

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1138th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Monday, 1 October 1962,  
at 10.30 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
Speech by Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan) . . . . .	239
Speech by Mr. Falcón Briceño (Venezuela) . . . . .	242
Speech by Mr. Peter (Hungary) . . . . .	246
Speech by Mr. Spaak (Belgium) . . . . .	251
Statement by the representative of the United Kingdom . . . . .	257

*President: Mr. Muhammad ZAFRULLA KHAN  
(Pakistan).*

## AGENDA ITEM 9

### General debate (continued)

1. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): It is a privilege for me to address this distinguished Assembly on behalf of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, particularly at a juncture in the history of the United Nations which is one of the most crucial, challenging, and indeed, one of the most potentially creative in humankind's eternal struggle to construct a world order anchored in a framework of shared dedication to the cause of world peace, inspired by an inalienable devotion to the principles of justice, and impelled by the divine and inexorable urge in man to achieve a richer and higher life upon this earth.

2. These are not pious or vain expressions but rather a treasured register of man's yearnings throughout the ages. They have oftentimes been brought to fulfilment; they have on occasion been thwarted and compromised. As a repository of these shared beliefs and common values, the cardinal objective of the United Nations is to strive to preserve and expand them; and Jordan hereby pledges once more its staunch adherence to them and its readiness to contribute towards their fulfilment.

3. I deem it my privilege at the outset to express the profound congratulations of my Government to our most distinguished President for the confidence which the General Assembly has vested in him, and which he has so richly earned and deserved through long years of association and dedication to the principles and causes of the United Nations. I am confident that with the President's able and single-minded guidance, the General Assembly will make its way through its heavy load of work judiciously and with expedition.

4. We are meeting in this seventeenth regular session of the General Assembly to review our achievements and our failures over the past year in our common endeavours in the fields of human progress and world

peace and to explore all possible avenues for the attainment of our objectives.

5. I am fully aware of the apprehensions which beset our minds as we take stock of the world situation today—the seemingly never-ending tensions, the conflicts, the fears and all the other instincts and attributes which stem from our human nature, behaviour and motivations. But I would like to venture the thought that these conflicts and tensions—grave as they may seem, in fact, grave as they are—should not cause us to be unduly disheartened. For in their absence there might well be a situation of lethargy, stagnation and immobility in which the processes of life were little more than self-perpetuating, if not retrogressing. This is the world of the dark ages from which the modern world has only relatively recently emerged.

6. The apprehensions and misgivings, therefore, which beset our minds as we review the grave problems which confront the United Nations should be tempered by the realization that we are living in a uniquely expanding and dynamic world. The immensity and dimensions of the problems involved are such as to put to the severest test the statesmanship, the wisdom, the ingenuity and, above all, the collective goodwill and tolerance of the leaders of the community of nations. It is largely an uncharted and untrod territory, bearing in its womb the seeds of unfathomable progress and change both on the national level and in the relationship amongst nations.

7. We rejoice as we witness in our present age man's brave exploration of outer space. It is a triumph of the human mind and spirit in their ceaseless surging forward to discover the unknown and to rise to even higher plateaus of attainment. Our admiration for those of our human kin who have made these achievements possible is limitless, and it is a great honour for me to pay the deepest tribute to them on behalf of the people of Jordan.

8. It is unthinkable that at the moment of man's greatest triumph the rejoicing at the opening of new and undreamt-of vistas of life should be marred by fears and forebodings that these discoveries should be turned to purposes of destruction. It is equally hard to believe that the great Powers which have achieved these marvellous technological feats should fail to arrive at a formula for pooling their technological and human resources in a common effort towards utilizing these discoveries in the cause of world peace and progress.

9. My Government supports every endeavour with a view to concluding a mutually acceptable agreement, or series of agreements, between the great Powers for co-operation in the exploration and control of outer space. Indeed, we look forward to the day when other nations of the world, including the Arab nations, will have reached a position where their talents could en-

able them more effectively to join in this marvellous human venture.

10. But of more immediate and lasting significance than exploration and control of outer space is our ability to control our inner selves, to make this planet a place worthy of decent and friendly habitation. And it is here in this hall that we meet in what is the most encompassing parliament of nations, to lay down the foundations for peace, goodwill and co-operation among nations. If we should fail in this pivotal task, then all the efforts which are being expended in various fields will have been of no avail, with the threat of extinction continuing to hover menacingly over our fates.

11. But world peace cannot be achieved by pious hopes or even under the compulsion of fear or the instinctive desire for survival. Any such assumption would be a serious misreading not only of history, but of the inner springs of human motivation and behaviour. For there will always be differences and conflicts so long as human beings are what they are. What is imperative is that these conflicts and differences be dealt with and resolved in accordance with norms, procedures and attitudes that are just, equitable and commanding of universal acceptance and respect; it is essentially the rule of law, rather than the unruly whims or interests of any particular group. This has been the function and the achievement of domestic law in national societies. It is our challenge to make it equally applicable in the field of international relations.

12. The question now is: How can the United Nations work out a modus vivendi which would bring us as close as possible to a universally acceptable rule of law?

13. It is the firm conviction of my delegation that this can be achieved only if we set as our criteria; in the judgement of every issue, the eternal principles of justice and equity. This demands that our attitudes and judgements be guided by the intrinsic and objective merits of each case, rather than by extraneous considerations of power, vested interests and influence.

14. Our delegation firmly believes that the seriousness of any international issue rests as much in whether it complies with the principles and norms of the United Nations, as in whether it entails a threat to international peace and security. If this is not recognized and given effect by the moral and the material resources which the United Nations commands, then it is tantamount to an open invitation to the aggrieved and the wronged and the dispossessed to take the law into their own hands, with all the dire consequences that would inevitably flow from such action.

