet government intended to serve as a screen for open intervention in my country by the communist Powers.

69. I have no wish to expatiate on this unhappy aspect of the problem, because I do not want to interfere with the course of the negotiations in progress or to hinder the efforts towards reconciliation and union which we Laotians have been striving after for months.

70. Moreover, the Soviet Union representative need only glance over the Zurich communiqué signed by the three Princes on 22 June 1961 to see that the arguments on which he bases his case are worthless.

71. Lastly, at a moment when all parties are uniting their efforts to resolve the drama of Laos and the end of the crisis seems to be in sight, I would like to request the Soviet Union representative in the interests of peace and concord to stop sowing confusion in the conflict which is rending my country. My compatriots have already had enough to worry about without adding here to their resentment and bitterness.

72. These were the few points that I wanted to clear up so that the members of this Assembly might be able to make a sound and valid judgement on the legitimacy of my Government.

73. My delegation will vote in favour of the report of the Credentials Committee [A/4854].

74. Mr. DJIKIC (Yugoslavia) (*translated from French*): The Yugoslav delegation will vote in favour of the report of the Credentials Committee. In approving this report I would like to make the following observations.

75. In the first place, approval of the report by the Yugoslav delegation cannot be interpreted as a modification of the Yugoslav Government's position concerning the representation of China in the United Nations.

76. In the second place, our affirmative vote on the report in no way means that the Yugoslav delegation approves of the procedure adopted by the majority of the Committee with regard to the powers of the Hungarian delegation.

77. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic): In the Credentials Committee my delegation has already entered its reservations regarding the question of the representation of China in the General Assembly. My Government which recognizes the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate Government of China, considers that only representatives nominated by that Government are entitled to occupy the seat of China in the Assembly.

78. With regard to the representation of Hungary, with which my Government enjoys diplomatic relations, my delegation believes that the credentials of the Hungarian delegation to this special session of the General Assembly are in order and in full conformity with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

79. With these two reservations, my delegation will vote for the approval of the report [A/4854] of the Credentials Committee.

80. Mr. ELMU (Somalia): The delegation of Somalia votes in favour of approving the report [A/4854] of the Credentials Committee with the following two reservations.

81. The Government of the Somali Republic recognizes the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, with which we maintain diplomatic relations, and this State is entitled to be a Member of the United Nations.

82. Secondly, my delegation objects to the doubts expressed concerning the validity of the credentials of the Hungarian People's Republic.

83. Mr. BUDO (Albania) (*translated from French*): Since we are about to vote on the report of the Credentials Committee [A/4854], the delegation of the People's Republic of Albania deems it necessary to make the following statement.

84. The position of the Government of the People's Republic of Albania regarding the representation of the Peoples Republic of China has been stated in this Assembly on many occasions. In reaffirmation of that stand, we wish to make clear that we do not support the passages of the report relating to the powers of the Chiang Kai-shek clique's representative. The Central Government of the People's Republic of China is the only legitimate Government of China and is the only Government entitled to represent the Chinese people in the United Nations or in any other international organization. Accordingly, the representatives of that Government, and of that Government alone should occupy the seat in this Assembly that rightly belongs to them.

85. The attitude of the United States in seeking to debar the People's Republic of China from taking its place in the United Nations is impeding the solution of important international problems and is prejudicial to the strengthening of peace and international collaboration. The very authority of the United Nations is being seriously assailed.

86. In order to ensure the fulfilment of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter and to do justice to the great Chinese people, the delegation of the People's Republic of Albania considers it essential that this question be settled forthwith and that the People's Republic of China be allowed to occupy the seat that has until now been usurped by a traitorous clique that was driven from the country and is the creature of a foreign Power.

87. I also wish on behalf of my delegation to protest strongly against the action of the Credentials Committee in querying the Hungarian delegations credentials.

88. Any attempt to raise doubts about the credentials of the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic constitutes interference in Hungary's domestic affairs and serves the ends of the partisans of the "cold war".

89. As far as Laos is concerned, we consider that only those representatives whose credentials emanate from the legal Government headed by Prince Souvanna Phouma are the true representatives of that country.

90. Subject to these reservations, my delegation will vote in favour of the report of the Credentials Committee.

91. Mr. KOIRALA (Nepal): The Government of Nepal has recognized the Government of the Central People's Republic of China as the only legitimate Government of China. We have consistently supported the

legitimate claims of the People's Republic of China to be seated in the United Nations.

92. My delegation also recognizes as valid the credentials of the representative of the Hungarian People's Republic.

93. With these reservations, we shall vote for the adoption of the draft resolution contained in the report [A/4854] of the Credentials Committee.

94. Mr. SULEIMAN (Sudan): My delegation has noted and will vote for the approval of the report [A/4854] of the Credentials Committee with only two reservations.

95. We recognize the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate Government of that country.

96. As for the credentials of the present delegation of Hungary, we believe that they are quite in order and valid.

97. Mr. MAIGA (Mali) (*translated from French*): I should like to make a few brief remarks on the results of the Credentials Committee's work. It would not be right to bracket Hungary with China as regards representation in the General Assembly. The factor to be taken into consideration in this regard is whether a government of unassailable sovereignty exists, it being irrelevant whether or not that government has the blessing of certain Powers. This is the case for Hungary, which is under the authority of a single government.

98. As regards China, the authority of the Government represented here does not extend beyond the coasts of Formosa. The great country of China has the good fortune to be ruled by a government which has in a very short time succeeded in accelerating that country's development and social progress. There can be no doubt that Peking enjoys all the authority that it needs and exercises that authority fully throughout the continental territory of China. Justice demands that the Government of Communist China should take its place in the Organization. Whatever decisions may be taken here on the questions of disarmament and peace will lose much of their effectiveness if this nation, which abundantly deserves the admiration of the peoples of Africa and Asia, does not rejoin this great family of nations. I shall go further and maintain that if, tomorrow, the Soviet Union and the United States were to reach agreement on disarmament, many practical difficulties would arise unless China was validly represented here.

99. I therefore appeal to the General Assembly to give back to the legitimate China its seat in the United Nations. Subject to these reservations, we shall vote in favour of the report of the Credentials Committee.

100. Mr. CROWE (United Kingdom): My delegation wishes to put on the record that, in approving the report [A/4854] of the Credentials Committee, we do so solely on the grounds that the credentials concerned are, considered as documents, in order and consequently, as the Assembly will be aware, does not necessarily imply recognition of each of the authorities by whom the credentials were issued.

101. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (*translated from French*): My delegation has already, in the Credentials Committee, set out certain observations which it felt obliged to make. I wish to make it clear in the General Assembly that my Government, which maintains diplomatic relations with the Central Government of the People's Republic of China, will vote in favour of the report of the Credentials Committee [A/4854]. My

Government maintains cordial relations with the Hungarian Government, and my delegation knows that its credentials are in good order.

102. The PRESIDENT: The delegations now have before them for consideration the report [A/4854] of the Credentials Committee. They have also heard the various reservations and objections in regard to this report which have been expressed at the rostrum. These reservations and objections will, of course, be duly recorded in the verbatim record of the meeting.