15. We are not oblivious of the overriding considerations of power and influence, the political, the economic, the ideological, and all the other factors which must be reckoned with in every situation and in every decision. But since these factors are not the exclusive possession of any particular country or group of countries, have we any alternative in hard-boiled, realistic terms than to urge that the United Nations be guided in its decisions by considerations of justice, right, morality and a universally accepted rule of law?

16. I beg your indulgence for having, perhaps, over-emphasized this banal point. My excuse is that I am the representative and the son of a country whose people have suffered and continue to suffer grievously because of a denial and a violation of these basic premises.

17. As I address you, my mind irresistibly wanders several thousand miles away to where my countrymen—men, women and children, in town and in village, in refugee camps and in forced dispersal under every sky—have endured their suffering for fourteen long years. They are suffering morally, psychologically and physically, day in and day out, before the very eyes of the United Nations and, ironically, at a period which we boast to be the era of mankind's greatest emancipation.

18. It would be redundant for me to restate the facts of the case, for there is hardly any other problem which has been discussed as thoroughly or as repeatedly during the past years; and yet, there is hardly any other case where less positive action has been taken.

19. My countrymen, simple honest folks, are somewhat confused and bewildered by the snarls and the tangles with which a seemingly straightforward case has been side-tracked and shrouded, and I would be less than honest to them, or to you, if I did not restore the problem to its true, simple essentials.

20. The truth of the problem is that here is a people—an ancient and homogeneous people—who have in the twentieth century not only been denied the right to self-government or self-determination, but even the right to exist in the homeland in which their forefathers have lived and died from time immemorial. They have been uprooted to make room for a conglomeration of alien peoples from all corners of the earth, having different backgrounds, different traditions, different languages and different races, and claiming to be united on the sole ground of professing the same religious faith. What a disservice to a great religion that its name should be used for such unholy and irreligious ends; for a blatant aggression against the very existence of another people.

21. At times we are told that this is a recompense to a people who had been persecuted and wronged. But is not the treatment meted out to the people of Palestine like dragging an innocent man taken at random and sending him to the hangman for a crime which he had never committed, in place of the real culprit? Is not this a strange form of justice?

22. At other times we are told that the Zionists are very influential and that it would be futile to bang our heads against the wall. We know only too well how influential they are. But what we cannot believe is that they are more influential than the collective will and the collective conscience of the United Nations, of the community of nations as a whole represented in this hall.

23. If there should be a continuance of the present attitude of complacency and indifference to the plight of the Arabs of Palestine, can we in all honesty ascribe it to anything but an attitude of inertia, of unwillingness, rather than to an inability to act?

24. A motion was tabled last year calling upon the Arab States and Israel to enter into direct peace talks. It is not unlikely that the Israelis will make a similar attempt this year. To the uninitiated in the sordid record of this problem the proposal may hold some attraction; for, ostensibly at least, what better than to have a dispute settled directly by the disputants?

25. To those gentlemen who may find themselves enticed by such a proposal, I would say: please ask the Israelis themselves, who are so assiduously preaching the cause of peace, whether they are prepared to sur-

render the rights unlawfully wrested from the Arabs of Palestine. Are they willing to abide by and implement the United Nations own resolutions—unfair as the Palestinians felt they were—concerning the restoration of territories in Palestine which the Israelis presently occupy in defiance of the United Nations?

26. Are the Israelis willing to accept, in real terms rather than as a tactical token, the repatriation of the refugees to their homeland? Are the Israelis willing to pay just compensation for damages to property suffered by those helpless victims?

27. This is the crux of the matter and it is truly an act of disrespect to the wisdom, to the intelligence and to the integrity of the United Nations to present the problem in the manner in which the Israelis have been propounding it.

28. After all, the United Nations can only survive if its decisions are based upon the foundations of legality and order. And where do we stop if these foundations are deliberately overlooked and replaced by the fait accompli? The United Nations has ample machinery for handling disputes in a manner conformable to its own Charter and to its own collective sense of justice and fairness. Shall the United Nations abdicate its rights and its obligations in the matter, leaving the victim face to face with the aggressor? For the tragedy of Palestine is not one solely pertaining to the people of Palestine, nor for that matter to the Arab States. It is a problem which belongs equally to all as Members of the United Nations and as guardians of an international order based upon law and justice.

29. As a representative of Jordan, in whose territory reside two-thirds of the Arabs of Palestine, one and a quarter million of them, I solemnly declare that we will not be goaded or coerced into an act of national suicide, or put our seal and signature on an arrangement which violates not only our fundamental and inalienable rights, but also our fundamental obligations as Members of the United Nations. We have none of the terrible weapons of destruction to rattle, but we have enough faith in our humanness and in the essential goodness of the community of nations to hope and expect that it will rally to aid in defending what we believe to be fair and just.

30. The announcement made a few days ago concerning the impending delivery by the United States of missiles to Israel has, I need hardly state, been received with deep disappointment and grave apprehensions in my country. Not only is it a deadly threat to our security and survival, but it can only increase the intransigence of the Israelis in their aggressive designs upon the Arab countries and in their adamant refusal to abide by the United Nations resolutions on Palestine.

31. My Government has observed with deep satisfaction the success which has been achieved during the past year in solving a number of important international problems, particularly in Asia and Africa. It is my privilege on this auspicious occasion to salute our valiant Algerian brethren on the crowning achievement of their freedom. Their dauntless spirit, their sacrifice and their dedication to a just cause are a source of inspiration to freedom-loving peoples everywhere. Rarely has a nation paid so dearly for its independence and rarely has one earned it so abundantly and so deservedly. I humbly pay tribute to those who gave their lives, hundreds of thousands of them, in order that their country may live, and I am confident

that our Algerian brethren will show the same exemplary qualities in nation-building, development and progress as they have shown in the struggle for freedom.

32. I also wish to pay tribute to a great leader and statesman, General de Gaulle, whose wisdom and courage in the face of great odds reaffirmed his mantle as a true son of France and a loyal upholder of its great traditions. Jordan looks forward to a renewal of the old ties of friendship which linked our two countries and our two cultures for generations past.