103. Unless I hear any objection or any proposal to the contrary, I would propose to regard the report of the Committee as being approved, subject to the reservations and objections which have been expressed.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 7

##### Consideration of the grave situation in Tunisia obtaining since 19 July 1961 (*continued*)

104. Mr. KOIRALA (Nepal): May I be allowed to join my fellow representatives, who have already greeted the President in congratulating him on behalf of my delegation on his unanimous re-election to the presidency of this special session of the General Assembly? This is positive proof of our faith in his judgement and of the esteem in which he is held by all of us.

105. The draft resolution [A/L.351], which we have the honour to sponsor, regarding the unhappy and deplorable events that have occurred on Tunisian soil since 19 July 1961, is before the Assembly for its consideration. The very fact that the General Assembly has met in this third special session at the request [A/4831] of the majority of the Member nations, including Nepal, shows clearly how gravely most of the nations of the world have viewed the situation in Bizerta. The case of Tunisia has been presented eloquently by its distinguished Ambassador, Mr. Slim, and I must congratulate him on his cool composure and objectivity, although events at home provide more than enough ground for provocation. Several speakers have already elaborated upon the facts and the issues involved. These are admittedly clear and simple, and need no repetition here.

106. Since its admission to the United Nations, Nepal has always clearly and unequivocally expressed its indignation at the violation of the United Nations Charter, and against aggression in any form, in any quarter of the world. May I repeat the words of our first delegation, attending the eleventh regular session of the General Assembly:

"We do not view with complacency the interference of one country in the internal affairs of another. We are opposed to imperialism of any kind or colour. We are opposed to the stationing of foreign troops anywhere in the world... whenever the choice is between good and evil, between freedom and slavery or between justice and injustice we shall always know which to choose." [602nd meeting, para. 10.]

"...we abide by the same moral standards in assessing international events everywhere in the world—be it in the Middle East or in Eastern Europe." [Ibid., para. 11.]

107. We have lived up to this ideal and we propose to continue to do so. The moral standard to which I have just referred is the same with us even now, and, adhering thereto, we are constrained to hold that France

has not only acted in violation of the United Nations Charter, but has gone much further. Even the closest friends of France have not seen a way to defend her aggressive actions in Tunisia and her irresponsible behaviour towards the United Nations. It is deplorable that France seems to have taken too much for granted Tunisia's patience and amicable gestures, and undervalued her friendship.

108. We are a small nation and we do not claim to be adept in the art of speaking tongue in cheek. Since we are a small nation and we have no axe to grind, we are guided solely by our plain conscience. We know only to call a spade a spade. We do not have separate standards of sovereignty and freedom for different nations. On another occasion we have heard France speaking eloquently against aggression on this very floor. How can she now exonerate herself when she has been the aggressor? Tunisia, a small nation which, like Nepal, had joined in the chorus of indignation concerning aggression against another small country, is unfortunately the victim herself of French aggression now. This naturally raises deep anxiety in the minds of all the small countries about the flexible standards often adopted by different Powers when issues at stake affect their own interests. The meaning of independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity will certainly lose their value if they are interpreted to suit the interests of any particular nation. Our stand on this occasion, as on similar occasions in the past, is very clear. In assessing the present case purely on its own merits, we are confident that truth and justice will ultimately prevail.

109. Humanity has survived annihilation by keeping its faith in its conscience, and it is the very dictate of conscience which has united us in this Organization. If any Member, however powerful, tries to defy it or go against its accepted principles, we ought to rise unanimously, declaiming against it, and make the errant nation see reason, or else I am afraid we shall defeat our own purpose and our own ideals. The essential purpose of the draft resolution before the Assembly is to open the way to settlement of the Bizerta issue by amicable negotiations between the two parties involved. Our delegation therefore appeals for unanimous support for this draft resolution, so that we can prove to the world that we live by our conscience and that "liberty, equality and fraternity" are not yet dead.

110. Mr. MOD (Hungary): I wish first of all on behalf of the Hungarian delegation to join all the previous speakers in congratulating the President, on his unanimous election to the post of President of this special session of the General Assembly.

111. The General Assembly has once again been convened with the purpose of stopping the aggression of a colonial Power against a newly-independent nation. Once again we are faced with an attempt to reinstate one-sided colonial "rights"—rights which this time were not even put on paper—against the will of a people, its elected organs and leaders.

112. Our debate on the aggression of France against Tunisia is nearing its end, and my delegation feels that there are a few conclusions that one could and should draw and lessons that we can learn from this debate. The first and foremost of them is what most of the speakers underlined in their interventions, that is, "once again". Once again a colonial Power has attacked a newly-independent nation. Once again the United Nations and all its Members had to take a stand on

one of the most crucial problems of our times, the termination of colonialism and its prerogatives, in whatever disguise they may have assumed. Once again the solidarity of the newly independent nations, with the full support of the socialist countries, has succeeded in arranging for the calling of a special session and unmasking before the whole world the colonialist and its allies.

113. In listening to the debate, an all too familiar pattern has evolved in front of us. One colonial Power has attacked a militarily weak member of the African-Asian countries. The substance of the pretext is always the same, the lamb was grazing on the pasture of the wolf. The form may be different, defence of the wolf's rights, defence of the "Western civilization" against the communist menace, defence of the "free world" and so on.

114. The rest of the colonialists rush to the help of the aggressor. This is the second conclusion to be drawn from our debate. The countries fighting to stop the aggression against Tunisia are confronted not only by France, but by all the countries of the aggressive NATO alliance led by the United States. So there is nothing strange in the fact that the political manoeuvres aimed at whitewashing France are also led by the strongest Power of this alliance.

115. In this case, the help took the form of blocking the approval of an effective resolution in the Security Council and of strenuous efforts to block the calling of this special session of the Assembly. The United States representative in his intervention quite openly expressed his unhappiness about the fact that the request that the Assembly should be called to meet had succeeded.

116. The General Assembly started its work, and with it began the next set of manoeuvres from the colonialists' side. This was first to whitewash the aggressor and then to throw mud into the crystal clear situation. The victim was accused of impatience in its negotiations with the wolf. Arguments were advanced that approval of a resolution—one that does not even condemn the wolf—might provoke the wolf's displeasure and this should, therefore, be avoided.

117. All these manoeuvres—as has already been pointed out from this rostrum—served the aim of stripping the victim—Tunisia—of its most important defence: the solidarity of the African-Asian and Socialist countries, to let it sit alone, isolated, when the time for dealing with the wolf arrives.

118. But let us turn to another aspect of the debate. The representative of Tunisia underlined, in his introductory statement [996th meeting, para. 74], that the aggression against Bizerta is but "Operation Short Plough", to be followed by "Operation Long Plough", the occupation of the whole of the northern territory of Tunisia, with the aim of crushing in blood the independence struggle of another African nation, Algeria. It is from this point that one can start to see the whole perspective of this aggression.

119. It is aimed against the sovereignty and independence of Tunisia, Algeria, and, *sui generis*, against the independence and freedom of the whole African continent. The *dramatis personae* are, as has become clear from the debate, not simply France and Tunisia, but the newly independent countries, supported by the socialist countries, on the one hand, and the "Holy Alliance" of NATO on the other. Those in doubt

should look up the list of countries which requested [see A/4831] that the Assembly be called into session.

120. The aggressive action taken against Tunisia is not only the aggression of France. It is well known that the weapons used by the French at Bizerta were the arms of NATO, American weapons, to be exact. If we dig into the substance of the matter, we may establish that Bizerta is not simply a French military base, but a NATO base, first of all.

121. Its imperialist role and purpose has been so clearly and eloquently described by the representative of Indonesia that I merely wish to remind the Assembly of his statement [1001st meeting]. In these last days Bizerta has grown into a symbol of the struggle of the African peoples and States for an Africa free of nuclear weapons and foreign military bases. We all remember President Nkrumah's appeal for this during the fifteenth session [869th meeting] of the Assembly and the draft resolution [A/C.1/L.264/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1] tabled in the First Committee for this purpose. A number of African representatives have again in this debate quite logically advanced this thought as a solution to the basic issues involved here.

122. One final conclusion. No one has dared to challenge openly the sovereign right of Tunisia to Bizerta. But let us not be misled by empty phrases. The United States representative stated:

"First, there is not and cannot be any question as to Tunisia's sovereignty over Bizerta. There is a practical problem as to how to relate that sovereignty to the present dispute." [998th meeting, para. 95.]

Listening to him one gets the impression that we actually have just a trifle of a problem to solve. What "trifle" it is, however, is more openly admitted by the representative of the United Kingdom, who in his statement classified the issue in the following way:

"The issues are in truth very simple. Tunisia claims that France should agree to a more or less rapid time-table for the evacuation of the base at Bizerta. France for its part does not question Tunisian sovereignty over Bizerta, but says that it has never committed itself to any particular date for evacuation and does not intend to do so during the present dangerous situation." [1000th meeting, para. 55.]

123. Here lies the crux of the matter. France, together with its NATO allies, the United States and the United Kingdom, does not question Tunisian sovereignty. It simply occupies a part of Tunisian territory without question and does not intend to leave it. Tunisia, the African-Asian countries and the socialist countries do not question Tunisia's sovereignty either. They, however, are of the opinion that respect in words should be followed by respect in deeds, that is, the immediate withdrawal of the aggressor from Tunisian soil—just a small "practical" difference, as we all see.

124. The Hungarian delegation fully supports the just demand of Tunisia for the withdrawal of the aggressor from Tunisian soil. We are of the opinion that the aggressor and its accomplices have to be stopped in their schemes against the independent countries of Africa and Asia. It is the sacred task of the United Nations to do so in fulfilling the stipulations of its Charter, according to which the United Nations is founded on the sovereign equality of all its Members.

125. Before concluding I ask permission to make another remark in exercise of the right of reply.

126. During the current debate the representative of the United States thought it proper to launch a slanderous and unfounded attack on the USSR, and in this connexion mention was made, among other socialist countries, of my country as well.

127. It would be easy for me, indeed, to prove, with relevant data and facts, how unfounded the United States representative's allegation are. This, however, is not necessary. Members of the Assembly are already used to such outbursts by United States representatives and can pass correct judgement upon them at the first hearing.

128. On the other hand, it is well-known fact that whenever the representatives of the United States have taken an untenable position in defence of their colonial friends, they have always tried to divert the attention of the General Assembly from the weakness of their own moral and political stand by unleashing assaults on the socialist countries. These tactics can deceive nobody anymore and it is not worthwhile wasting time on them.

129. It is regrettable, however, that Mr. Stevenson, instead of trying to contribute constructively, on behalf of the United States, to the solution of the grave issues under discussion, has resorted to a kind of manoeuvring which is not in accord with the dignity of the Assembly and which has already been discredited by his predecessors.

130. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (*translated from Spanish*): In placing the conduct of the proceedings of this special session of the General Assembly in the hands of Mr. Boland, the delegations present here have wished unanimously to demonstrate their admiration and gratitude for the ability, impartiality, zeal and tact which he demonstrated as President of the fifteenth regular session of this Assembly of the peoples of the world. My delegation is pleased to congratulate you most warmly and also to congratulate Ireland, your small but great country, whose conduct in the United Nations has always been a model of wisdom, moderation and true courage, without vainglory—an example of love and selfless devotion for all good causes.

131. The grave situation which has obtained in Tunisia since 19 July 1961 has been the reason for convening this third special session of the General Assembly and is the only item on its agenda. However, the truth of the matter is that the unfortunate events which took place on 19 July in the neighbourhood of the base of Bizerta and in the town of Bizerta itself, and the situation that has existed since then, are only an episode—the most recent, and certainly the most tragic—in a state of affairs that has persisted, and that has unfortunately very seriously impaired French-Tunisian relations, ever since France formally recognized Tunisia's independence in the Protocol of Agreement signed by both countries on 20 March 1956.

132. Indeed, we are all aware that serious events took place in Tunisia during 1958, as a result of which the Security Council was called upon to consider complaints made by Tunisia against France, and by France against Tunisia.

133. The first of these complaints was made by Tunisia on 13 February 1958<sup>2</sup> and charged that France had committed an act of aggression on 8 February 1958 at

<sup>2</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Thirteenth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1958, document S/3951.

the small Tunisian border-town of Sakiët-sidi-Yousseff. On the day after that complaint had been submitted, the French delegation also lodged a complaint<sup>3</sup> with the Security Council alleging that a serious situation was resulting from the aid furnished by Tunisia to the Algerian rebels enabling them to conduct operations from Tunisian territory directed against Algerian territory and the safety of the persons and property of French nationals.

134. Although the Security Council put both complaints on its agenda, it did not in fact consider them, nor was there any discussion about them, owing to the fortunate circumstance that the French and Tunisian Governments, displaying commendable prudence and common sense, accepted the offer of good offices made by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom. The Security Council concluded its business quickly without adopting any resolution, and the various delegations expressed their satisfaction at the hope of conciliation held out by the acceptance of the offer of good offices as a means of bringing about an amicable settlement of the matters at issue between Tunisia and France.

135. In that initial case, thanks to the efforts of the good offices mission and the good will shown by both parties, the latter were about to find a way to settle their differences in a satisfactory manner. In the course of the negotiations which took place, a compromise agreement was reached which provided that all pending questions would be settled in two successive stages. During the first stage, all French military personnel outside the perimeter of the Bizerta base were to have been immediately withdrawn, and during the second stage a provisional arrangement for the Bizerta base was to have been established by mutual agreement. However, that compromise agreement was never put into effect, owing to a change of government that took place in France at that time, and shortly afterwards both parties again began to submit complaints against each other to the Security Council.

136. On 24 and 25 May 1958 new incidents occurred in the area of Remada in southern Tunisia, and on 29 May the Tunisian delegation requested an immediate meeting of the Security Council to consider a complaint in respect of acts of armed aggression committed against it by the French military forces stationed in its territory and in Algeria.<sup>4</sup>

137. On the same day, 29 May 1958, France asked the Security Council to consider two questions,<sup>5</sup> namely, the complaint brought by France against Tunisia on 14 February 1958, and the situation arising out of the disruption, by Tunisia, of the *modus vivendi* which had been established since February 1958 with regard to the stationing of French troops at certain point in Tunisian territory.