33. We are happy that the problems of West Irian and of Laos have been satisfactorily solved, and I wish to congratulate all those who have, with wisdom and restraint, contributed to their solution.

34. It is also our most earnest hope that the Congo will find its way to a final and satisfactory solution in unity and strength, and I wish to take this opportunity to express deep appreciation to the Acting Secretary-General, U Thant, for his tireless and dedicated effort to help the Congo out of that unhappy situation in which it found itself embroiled.

35. It is most regrettable that while listing the achievements of the past year we should find that the problem which ultimately has more bearing upon our very survival than any other is still bogged down. We realize, of course, that nuclear disarmament is an extremely complex matter. We also realize that disarmament cannot realistically be separated from the all-important problem of inspection and control. But living in the dwarfed world that is our planet, have we any alternative but to urge that the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament at Geneva should have the full and unswerving backing of all Members of the United Nations in intensifying the efforts towards total nuclear disarmament and the removal of this monstrous menace to the survival of the human race?

36. Although the non-nuclear Powers are represented at the Geneva talks, we realize full well that the outcome of these efforts depends upon the agreement of the major Powers. This is a case where all of us—big and small—can speak the same language, for we are all in the same boat.

37. In the meantime, and because of the imminent peril to the health and security of the human race, can we but appeal for an immediate discontinuance of nuclear tests? There are enough bombs already to blow us all to bits and pieces, so what overriding purpose can further testing serve?

38. One of the proud achievements of the United Nations has been the impetus which it has given to, and the sustained determination with which it has helped, the emancipation of peoples from colonialism and their emergence into full-fledged freedom and dignified nationhood.

39. We have witnessed with pride and exhilaration the great movement of liberation, particularly in Africa, during the past few years. We extend our heartiest congratulations and welcome to the new Members in our family of nations: Trinidad and Tobago, Jamaica, Rwanda and Burundi, and wish them all the prosperity and progress which they will no doubt achieve in their nationhood.

40. The Jordan Government has been following with the most profound interest the work of the Special

Committee of seventeen members<sup>1/</sup> and it is our earnest hope that the work of the Committee will continue without let or hindrance. The Jordan delegation, therefore, will give the most careful consideration to the report of the Committee and will appraise objectively the recommendations pertaining to its re-composition, its jurisdiction and the territorial delineation of the area which should fall within its purview.

41. Our delegation will give particular attention to the case of our sister Oman in her striving to achieve self-determination and nationhood.

42. It goes without saying that if the United Nations is to discharge the wide range of functions which devolve upon it, it must necessarily ensure that its structure and housekeeping tools are functioning safely and soundly. Our delegation, therefore, will support every constructive suggestion for streamlining its operations and ensuring its solvency. I am happy to take this opportunity to renew our confidence in and to pay tribute to the exemplary work which our Acting Secretary-General has been performing in the manifold fields of activity of the United Nations.

43. We are proud that Jordan, under the leadership of His Majesty King Hussein and with the determined national will of its people, has been a stronghold of stability, freedom, progress and unflinching dedication to the public welfare. For our motto is: "Let us build this country and serve this nation."

44. We are happy, though by no means complacent, about the progress which we have achieved during the past decade. But what is more important is that our plans and our aspirations for this coming decade are geared to the aims and challenges of the United Nations Development Decade.

45. We are grateful for the generous aid which has been given to us by friendly countries, institutions and the specialized agencies of the United Nations. We are an open and free society pledged to the lofty ideals of democracy, social justice and the movement of man towards a higher and better life in dignity and freedom. But we are neither self-centred nor parochial and we do not regard ourselves in any terms other than as a loyal and dedicated part of our greater Arab homeland. I feel it is imperative to give this reaffirmation because of the doubts and the misgivings which have of late arisen in some minds concerning the essential unity of the Arab nation.

46. There are inevitably some differences in approach, in outlook, in methods and even in social and economic ideas and ideologies. We, the Arabs, certainly have no monopoly of such partisan disagreements in outlook, as the experiences of other nations amply show. But there is one thing that I wish categorically to reaffirm, namely, that Jordan will continue to work with determination and unswerving faith for the achievement of Arab integration and unification in an orderly, democratic and harmonious relationship.

47. For one hundred million Arabs in unison will not only unleash the latent creative talents and energies of our nation, but will also create that wider area of consensus which is an avowed and worthy aim of the United Nations.

48. I cannot but close my statement before this Assembly with a remark which I am certain represents the views of us all: in unity and friendship we shall all survive and prosper; in disunity, we may all perish.

49. Mr. FALCON BRICEÑO (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to congratulate you on your election as the presiding officer of this Assembly. We are convinced by your record of outstanding service in the political and judicial offices you have held that you will carry out the duties of the high office of President of the General Assembly with your customary intelligence and discretion. We cherish the hope that under your expert guidance the present session will prove to be a great success.

50. It is also a pleasure for me to extend the warmest of welcomes to the representatives of the four new independent States recently admitted to the United Nations: Rwanda, Burundi, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago. The last two are countries of the American continent which are close to Venezuela both geographically and historically. Simón Bolívar lived in Jamaica, and it was there that he wrote one of his most extraordinary documents, "Letter from Jamaica". It was Trinidad which gave a brotherly welcome to the first political exiles from my country, the heralds of our independence. These and other things which have united us in the past and unite us in the present explain the special sympathy with which Venezuela has welcomed the independence of these two new States.

51. In attending this General Assembly of the United Nations we are naturally concerned over the difficult problems of our times. We cannot ignore the fact that the world is passing through one of its most serious crises which we must try to solve in ways dictated by reason, law and historical experience. It is fortunate indeed that we can meet here, with our different points of view to be sure, with more or less conflicting interests, but, there can be no doubt, with the purpose of saving the world from one of those relapses which have so far proved ineffective as a solution to its most serious problems.