138. At the end of that debate, France proposed—and the proposal was adopted without opposition—that the Council should postpone consideration of the items on its agenda until 18 June 1958, so that the parties might embark on negotiations.

139. The negotiations resulted in an agreement between the parties. On the appointed date of 18 June, the representatives of Tunisia and France informed the

Council that in an exchange of notes effected the previous day between the Tunisian Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and the French *chargé d'affaires* at Tunis, it had been agreed that all French forces except those stationed at Bizerta would be withdrawn from Tunisia in four months and that a provisional arrangement would subsequently be negotiated with regard to the Bizerta base.

140. We have felt it necessary briefly to recall these events not only because they are illuminating and important for a better understanding of the grave question that is now before the General Assembly, but also because they provide evidence of two facts of equal significance: firstly, that the difficulties which have arisen between France and Tunisia have been due to the presence of French forces on Tunisian soil and to the developments connected with the war of independence in Algeria, a country bordering on Tunisia; and secondly, that France and Tunisia have already had recourse to negotiation with some measure of success in their search for a permanent solution of their differences.

141. The events which have taken place in Tunisia since 19 July 1961 and which led to the convening of the Security Council and now of this special session of the General Assembly are undoubtedly of the utmost seriousness, both because hundreds of people—most of them civilians—have been killed and much damage has been done, and because these events have deepened the rift between two peoples which for geographical, historical and cultural reasons, should be drawing closer together in a spirit of mutual friendship, confidence and co-operation in this world of today already brimful of suspicion, unrest and anxiety.

142. The matter to be considered now is a complaint by Tunisia against France in respect of the grave events which took place on 19 July and the following days<sup>6</sup> and as a result of which France is now occupying a part of Tunisian territory not included within the perimeter of the Bizerta base.

143. During the initial consideration of the matter by the Security Council, that body, on 22 July, adopted almost unanimously—the only vote lacking being that of France, which did not take part in the voting—a resolution calling for an immediate cease-fire and a return of all armed forces to their original position.<sup>7</sup>

144. A week later the Council resumed consideration of the matter, at the request of the Tunisian representative,<sup>8</sup> who stated that whereas his Government had fully complied with the provisions of the Security Council's resolution, the French Government had merely ordered a cease-fire and had refused to withdraw its forces to the position they had occupied before 19 July. The Council was unable to adopt a new resolution, because the necessary seven votes could not be obtained, and hence a larger number of Member States asked that this special session of the General Assembly be convened.

145. That is how matters now stand. What other course is open to the General Assembly than to insist on the re-establishment of the *status quo ante* as ordered by the Security Council and to urge both parties to proceed without delay to negotiate an agreement for putting an

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, document S/3954.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, *Supplement for April, May and June 1958*, document S/4013.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, document S/4015.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, *Sixteenth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1961*, document S/4862.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, document S/4882.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, document S/4893.

end to such incidents and to a state of tension which is so dangerous in a world already beset by difficulties?

146. Tunisia is an independent and sovereign State—a fact which no one disputes—and its sovereignty extends to the portion of its territory on which the French naval and air base of Bizerta is situated. The presence of foreign military detachments in the territory of a sovereign and independent State is only admissible when the express consent of that State has been given.

147. These are truths which are recognized by international law and undoubtedly also by France, since, in the agreement concluded by the exchange of notes of 17 June 1958, it was agreed that the parties, France and Tunisia, would negotiate a provisional arrangement for the Bizerta base.

148. Why a provisional arrangement, and not a final settlement? Unquestionably because this is a transitional situation and by no means a permanent, and still less a perpetual, state of affairs that would be incompatible with Tunisia's sovereignty over the part of its territory now occupied by the base.

149. We accordingly consider that what is needed is for the parties to undertake negotiations. The negotiations can have as their aim either a provisional agreement on the Bizerta base or an agreement for the complete and final withdrawal of the French forces. In any event this is something which, in the opinion of many delegations, including our own, must be resolved solely by the two countries concerned.

150. We believe that the General Assembly should refrain from attempting to determine the specific direction or objective of the negotiations, not merely on the legal ground that it is doubtful whether the Assembly has the power to do so, but more especially for the pragmatic reason that any attempt to prejudge the issue without the consent of the two parties, instead of easing the way to friendly negotiations and a possible settlement of their differences, would have the reverse effect to that intended.

151. Having thus expressed the views of my Government and of my delegation, I should like to add a few comments, for the most part of a general nature.

152. In spite of our optimism, we cannot hide our concern at the absence of the French delegation from this debate. We should have liked to hear its point of view in regard to the present stage of the French-Tunisian problem, just as we did during the Security Council debate in 1958, and only recently when the Council was considering the complaint of Tunisia concerning the events of 19 July and after.

153. However, we must frankly confess that what concerns and disturbs us much more is the obvious tendency to exploit this matter as an element in the cold war, as well as the increasingly transparent efforts to attract Tunisia and other peoples having an unquestionably democratic outlook into an alignment which is not in keeping with their origins, their traditions, their religion, their culture and their true interests.

154. We wish to express our admiration to the Tunisian representative, Mr. Slim, whose statements have always been carefully weighed, serene and judicious, notwithstanding his feelings as a national of the country whose inhabitants have suffered the consequences of the armed struggle which began on 19 July.

155. We cannot, however, say the same of all the speakers who have taken part in the debate. No one who looks at things dispassionately can deny that

speeches have been made here with the object not of assisting in bringing the French-Tunisian dispute to an end, but on the contrary of causing it to break out anew, of encouraging a feeling of animosity and of extending the scope of the deliberations into a field which no longer relates only to the questions outstanding between France and Tunisia in consequence of the latter's accession to independence but embraces the whole question of military bases on foreign territory.

156. The wisdom and perspicacity of Mr. Slim have, we are sure, enabled him to realize that although the assistance and encouragement of many brother, or merely friendly, countries have no doubt helped to further his cause, the violent statements, full of hatred and inspired by ulterior motives, which have been heard in these precincts have rendered him scant service in this affair.

157. There is no need to repeat that the present world situation is one of the most explosive that we have had to face in the last few years. Only by exercising prudence, intelligence and good will can we prevent the danger that threatens from speedily turning into catastrophe. Consequently, in considering international problems we must at all costs eschew violence.

158. The United Nations, if it is to be worthy of its name and of the ideals set forth in its Charter, must endeavour to find adequate solutions by the means and procedures provided for in that same Charter.

159. We accordingly associate El Salvador with the other Member States which have appealed to Tunisia and to France to seek once more the path of negotiation and agreement in order to end this crisis and resume their long-standing friendship. The moral, intellectual and political stature of Presidents de Gaulle and Bourguiba lead us to hope that our voices will not be voices crying in the wilderness, and that we shall not, as Bolívar said, have been ploughing in the sea.

160. Mr. GEORGIEV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): May I be allowed first of all to congratulate the President of the current session of the General Assembly on his unanimous election.

161. I should like to dwell on certain aspects of the problem with which the General Assembly is dealing. I shall not review the events of the past.

162. I should like first to deal with the question from the point of view of the French attack on Tunisia. Mr. Slim, in his speech [*296th meeting*], gave an admirable analysis of what occurred, and on the basis of the indisputable elements of the situation he drew the conclusion that we were confronted with French aggression. According to the facts set forth by him there was nothing at the outset on the Tunisian side but some popular demonstrations and a few warning shots, whereas on the French side there was a large-scale attack by the land, sea and air units of the armed forces.

163. This attack resulted in the slaughter of hundreds of innocent Tunisian citizens—civilians, women and children—and caused very serious damage to the Tunisian economy. It was carried out with a cruelty worthy of the Hitlerite SS troops, and was continued even after the decision of the Security Council,<sup>9</sup> thus constituting a challenge to the United Nations.

164. For the time being, however, I am concerned with another aspect of the problem, namely the fact that this act of aggression committed on 19 and 20 July 1961,

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, document S/4882.

goes back to 1881 and even to a far earlier time. Indeed, it has never stopped; it has been a repeated crime, like all cases of aggression by the imperialists against their former colonies. It is a continuing international crime, and no legal instrument has been able to make this aggression legally justifiable.

165. Hence in the case of Tunisia we are faced with an international crime which has never ceased, with the result that that country had the right at all times to defend itself against this aggression. Even if the circumstances had not been such as in fact they were and as they have been described here by Mr. Mongi Slim, even if there had been an attack by Tunisia on the French forces at Bizerta, that would have been an act of self-defence, and the same applies to the other bases in the former colonies.

166. We want to develop international law. This question forms the subject of item 70 of the provisional agenda of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly. This task was entrusted to the Sixth Committee at the fifteenth session. Many countries have already submitted recommendations to that Committee, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1505 (XV) on the development of international law.

167. If we really want to develop international law instead of becoming involved in legal verbiage, we must consider the question of self-defence against the armed forces of all the imperialist countries which possess bases in the former colonies. That would be the real way to develop international law.

168. It is a legal corollary of sociological principles that insurrections of wars of liberation are justified. Of what, in fact, does justice consist? It is a judgement concerning the conformity of legal standards with the elements of extra-legal social reality. In order to form an opinion about a system of standards and to make up our minds whether or not it is correct, we must compare it with the extra-legal social reality, which is something that moves and develops.

169. Hence, international law, if it is to undergo progressive development, must recognize that every former colony on whose soil an imperialist base is situated has the right to defend itself at any time against the imperialist forces stationed at that base, irrespective of how they conduct themselves. That is the problem raised by the situation in Tunisia.

170. But that is not all. In addition to the military bases situated in the former colonies, there are also bases in independent countries. In so far as those bases are the outcome of agreements concluded under the pressure of force, by fraud and through the corruption of the leaders, or under the pressure of economic conditions, the agreements in question have no legal validity.

171. But there is more. There are agreements which are perfectly valid and in virtue of which there are bases in completely independent countries. If, however, these bases are to serve as spring-boards for future aggression, they constitute a weapon of offence. Therefore from the point of view of the United Nations Charter, which forms an integral part of contemporary international law, they are illegal.

172. Mr. Stevenson, the United States representative, expressed surprise at certain legal arguments which have been adduced against the bases. When a progressive historical movement spreads irresistibly all over the world, legal arguments come from all sides and legal theories are easily formulated. That is how international

law is developed, and that is one of the factors in its development. Hence there is a sound legal reason for attacking and abolishing these bases. If that is not done, if certain countries repudiate such attacks, it is not because they have not the right to do so, but because they are guided by political expediency. It is therefore political expediency which will decide. But if we are asked: "Have you this right?", we shall say, "Yes, we have".

173. We have been able to see that the current session has been the occasion for a wave of indignation all over the world directed against military bases and especially against those situated in the former colonies. I shall cite by way of proof a letter<sup>10</sup> to the President of the Security Council from the representatives of Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Saudi Arabia and other countries, that is to say, from the representatives of a large number of non-aligned countries. This letter states:

"For us who mostly represent small and newly emergent States, the Tunisian situation has a special significance. While we recognize the right of a sovereign State to permit the presence of foreign forces on its soil, we equally recognize and insist on the sovereign right of all States not to tolerate the presence of foreign forces or foreign military bases on their territory. Such a right is an essential attribute of sovereignty and is a corollary to respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity to which Members of the United Nations are pledged under the Charter."

This is the progressive development of international law, and here is the proof that there is a wave of indignation on the subject of the bases.

174. The military bases possessed by the former colonial countries demonstrate in a most flagrant manner how these colonies are being oppressed. That is why there is so much indignation. It is time, therefore, to do away with these bases and to put an end to this intolerable situation, which constitutes a threat of war, endangers international security and is leading us towards a third world conflict. These bases are the strongholds of the oppression of the former colonial countries, and of the colonial countries of today, more or less everywhere.

175. Even from the point of view of the enlightened self-interest of the imperialist countries, aggression against former or existing colonies does not pay. In the specific case of the attack on Tunisia by France, the result has been a strengthening of the international front against colonialism and imperialism and the convening of the present session, so greatly feared by the imperialist countries. They did not succeed in preventing its being convened; they were unable to reduce us to silence. Despite their power, despite the pressure of every kind which they exercised, through diplomatic and other channels, despite all their efforts, they were unable to find a solution of the problem outside the United Nations, by negotiation between the two parties.

176. There is something more. If we observe the foreign policy of the imperialist countries, both in the present case and in all cases involving colonial problems, we see that these States are increasingly perplexed. On the eve of this session they did not know what to do nor what attitude to adopt. They have not been able to collect themselves or to take any definite stand. They do not even know how to vote at this session. They cannot decide whether to propose amend-

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, document S/4896.

ments to the present draft resolution [A/L.351], whether to abstain or whether to vote against it. This proves that the anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist movement is so strong that even States which possess formidable military equipment and enormous economic resources and whose diplomacy has no mercy for the countries where it operates are unable to stop it.

177. Certain newspapers in the United States, in an effort to find a way out of an untenable situation for the imperialists, have recognized the danger to the imperialists themselves which is represented by the policy of extreme imperialism. The situation, however, is such that not even the attempts of the neo-imperialists to maintain domination over the States which were formerly colonies, by granting them certain advantages and giving domination a new form, can succeed. Despite all the efforts of the neo-imperialists, the situation remains as it was during the era of the old imperialism. There are, of course, the activities of the neo-imperialists, but these activities are combined with those of the vilest old-style imperialism. I will quote a passage from the draft programme of the Communist Party of the USSR, which was reproduced in *The New York Times* on 1 August 1961:

[*The speaker continued in English*]

"The imperialists are using new methods and new forms to maintain colonial exploitation of the peoples. They have recourse to whatever means they can—colonial wars, military blocs, conspiracies, terrorism, subversion, economic pressure, bribery—to control the newly free countries and to reduce the independence they have won to mere form or to deprive them of that independence."

[*The speaker resumed his statement in French*]

All is in vain. The imperialists have not even succeeded in reaching the stage of neo-colonialism.