52. No people wants war, nor does any statesman who loyally interprets the feelings of his people. But the mind of peoples has been, and is being, poisoned by the preaching and practice of doctrines which seek to build a new world on the ruins of liberty, as if man were eager to return to primitive times. There cannot be the slightest doubt that throughout history man has been struggling towards liberty. Nations which have no powerful army and which use no language other than that of principle firmly maintain that the problems plaguing this world in crisis can be solved by peaceful means. Long before Europe, we in America proscribed wars of aggression and declared recourse to war a real crime. In keeping with the ideal of peace—which is the very basis of our world Organization—the Charter of the United Nations tells us "to practice tolerance" and "to live together in peace". That is an ideal which cannot be achieved overnight. The history of mankind has been different, but its long and dramatic past has given rise to the conviction that war is not a solution, that it is always better to negotiate than to fight. It is in order to negotiate that we who constitute the United Nations have come together here. If only the great Powers, too, might be guided in their deliberations here by that spirit of understanding and faith in principles. If only those great Powers might forget that they possessed the most destructive wea-

<sup>1/</sup> Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

pons hitherto know, and might, like the small Powers, the unarmed Powers, rely on a surer and more human arsenal in their international disputes: on international law and the procedures laid down in our Charter, which are the only civilized means of solving any kind of problem between the States Members of our Organization.

53. Mankind has had a spectacular history. In Europe, the cradle of our Western civilization, the two greatest wars of all times broke out within a period of barely twenty years. Even now it could not be said that we are living in peace. Some call our present situation cold war; others, bellicose peace. Both expressions aptly show the ferment of our times.

54. In primitive times warfare was more or less man's natural state. The law of the strongest prevailed. He who had nothing with which to defend himself perished. To redress the balance, weapons appeared, weapons of stone, then of metal. Much later came fire-arms. Fire-arms had a terrifying impact, and no doubt people believed that weapons of such destruction would not be used for fighting and that peace would reign among men. The romantic socialists of the middle nineteenth century welcomed the appearance of the railway as a vehicle of friendship. The peoples, they said, would become better acquainted, would fraternize, by using such facilities for exchanges of visits. Things did not turn out in that way. We have seen how railways have been used to transport troops and to invade neighbouring countries as quickly as possible. And in the First and Second World Wars the most powerful weapons, huge guns, submarines, battleships, aircraft, all were put to use as soon as they appeared. The most powerful conventional weapons went into action. Nevertheless, man still retained control over the destructive means he used. Today, with the appearance of nuclear weapons and radiation, he has lost that control, and this change, this loss of control over his means of destruction, is what makes us less pessimistic as regards the possibility of a new war.

55. While weapons have changed—there has been quite an evolution between the invention of gunpowder and the atomic bomb—the fact unfortunately remains that man has changed very little and the saying *Homo homini lupus* still seems to be all too true. The root of everything that has happened and will happen in the world is buried in the heart of man, which is therefore the measure of all things. Our efforts must be directed at knowing each other better, at understanding each other, at negotiating always, at using every possible means to reach understanding and, when all of them seem exhausted, to begin anew, bravely and resolutely, until peace is enthroned in the hearts of men and of peoples.

56. This desire for understanding, to which I have just referred, seems to be absent, and in every corner of the world we find the deepest anxiety, fully justified because of the impression that we are witnessing the final deterioration of an international situation which has never been so heavily laden with dangers for mankind. It is painful to have to realize that the fine words and the promises of peace are losing their noble meaning and force and are giving ground before what might better be regarded as preparations for war. For example, there is no inkling of success in the disarmament talks and no apparent hope for the prohibition of atomic weapons and the discontinuance of nuclear tests as part of the disarmament process. In that regard, as the representative of a Government that wants peace,

I should like to record our profound disappointment over the renewal of atomic weapons tests and our eagerness to see a final agreement on disarmament. We believe that a strong effort must be made for the immediate attainment of, at least, the cessation of nuclear tests under international supervision.

57. So far as our continent is concerned, we, the people of America, have built by a process that has taken sixty years a political structure founded on democratic solidarity. The attainment of that solidarity and of the lofty aims towards which it is directed calls for the organization of Member States on the basis of the effective exercise of representative democracy. This principle is laid down in article V of the Charter of the Organization of American States and is unquestionably of a binding character. That this principle has been successfully enshrined as the standard of political life is explained by the fact that the feeling most deeply rooted in our American peoples is a sense of liberty.

58. We believe that if there is world peace, the democratic form of government will be established in our America. We Venezuelans are convinced that a system of public freedoms will enable us to carry out the most progressive economic and social reforms. In other words, we can practice a dynamic democracy aimed at achieving social justice. In this regard it is worth noting, by way of example, what has so far been done in Venezuela in the matter of agrarian reform. Up to now 56,284 families have been settled and 1,620,000 hectares have been distributed to the peasants.

59. It should be emphasized that in order to achieve its objectives of social justice and economic betterment, the agrarian reform is not limited simply to giving land to the man who works it. The State is also providing him with education for his children, sanitary conditions, loans and technical assistance.

60. With particular reference to the work being done by our world Organization, we agree with the Secretary-General that a dynamic, rather than a static approach, is required. In this time of profound and rapid changes in every sphere of international life, no other interpretation concerning what are the proper functions of the United Nations is conceivable. It should be the mission of our Organization to play an active part in promoting co-operation and understanding rather than maintaining the present precarious *status quo*, which was recently described from this very rostrum as a balance of terror.

61. One of the main problems which continue to disturb all nations is that of Berlin. We believe that the so-called problem of Berlin must be considered within the framework of the reunification of Germany and must be solved through appropriate negotiations among the interested parties, carried out in keeping with the applicable treaties. The present situation cannot be resolved unilaterally, and any desire to seek such a solution will only help to increase international tensions and the risks of a world conflagration.