178. There is one question which we cannot overlook at this special session; it is that of the special forces used by the French Government in its attack on Tunisia. I am referring to the paratroops and the Foreign Legion. The war crimes committed by these forces in Tunisia have been described here. They are recorded in a number of documents submitted by Tunisia to the United Nations Security Council.

179. What are these units, who are these soldiers responsible for the crimes to which I have just referred? This is a special weapon, which at the present time is also being forged in the United States and which we should consider outlawing by international convention. Why? Because the components of this weapon are recruited in a particular way. They are recruited among the dregs of society, among common criminals. This weapon is composed of mercenaries who do not even speak the language of the nation by which they are employed; it is composed of former followers of Hitler, former SS men, professional killers. That is the specific composition of this weapon, which is designed for special purposes, which is designed to sow terror among the civilian population, to commit every imaginable crime against the civilian population of a nation (whether a metropolitan country or a colony) when that population rises up to defend its national independence and to preserve democratic freedoms and human rights. We have had actual experience with this kind of weapon in the case of the SS. We must not allow it to be revived.

180. We should draw up an international convention prohibiting such a weapon, just as poison gases and

bacteriological weapons are prohibited and as atomic weapons should be prohibited. It is high time to pay attention to this question, for it concerns the rights and liberties of men all over the world, as well as the sovereignty of nations and the right of the people to defend that sovereignty. It is unthinkable that the imperialist States should be allowed to forge a weapon which, by its composition and its purpose, is specifically intended for the suppression of any popular movement in favour of freedom and human rights.

181. It is one of the ironies of history that these paratroops, this Foreign Legion, who have twice attempted to overthrow the French Government, who have perhaps even tried to kill the head of that Government, have been used to kill hundreds of innocent Tunisians. This has been a holocaust offered to world imperialism, to French imperialism, to those very military and civilian circles in France who wanted to overthrow the de Gaulle government by a *coup d'état*. This has been a holocaust offered by that government to those very circles which wished to annihilate it. That is the irony of history. Those are the internal inconsistencies of an imperialist State.

182. We are thus witnessing the extraordinary spectacle of a sagacious and far-sighted statesman, who has undoubtedly demonstrated what we would do and who already belongs to history, but who is fervently, enthusiastically and, I might even say, lovingly sawing off the branch on which he is sitting. That is the result of the internal inconsistencies of the imperialists, which they are unable to reconcile and which are inevitably and rapidly causing them to adopt the total colonialist position. What, however, is the power behind all this? A man who is much better qualified than I am, and who is intimately acquainted with this power, has described it as follows:

[*The speaker continued in English*]

"We have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are actively engaged in the defence establishment. We annually spend on military security alone more than the net income of all United States corporations.

"Now this conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every state house, every office of the federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development, yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

"In the councils of Government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

"We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defence with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

"...

"The prospect of domination of the nations scholars by Federal employment, project allocations and the

power of money is ever present, and is gravely to be regarded."<sup>11</sup>

[*The speaker resumed his statement in French*]

183. Who said this? The former President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower. He said it in his farewell speech. Whatever we may think of President Eisenhower's personality or of his policy—which belongs to the past—we must admit that these words show great civic courage, particularly in a country where anyone, even though he is not guilty, can be destroyed overnight by private-interest groups that are all-powerful.

184. This is the force which stands behind the acts and crimes of imperialism. This is what we call, in Marxist and Leninist language, a combination of economic and financial monopolies on the one hand with the State and the army on the other. This is State capitalism. The terms matter little, for the content is the same. This was pointed out with extraordinary force by a President of the United States. Reading these lines, my thoughts turned to the works of Lenin, to his book on imperialism and to all his articles, written during the war and the Russian Revolution, in which he described this combination of the State and capitalism.

185. I said before that France's action against Tunisia has strengthened the international front against imperialism. I should like to add yet another proof: this is the joint Bulgarian-Ghanaian communiqué published on 12 August 1961 in the organ of the Bulgarian Communist Party, *The Workers' Task*. This communiqué, signed by the President of the Republic of Ghana and by the Chairman of the Presidium of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, says, among other things—and I translate from the Bulgarian:

"It became evident in the course of the talks that there is complete agreement on such important international questions as general and complete disarmament, peaceful coexistence, the total and rapid liquidation of colonialism in all its forms, and other questions. The Governments of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and of the Republic of Ghana have reached agreement on the need to make every possible effort to implement as quickly as possible the decision of the fifteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly calling for the liquidation of the vestiges of colonialism. Guided by the declaration on the liquidation of colonialism, the two countries have condemned French aggression in Tunisia, i.e., the attack on Bizerta, and they support the Tunisian people's request for the immediate evacuation of all French forces from its territory."

186. This attack by an imperialist State on a small independent country recently freed from colonialism is yet another proof that international unity against colonialism is being strengthened. In saying all this and in using the strongest words I could find, my intention has not been, as some might think, to exacerbate international tension. No, we must tell the full truth about colonialism, or as one might say in Russian, the *pravda*. This is the name of a Soviet newspaper, but what does the word mean? It is an extraordinary word, signifying both justice and truth. It does not exist in our language, or in French. That is why I use it—truth and justice at the same time. This is what we must say here before the whole world.

<sup>11</sup> Statement published in *The New York Times* of 18 January 1961.

187. The colonialist countries were afraid of this session, because they would have been seen on this rostrum, in this chamber, before the eyes of the whole world, stripped of their fine clothes and sparkling jewels. They would have been seen in all their hideous nakedness.

188. They would have been seen like lepers without their masks. That is what they were afraid of; they were afraid of the truth, the *pravda*. But they did not succeed. I repeat that truth and justice, openly defended here before the whole world, are the only possible foundations of any understanding between nations.

189. We are against war, and we have said so a thousand times. We are for international understanding, but it is impossible to achieve such understanding by hiding behind a curtain, as Polonius did in *Hamlet*, and as the French delegation is doing now.

190. Here I shall quote the words which were used by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union at the Soviet-Romanian Friendship Meeting, and which were published in *Izvestia* of 13 August 1961. These, then, are the words of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union:

[*The speaker continued in Russian*]

"The Soviet Government proposes to the Government of the Western Powers that they should join us in solving all the problems on which our views differ..."

[*The speaker resumed his statement in French*]

We take the same view. There is no need for me to say so, but I shall say it anyway. We subscribe to this, and all the socialist countries subscribe to it. I shall not give their names, but all here present know that on this question we take the same stand.

191. I shall continue with the words spoken by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR:

[*The speaker continued in Russian*]

"...but which cannot be left unresolved, since they cause friction among States and engender tension in the world".

[*The speaker resumed his statement in French*]

192. This is the firm policy of our country, but it does not mean that we are ready to fall on our knees before imperialism. It does not mean that we will sacrifice the fundamental principles of our policy, and what we believe to be the progressive development of mankind, to a peace which would be worth nothing if these principles were not applied.

193. There is another question which was raised here by the representative of Tunisia, and which I think most important: He said:

"In fact, we have learnt from the Press that the general staff responsible for the aggression of 19 July intends to link up the French forces at Bizerta with those operating in Algeria, 170 kilometres from Bizerta, by means of a simultaneous attack which would result in the occupation of the whole northern region of Tunisia. This operation is said to be referred to as the 'long plough', the 19 July aggression against Bizerta being called the 'short plough'." [996th meeting, para. 74.]