62. There can be no doubt that important steps have recently been taken in our Organization as regards the speeding up of independence for the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Venezuela, true to its inflexible anti-colonialist position, has played an active part in those efforts and has co-operated, most significantly by its work in the Committee of Seventeen, in

the common endeavour to speed the demise of colonialism.

63. Of very special importance to Venezuela is the item which was included in the agenda of this session of the General Assembly at the request of my country and which is entitled: "Question of boundaries between Venezuela and the territory of British Guiana". On this I can give the following information.

64. For a good part of the past century, there were long and sometimes bitter disputes between Venezuela and Great Britain with regard to the boundaries of their respective territories in Guiana. On becoming an independent republic, we had inherited from Spain all the territory which up to 1810 formed the Capitanía General de Venezuela. In Guiana this territory was adjacent to the Dutch settlements of the Essequibo. By the Treaty of London of 13 August 1814 the Netherlands ceded approximately 20,000 square miles of this Dutch colony to Great Britain. The ceded territories bear the names of Essequibo, Demerara and Berbice. At the expense of Venezuela and contrary to all legality, the British colony began to expand, and rich areas of our land were incorporated by a powerful Great Britain during the period of Victorian imperialism at such a pace that by the middle of the last century the 20,000 square miles had grown to 60,000 and, by the end of the century, had turned into a claim of an area of 109,000 square miles. There was no holding back Great Britain in its ambitions, and the territory which it desired would have stretched to the very mouth of the Orinoco, one of the great rivers of South America and the most important in Venezuela.

65. Our repeated protests to Great Britain over the occupation of our territory received no response, and Venezuela, weak though it was but sustained by a deep feeling of national dignity, broke off diplomatic relations with the British Government.

66. The United States of America became alarmed by the British expansion in Venezuela, and President Cleveland exercised his influence with a view to obtaining Great Britain's agreement to the request by Venezuela that the boundaries question should be submitted to arbitration. In 1897, the representatives of Venezuela and Great Britain signed at Washington an arbitration agreement creating an arbitral tribunal for the purpose of determining the dividing line between Venezuela and the colony of British Guiana. Under that agreement an arbitral tribunal was created consisting of five judges: two Britons, two from the United States of America and, as President, the Russian professor, Frederic de Martens. The rules by which the case was to be studied and decided were laid down, as is customary, in the arbitration agreement. However, when the award was made, no attention whatever was paid to those rules, the sole source of authority which the arbitrators had for making an award in the case submitted to them. The arbitral award, which failed to state the grounds on which it was made, gave Great Britain 45,000 of the 50,000 square miles in dispute.

67. A famous former President of the United States and a man of exemplary public and private conduct, Mr. Benjamin Harrison, was our legal counsel in the proceedings. We know that Harrison, animated by his sense of justice, devoted himself to a thorough and passionate examination of Venezuela's case. He defended our high interests with all the zeal that would have been shown by a good son of Venezuela. Harrison's colleague in these delicate tasks was a New

York attorney, Mr. Severo Mallet-Prevost, who could never reconcile himself to the idea of the larceny done to Venezuela and who, in a memorandum published shortly after his death, tore a hole in the curtain of mystery which for years concealed what had happened in a very private room of the Quai d'Orsay, in Paris, at noon on 3 October 1899. That was when the so-called arbitral award was made. Mallet-Prevost states:<sup>2/</sup>

"When all the speeches had been concluded in the month of August or early September the court adjourned so as to allow the arbitrators to confer and render their decision. Several days passed while we anxiously waited, but one afternoon I received a message from Justice Brewer [one of the United States judges] saying that he and Chief Justice Fuller [the other United States judge] would like to speak with me and asking me to meet them at once at their hotel. I immediately went there.

"When I was shown into the apartment where the two American arbitrators were waiting for me, Justice Brewer arose and said quite excitedly: 'Mallet-Prevost, it is useless any longer to keep up this farce pretending that we are judges and that you are counsel. The Chief and I have decided to disclose to you confidentially just what has passed. Martens [the Chairman of the Arbitration Tribunal] has been to see us. He informs us that Russell and Collins [the two British judges] are ready to decide in favour of the Schomburgk Line which, starting from Point Barima on the coast, would give Great Britain the control of the main mouth of the Orinoco; that if we insist on starting the line on the coast at the Moruca River he will side with the British and approve the Schomburgk Line as the true boundary. 'However', he added that, 'he, Martens, is anxious to have a unanimous decision; and if we will agree to accept the line which he proposes he will secure the acquiescence of Lord Russell and Lord Collins and so make the decision unanimous.' What Martens then proposed was that the line on the coast should start at some distance south-east of Point Barima so as to give Venezuela control of the Orinoco mouth; and that the line should connect with the Schomburgk Line at some distance in the interior leaving to Venezuela the control of the Orinoco mouth and some 5,000 square miles of territory around that mouth.

"That is what Martens has proposed. 'The Chief and I are of the opinion that the boundary on the coast should start at the Moruca River. The question for us to decide is as to whether we shall agree to Martens' proposal or whether we shall file dissenting opinions. Under these circumstances the Chief and I have decided that we must consult you, and I now state to you that we are prepared to follow whichever of the two courses you wish us to do.' From what Justice Brewer had just said, and from the change which we had all noticed in Lord Collins, I became convinced and still believe [continues Mallet-Prevost] that during Martens' visit to England a deal had been concluded between Russia and Great Britain to decide the case along the lines suggested by Martens and that pressure to that end had in some way been exerted on Collins to follow that course. I naturally felt that the responsibility which I was asked to shoulder was greater than I could alone bear. I so stated to the two arbitrators and I asked for per-

<sup>2/</sup> See *The American Journal of International Law*, vol. 43, 1949, pp. 529 and 530.



mission to consult General Harrison. This they gave and I immediately went to General Harrison's apartment to confer on the subject with him.