194. What does this mean? Has a plan of this kind really been prepared by the general staff of which Mr.

Slim speaks? Have we not the right and the duty to consider this rumour, or perhaps this journalist's report, in the light of the French Government's declared plan for a partition of Algeria? Have we not the right and the duty to seek a relationship between this rumour and the fact, mentioned here by the representative of Tunisia, that a number of French citizens arrested in Tunisia were found to possess offensive weapons? We know of the links between continental France, Algeria and Tunisia, the customs and political tendencies of that region and the events which are taking place there. If we take all this into account, we may well be anxious. This information may be correct.

195. In a leading article in *The New York Times* of 24 August 1961, we read:

[*The speaker continued in English*]

"President Bourguiba, presuming on the relative immunity he has enjoyed in the face of his virtual co-belligerence with the Algerian rebels to whom he provides a privileged sanctuary, has been lured by Sahara oil and the profits of neutralism..."

[*The speaker resumed his statement in French*]

196. What is the meaning of this reference to the relative immunity which President Bourguiba has enjoyed. Is a still more serious act of aggression being prepared? We must be vigilant. I simply wished to mention all these facts.

197. It is unfortunate that the French delegation is absent, since it might perhaps have been able to deny this. If, however, it is not denied, our anxiety will increase.

198. I return to my general idea. I shall say a few words about the assertion of the United States that this question can be settled outside the United Nations. There is no reason why a country should not offer its good offices. But is the United States capable of doing anything when it is in a worse position than France, when it is still more colonialist and still more deeply committed to a series of aggressions almost everywhere in the world? How can it hope to bring about a settlement? It is incredible! It is impossible! In my opinion this is nothing more than a delaying tactic. Personally, I do not doubt the good intentions of many statesmen in the United States. However, we are not concerned with this, but with the real and objective policy of imperialism. If I could help these gentlemen, I should willingly do so, but I am not a citizen of the United States, and I am unable to come to their aid.

199. We should nevertheless try to make ourselves understood, as Mr. Khrushchev has said. How are we to make ourselves understood? We must make an effort, but the United States must also make an effort. My own observations up to the present time have convinced me that the United States finds it very hard to understand the under-developed countries and former colonies, and that even when it makes an effort to do so, it fails. To succeed, the United States leaders should not only read Marx and Lenin, but they should cease to be imperialists. Otherwise, success is impossible.

200. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I trust that the distinguished representative of Bulgaria will forgive me if I point out, in a very friendly way, that there are still two speakers to be heard. I shall therefore ask him, in an equally friendly manner, to condense his statement a little more in order that we may dispose of our work more quickly.

201. Mr. GEORGIEV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): The President is entirely right, and I shall end with two words, and a gift.

202. I shall mention a simple fact that shows how little the leaders of the United States know of the situation outside their own country, even if they wanted to know about it. This is a small detail without any importance, yet it is very characteristic and very interesting.

203. A statement by the United States Secretary of State on the reorganization of the United Nations Secretariat was published in *The New York Times* of 15 July 1961. It is of no particular interest to me except for a passage which shows how ideas about the outside world are formed in the United States. This is the passage: "It is called a 'troika' after the three-horse Russian sleigh."

204. How could such a mistake have found its way into a statement by a Minister for Foreign Affairs? This is what I read in a Russian-American dictionary, which I have before me:

"Troika, feminine word used in conversation.

"First meaning: the numeral three.

"Second meaning: mark given in class. Example: the pupil got 3 out of 5.

"Third meaning: playing-card. Examples: the three of hearts, the three of spades.

"Fourth meaning: three horses harnessed abreast."

205. How could such an interpretation have found its way into an official statement by the Secretary of State of the United States? Troika means the figure 3. To speak of the troika principle is to speak of the tripartite principle. What is the point of introducing this idea of a Russian sleigh drawn by three horses harnessed abreast? What is the public to think? The public will say: this a northern country covered with snow, a country with strange customs where sleighs, for some extraordinary reason, are drawn by three horses; and this is the country that is trying to impose upon us its habits, which, to say the least, are curious.

206. I do not say that public opinion will really gain this impression, but it is possible. I do not say that the United States Government wished to create this impression. I simply want to show how badly informed the State Department is, even about the most insignificant things.

207. Since I am moved by the noblest sentiments and anxious for mutual understanding between East and West, I should like to ask you, Mr. President, to present this Russian-American dictionary to the State Department. If the rules of procedure do not prevent such a gift from one delegation to another, I would ask you to offer this book to the United States delegation as my personal gift. If they do not accept it, I should like you to offer it to the United Nations museum, as a symbol of our wish for mutual understanding.

208. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I am glad of this opportunity to add my delegation's hearty congratulations to Mr. Boland on the occasion of his unanimous election to preside over this special session. His wise and skilful conduct of the fifteenth session of the General Assembly fully justifies this token of general appreciation.

209. I hope I shall be brief in dealing with this matter. It is a matter of concern to my delegation that

two Member States of the United Nations, whose record has been one of particularly friendly relations and co-operation, and whose distinguished Heads of State had in the past co-operated in seeking peaceful solutions of other problems, should find themselves in their present predicament of such strained relations. It is further a matter of profound regret to us that there has been in Tunisia such a heavy and unnecessary loss of life, which from today's reports appear to be far graver than we originally thought. Our thoughts go out in sympathy to all the victims of those tragic events and our hearts beat as one with all the people who are struggling for their legitimate rights.

210. Cyprus, as a Mediterranean island geographically placed between three continents and desiring to serve as a bridge of friendship and understanding between the peoples of these continents, is particularly distressed by this conflict between France and Tunisia. Close, friendly associations have linked the peoples of Cyprus with the people of both these countries, and it is our most earnest desire to see a just settlement of their dispute by negotiation in mutual understanding based on freedom and equal rights under the Charter. Regrettably this has proved so far impossible in spite of diligent and persistent efforts by third parties. Indeed, as Mr. Slim, the representative of Tunisia, explained to this Assembly [996th meeting] in his admirable and lucid account, negotiations under the provisions of the exchange of letters of 17 June 1958<sup>12</sup> between France and Tunisia had been sought previously by Tunisia but without result, until we came to the present situation.

211. We shall not enter into the sequence of developments that led up to the armed conflict and the tragic events that followed. Nor shall we make any apportionment of responsibility or blame in these respects. This may be the work of the historians. We shall concern ourselves solely with what should be done now for a just solution of the problem in the interests not only of the parties immediately concerned, but also, and perhaps more so, in the interests of the United Nations and of the world community at large.