"After disclosing to General Harrison what had just passed he rose in indignation and pacing the floor described the action of Great Britain and Russia in terms which it is needless for me to repeat. His first reaction was to ask Fuller and Brewer to file dissenting opinions, but, after cooling down and considering the matter from a practical standpoint, he said: 'Mallet-Prevost, if it should ever be known that we had it in our power to save for Venezuela the mouth of the Orinoco and failed to do so we should never be forgiven. What Martens proposes is iniquitous, but I see nothing for Fuller and Brewer to do but to agree.'

"I concurred with General Harrison and so advised Chief Justice Fuller and Justice Brewer. The decision which was accordingly rendered was unanimous but while it gave to Venezuela the most important strategic point at issue it was unjust to Venezuela and deprived her of very extensive and important territory to which, in my opinion, Great Britain had not the shadow of a right."

68. Mallet-Prevost's account is of special importance. In the first place, it coincides with the view widely held from the very moment of the court's award, namely, that that award was the outcome of a political compromise rather than of the application of the rules of law to which the parties had agreed. Nor was this the only occasion on which Mallet-Prevost, a man of honour and discretion, referred to the matter. The injustice perpetrated on Venezuela made a permanent impression on him and left him with an unpleasant memory. Thanks to a careful inquiry recently made by my Government, we have been able to obtain evidence which corroborates Mallet-Prevost's testimony.

69. In due course we shall publish all this evidence. For the time being we shall confine ourselves to citing a few statements. In December 1899 Richard Olney, ex-Secretary of State of the United States, wrote the following, which I shall quote in its original English text:

*[The speaker continued in English.]*

"Upon his return to New York Mr. Mallet-Prevost, Venezuela's junior counsel, was anxious to tell me how the thing went and why it went as it did. On one of my New York visits I asked him to dine—with the result that he consumed less food than time and that the feast was not so much a flow of solid or liquid refreshment as of intense wrath and bitterness of soul at the course and decision of the arbitral tribunal. I refrain from going into particulars because no doubt you have already heard them from some other source. The worst result to be feared, apparently, is not the loss of territory to Venezuela but the general discrediting of the cause of arbitration. According to my informant, both the Chief Justice and Brewer are down on arbitration as a mode of settling international disputes unless some new safeguarding of the rights of parties can be provided. Ex-Secretary John W. Foster, with whom I dined here the other day, said Fuller and Brewer had come home pretty sick of arbitration."

*[The speaker continued in Spanish.]*

70. Ex-President Harrison, like Mallet-Prevost and others whom we shall quote in due course, also left on record his displeasure and indignation at the treatment meted out to Venezuela by the Arbitration Tribunal. In December 1899 Harrison made the following statement:

*[The speaker continued in English.]*

"My experience in Paris last summer developed in my mind some very grave difficulties in the way of a satisfactory arbitration of international disputes, and more particularly of American questions. The European Governments decline absolutely to allow that any American State except the United States is competent to furnish an umpire or even one of several disinterested members of a court. The result is that the ultimate decision of every American question is in the hands of a European umpire. The diplomatic habits and purposes of the great European Governments are wholly out of line with ours.

"The seizure and appropriation of the territories of weak nations is a practice to which all of them are committed, and our Central and South American States can hardly secure fair treatment.

"In the Venezuelan case I thought the Tribunal was constituted upon a judicial, and not a representative, basis and I made the strongest appeal I ever addressed to a court for the determination of the questions before the Tribunal in a purely judicial spirit. It was an utter failure.

"The British judges were almost as distinctly partisan as the British counsel. That there should be, upon such a tribunal, representatives is an anomaly and an outrage.

"If the findings of arbitration tribunals are to be influenced by the votes and private arguments of the representatives of the two nations and their decisions are not to establish the right but to enforce compromises, then arbitration can never be an institution. It will remain as it has been—a mere expedient."

*[The speaker continued in Spanish.]*

71. On 7 October 1899, four days after the arbitration award was made, Harrison had already spoken as follows:

*[The speaker continued in English.]*

"The British judges were as always aggressive advocates rather than judges. Law is nothing to a British judge, it seems, when it is a matter of extending British dominion."

*[The speaker continued in Spanish.]*

72. On another occasion, on 15 January 1900, Harrison said:

*[The speaker continued in English.]*

"As to Lord Russell's advice that a judicial spirit be exercised in these matters, I have only to say that neither he nor his British associates practised that good doctrine. I could tell, but will not write, some incidents that would surprise you. I believe that it is possible for an American judge, and perhaps for judges of some other nations, to exercise that judicial spirit in international controversies; but I do not believe it is possible for an Englishman.

"In controversies between individuals the English courts are conspicuously fair and independent, but when it comes to a question of extending the domain of Great Britain, and especially when gold-fields are involved, it is too much to hope. The decision in the Venezuelan case, as a compromise, gave to Venezuela the strategic points but robbed her of a great deal of territory which I do not question would have been given to her by an impartial judicial tribunal. The modern European idea is that there is nothing illegal or even immoral in the appropriation of territories of weaker states."

*[The speaker continued in Spanish.]*

73. We are linked by good and cordial relations with Great Britain and our neighbours in British Guiana, whose political independence we look forward to celebrating with particular warmth. Because of these good relations we are able to make Great Britain and British Guiana the following proposal: that we should seat ourselves round a table like friends and discuss, with minds free of prejudice, the redress of the injustice perpetrated on Venezuela at a time of misfortune which our people cannot forget, with a view to finding a solution giving due weight to the legitimate interests of Venezuela and of the population of British Guiana.

74. May the spirit of understanding guide us all along the road to redress and justice.

75. Mr. PETER (Hungary): According to French publications, instructions to President de Gaulle's night duty officers run as follows: "Do not disturb the President of the Republic except in case of world war." It may sound rather peculiar, and we may even enjoy the spirit of this new "Gaullism", but at the same time it is very seriously characteristic of the present situation. Night duty officers have to be vigilant indeed, because the moment may come any night when the President must be awakened. So many spots in different corners of the world have become for certain reasons so critical that local wars, regional showdowns and, in consequence, a thermo-nuclear world conflagration, may start at any moment. Tremendous dangers overshadow the world and overshadow many of our agenda items, especially the topics dealt with in this general debate.

76. Under the shadow of these dangers I am going to select some of the actual political problems of peaceful coexistence as the main subject-matter of my intervention. We must be mindful of the imperatives of peaceful coexistence precisely at a juncture of our life when peaceful coexistence is at stake again.

77. In representing Hungary, a country which has suffered so much for centuries and which is now realizing the best aspirations of present and past generations, my delegation has particular reason to concentrate on the international events which endanger the chances of peaceful coexistence and make it precarious.

78. The United Nations, according to its very conception, should be the conscious body of coexisting nations with different social systems. When the Charter laid down before the world that the peoples of the United Nations were determined to "live together in peace with one another as good neighbours", the world was already divided and the Charter was signed by representatives of three different groups of nations. There were represented not only socialist and capitalist countries, but newly independent nations as well

which had already embarked on a search for their own solutions to their special problems.

79. In this connexion, regarding African States, President Sékou Touré of Guinea stated in a recent article:

"...the interpretations made by foreign 'specialists' in African affairs are as a rule based on the conditions of their own social milieu, and thus take little account of the specific conditions of the various African societies. If the problems of Africa are to be understood, analyzed and solved, we must take into consideration the historical, economic, social, moral and cultural conditions which shape Africa's particular identity in the world—elements of the African evolution, in which total emancipation of the African peoples remains the main objective." <sup>3/</sup>

80. As a consequence of all the implications contained in this quotation referring to peaceful coexistence in an ever-changing world, we keep under consideration not only States having socialist or capitalist systems, but also the peoples of the newly independent nations who devise specific patterns to solve their economic and social problems. It is most regrettable that peaceful coexistence is at stake in these very times when otherwise there would be realistic prospects for a radical elimination of the danger of world wars.

81. The policy-makers of certain Western Powers try to make believe that the policy of peaceful coexistence, since it is advocated most consistently by socialist countries, would turn out exclusively to the advantage of the socialist States. Obvious and stubborn facts contradict any allegation of this kind. A few examples will be sufficient to show to what extent the practice of peaceful coexistence, and even hesitating steps towards it, would be in the common interest of all. Any effort made to consolidate co-operation and peaceful competition between different groups of nations may create honest and favourable conditions for the Western Powers as well.

82. The prestige of the previous Administration of the United States was never so much exalted in world public opinion as at the time of the so-called Camp David talks. On the other hand, the prestige of the same Administration never fell so low as at the time of the scandalous spy flight when in a period of negotiations, a sinister attempt was made to undermine existing understanding about certain aspects of peaceful coexistence. In the same way, the reputation of the present Administration of the United States was exalted everywhere when a readiness for reasonable negotiations was shown. Again, in the same way, the reputation of this Administration suffered much damage whenever, instead of reasonable talks, it resorted to aggressive preparations as in the case of Laos or at the time of the abortive invasion of Cuba. The present unrealistic, bellicose steps will result in even more humiliating failures.

83. Against all reasonable thinking, one has the impression that we are witnessing a revival of the so often, and justly, criticized "brinkmanship" of the late John Foster Dulles. Many of the actual measures and the sharp utterances of official organs of the United States remind us of the dreadful principle of the time when we were told that "the ability to get to the verge of war without getting into war is the necessary art". Shall we again experience adventurous experimentation

<sup>3/</sup> *Foreign Affairs*, October 1962 (vol. 41, No. 1), p. 141.



with the destiny of present and future generations by hot-headed and blind politicians who enjoy walking to the brink of war at a time when any miscalculation might have unpredictable consequences? According to all indications, the peoples are tired of this light-minded gambling with the chances of war and peace.

84. In a thoroughgoing interview which appeared in the *U.S. News & World Report* of 17 September 1962, the United States Senate majority leader, Mr. Mansfield, stated:

"I am afraid that the majority of the people, as I see it, would like to be left alone. I think many of them are afraid to face up to the complex and complicated problems which confront us today ....

"People are tired. After all, it is understandable. The world has been at war, in effect, since 1939. There has been no peace since that time."

85. It is self-evident that, at a time when there exists only one alternative, either to march inevitably and irrevocably towards a thermo-nuclear holocaust or to secure the peaceful competition of coexisting nations with different systems, any attempt to revitalize the so-called "policy of brinkmanship" is a more detestable crime against mankind than any that has gone before.

86. Certainly, the best news which delegations to the seventeenth session of the General Assembly could hope to carry home to their respective Governments and peoples would be that some of the obstacles in the way of developing peaceful coexistence and co-operation had been removed, and that at the same time some new indications of mutual confidence had been created. That would be the best of all news, and there can be no doubt about that.

87. First of all, there are quite a few artificially forged and capricious slogans and notions which are opposed to improving international relations. Some Western political quarters nurture the idea that the balance of power, the so-called deterrent character of thermo-nuclear weapons, may serve as a guarantee of peace. Those who give heed to such misleading slogans become paralysed when facing the problems of disarmament. Their contribution to international life is nothing but an offer for the nations to live forever under the shadow of the constant danger of a thermo-nuclear war.

88. The Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union rightly stated in his intervention in the general debate [1127th meeting] that:

"...to base the policies of States on a feeling of universal fear would be tantamount to keeping the world in a permanent state of feverish tension and war-anticipating hysteria. In such a situation each State would fear that the other side's nerves might snap, and it will make the first shot..."