212. I will not take the time to recount the proceedings in the Security Council on this issue, and the other facts that rendered the convening of this special session necessary. It has been amply done by many eloquent speakers who preceded me. I would only wish to say that clearly, since the Security Council was unable to reach agreement on any measures for the full implementation of its own resolution and for a peaceful settlement of this international dispute, another organ of the United Nations, namely, the General Assembly, should take up that task, or else the United Nations would be failing in its primary responsibility, that of maintaining international peace and security. In a general sense, where agreement through negotiations or mediation of any international dispute cannot be achieved because of too wide a divergence of interests or because the strong, being in a dominant position, are unwilling to concede the right of the weak, the intervention of the United Nations is an imperative need in the interests of peace, and I should say in the interests also of freedom. By introducing in an international dispute the weight of world conscience with a collective sense of justice and respect for principles, the General Assembly

can afford protection to the weak and reduce the existing inequality of power between the two sides, thereby creating a more balanced climate in which negotiations for a peaceful solution can be fruitful.

213. A reasoned and objective discussion of issues in the United Nations cannot fail to bring out in sharp relief what is right and what is just, on which basis alone real and workable solutions can be reached. Discussion in the United Nations is always beneficial, irrespective of any possible excesses that may occur in the debate. The gist and the effect of the discussion lies not in the excesses but in the resulting collective voice of humanity. Consequently, debate in the United Nations should not be shunned by those who are willing to abide by the principles of the Charter. In this sense my delegation joined with forty-seven other delegations in the request [A/4831] for the calling of this special session.

214. The issues before us are crystal clear. None of the able speakers that have taken this rostrum have disputed the facts as clearly stated by the representative of Tunisia, and none have questioned the validity of the principles involved. Indeed there seems to be a general consensus on the merits of the case. These merits are concisely and accurately embodied in the moderate draft resolution [A/L.351] which my delegation, together with thirty-one other delegations, has sponsored.

215. These merits are as follows:

(1) That France, by failing to withdraw its armed forces to their original position, has not fully complied with the provisions of the interim resolution<sup>13</sup> of the Security Council;

(2) That the Security Council failed to take appropriate action for the implementation of the said resolution and as to the main complaint by Tunisia that French armed forces are occupying admittedly sovereign territory of Tunisia without the latter's agreement or consent.

(3) That Tunisia has the sovereign right to call for the withdrawal of all French armed forces present on its territory without its consent.

(4) That the presence of such forces on Tunisia's territory against the express will of the Tunisian Government and people constitute a violation of Tunisian sovereignty and is a permanent source of friction endangering international peace and security.

216. Proceeding on these unquestionably and generally accepted premises, the draft resolution, in paragraph 1 of its operative part reaffirms the interim resolution of the Security Council and urges the Government of France to implement fully the provisions of operative paragraph 1 thereof.

217. In operative paragraph 2, it recognizes the sovereign right of Tunisia to call for the withdrawal of all French armed forces present on its territory without its consent.

218. In paragraph 3, it calls upon the Governments of France and Tunisia to enter into immediate negotiations to devise peaceful and agreed measures in accordance with the principles of the Charter for the withdrawal of all French armed forces from Tunisian territory.

219. There is no difference of opinion as to the correctness and as to the validity of these merits.

<sup>12</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Sixteenth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1961, document S/4869.*

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, document S/4882.

220. This moderate draft resolution, therefore, in its substance, is unobjectionable and ought to be acceptable to all. Where then does the difference lie, because obviously there is some difference?

221. It has been suggested that paragraph 3 ought to leave the purport of the negotiations unspecified, instead of relating it to the withdrawal of the French forces from Tunisian territory. Considering, however, that Tunisia's right to call for the withdrawal of all French forces from its territory has not been disputed in the Assembly and that Tunisia's demand for such withdrawal is an obvious fact, it follows as a logical inference that the only possible ground for negotiations between the parties would be nothing other than the time-table and the modalities of such withdrawal.

222. Considering furthermore that final evacuation is implicit in the exchange of letters of 17 June 1958 between France and Tunisia, and also that France has made known its intention of ultimate withdrawal, it would seem that even from the French point of view negotiations could not be for anything other than for withdrawal.

223. The draft resolution, therefore, rightly specifies withdrawal as the object of the negotiations, leaving it open for the parties to decide upon the time-table and procedures of such withdrawal.

224. Indeed, negotiations in this sense would be in the best interests of both parties, for independently of other considerations, the good will of the local population is an essential in the effective use of a base. However, it seems to us that the real difference lies elsewhere; the real difference seems to be between action and inaction, between those who would have the General Assembly adopt a resolution and those who would have it adopt none. In our view, inaction is impossible and would be disastrous in its implications. It should be remembered that the issues before us extend beyond the limits of the Franco-Tunisian dispute and directly affect the United Nations itself. This is the first time that the General Assembly has been confronted with a situation in which it is called upon to uphold a resolution of the Security Council which has not been fully implemented because one of the parties to which it is addressed fails to comply with it. The fact that the resolution in question was adopted by the Security Council without a dissenting vote adds to the gravity of the situation.

225. What is at stake is the authority and the efficacy of the Security Council, the most important organ of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security. If the General Assembly fails on this symbolic occasion to take appropriate action, the whole structure of the United Nations will be irremediably shaken, and this at a time when an ominous world crisis looming on the horizon makes a strong and effective United Nations more than ever necessary in the humanitarian effort for survival.

226. We cannot conceal our profound regret over the recent attitude of France towards the United Nations

and its organs, and the absence of France's representative from this General Assembly. The existence of this world Organization and the principles set forth in its Charter are in the vital interest of humanity as a whole and of every component part of it, large or small. If, on any particular occasion a given Power finds the United Nations and its Charter noxious to its own pursuits and objectives, there will certainly be other and more important occasions when it will find it necessary and beneficial.

227. The failure of the League of Nations and the calamities of the war that followed it have been a lesson for all who had no faith in the collective effort of humanity. A new spirit brought about the establishment of the United Nations, in which France, in keeping with its tradition, took a leading part. We confidently hope that the French nation will soon return to that wise and imaginative policy, in its own broadly conceived interests no less than in those of the world community at large.

228. We should also emphasize that as things stand, the way in which the General Assembly deals with the Franco-Tunisian question at the present juncture may have serious implications for the United Nations and for world peace. On such occasions as the present, Member States should unhesitatingly brush aside minor considerations and rally to the support of the Security Council and the United Nations. Susceptibilities, injured feelings, loyalties or other considerations of expediency, understandable as they may be otherwise, are minor compared to the greater issue of the United Nations with which we are now faced. The threat to the United Nations is there, and the dangers involved are as real as they are grave. Our mode of thinking and acting at this special session will inescapably affect the outcome of other and more vital issues, and the very functions of this Organization, in a way that may determine its whole future.

229. As *The New York Times* put the matter in its editorial for Sunday, 20 August 1961:

"This [session] will be more than ever a test of the Organization's ability to deal with situations in which the world's peace and humanity's future are at stake."

230. A dual responsibility falls on the General Assembly: first, to act in order to uphold the authority and efficacy of the main organ of the United Nations, namely the Security Council, and second, to protect the interests of international peace by adopting a constructive resolution based on the Charter and on the clear and unquestionable issues before it.

231. The draft resolution which has been proposed meets both those objectives. It is important that Member States, by overwhelmingly adopting this draft resolution, should reaffirm their faith in the United Nations and take this occasion to revitalize its Charter at a time when the strengthening of the United Nations is an imperious necessity.

*The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.*