"The militaristic doctrine of the 'balance of fear' is just half a step away from the even more dangerous doctrine of preventive nuclear war." <sup>4/</sup>

89. As a matter of fact, the Western Powers holding this view *nolens volens* do a service to the Soviet Union; in fact, by proclaiming that the balance of power is a guarantee against nuclear war, they admit that the military might of the Soviet Union is the main guarantee of peace, for it is by the development of Soviet nuclear

power that the so-called balance has come about. On the other hand, an exemplification of how much the theory of power balance may be used for stimulating the armaments race has been given by the recent United States-Israeli agreement for selling missiles to Israel under the pretext of keeping the balance of power in the Middle East.

90. Coexistence in these days under the constant threat of a nuclear disaster rests upon the enormous stockpiles of nuclear weapons. In order to depart from this precarious situation and to embark on renewed and successful negotiations in the interest of general and complete disarmament, the Western Powers should be convinced of the harmfulness of all sorts of theories regarding the "peace-making" effect of any balance of deterrents.

91. Another pretentious ambition is being propagated in the West, seemingly in favour of the perspective of peaceful coexistence, but in reality with a view to undermining it. I refer to the all-out efforts at unilateral integration in the West, such as the European Common Market. The protagonists of such endeavours keep saying that negotiation and co-operation in the form of competition between East and West are really the only peaceable alternative to a nuclear disaster. In order to prepare for peaceful competition, they say, the West needs integration.

92. The assumption is that by linking other areas with the Common Market they could establish further integrated regional communities—for instance, an Atlantic community, a South-East Asian community, and so on. What a revealing conception. Along the frontiers of the socialist States in Europe and Asia, in about twenty countries allied with the United States, aggressive military bases have already been set up. Beyond this chain of military installations they would like to create a chain of economic communities to encircle the socialist States and to give an economic background to their aggressive military alliances.

93. Do not misunderstand me. We are not frightened by such pretentious perspectives. They are so much against the nature of the present world situation, against the necessity of universal co-operation, that certainly they are doomed to failure. Any such effort at unnatural unilateral integration will lead to new disintegration in the West. It will create new antagonisms between the Western military allies. It will sharpen the contradictions between the interests of ex-colonial Powers and former colonies. It will speed up the disintegration of any Commonwealth and community construction.

94. Many relevant statements may be quoted in this respect. Permit me to quote only two of them. In England, for instance, Labour Party leader Mr. Gaitskell warned his countrymen recently that political union with Europe in the Common Market meant the end of Britain as an independent nation. He continued: "We become no more than Texas or California in the United States of Europe. It means the end of a thousand years of history. It means the end of the Commonwealth ...". <sup>5/</sup>

95. What does the integration problem look like when seen from another part of the world, for instance, Guinea? President Sékou Touré, in his recent

<sup>4/</sup> Provisional translation taken from the simultaneous interpretation.

<sup>5/</sup> This statement appeared in *The Times* of 22 September 1962.

article on Africa's future and the world in the quarterly review, *Foreign Affairs*, stated:

"Actually, the difficulties appearing within the European Common Market with regard to the renewal of Association Agreements made by certain African nations prove that it is not the form of the economic relations that must be changed but their very nature.

"Here, as in other realms, the interests of the African peoples are one, and the awareness of this unity is rapidly becoming more and more explicit. The African nations are realizing that in order to solve their urgent social problems they must speed up the transformation of their trade economy, and if this is to be done through industrialization, it cannot be done within the limits of our national micro-economies. But unconditional integration into a multi-national market consisting of highly developed and underdeveloped nations negates the possibility of industrial development in advance, it could only be the association of horse and rider ... The leaders of the European Economic Community seem not to be aware of all this, at least as far as Africa is concerned, and make no secret of their desire to achieve a political community of Europe which cannot be reconciled with Africa's desire for political independence; Africa remains as grimly hostile as ever to the division of Africa which began with the Congress of Berlin in 1885, &/

96. Consequently, these integration endeavours, hostile to one or another part of the world, are so much misconceived that we have no reason to be afraid of them. They will speed up antagonistic processes in the West to such an extent that from the strict point of view of a competition between socialism and capitalism we would have every reason even to stimulate and propagate them. However, the present problems of the world are so interdependent that, for the sake of all, we wish to take the chances of this competition with a minimum of trouble even for the Western societies.

97. Properly speaking, as President Sékou Touré put it into words, "it is not the form of the economic relations that must be changed but their very nature". The solution of world economic problems must be searched for on an entirely new basis, by taking into consideration the most varied particularities of each group of States and by seeking to satisfy the specific interests of nations living under different conditions and having different historical backgrounds.

98. The Soviet proposal for a universal conference on problems of world trade corresponds to these demands and takes into consideration the specific problems of the capitalistic West and the developing States of Asia, Africa and Latin America to the same extent as those of the socialist countries. The composition of the organ of world trade envisaged by this proposal should certainly reflect the three groups of States having specific problems of their own. Delegations representing different quarters of the world have already come out in this general debate with their support for such a universal conference. My delegation joins with them in supporting the Soviet proposal.

99. To sum up the foregoing observations: the practice of peaceful coexistence should rest on the programme of a disarmed world instead of on universal fear of deterrents, on world-wide co-operation instead of on efforts to create integrated camps directed against one another.

.. &/ *Foreign Affairs*, October 1962 (vol. 41, No. 1), p. 149.

100. To depart from the present way of coexistence based on enormous stockpiles of nuclear weapons and on the organization of antagonistic groupings, a certain degree of mutual trust and a sense of responsibility should be aimed at from every side. A whole series of official statements on our part have expounded our view that what peaceful coexistence means is not merely to exist simultaneously, but also to live and act together, to bear common responsibilities at least for the most vital problems of the present generation and to undertake those tasks with mutual confidence established through negotiations. In this respect, words are of no great value. Deeds speak for themselves. It is good to hear that a United States Ambassador to the Soviet Union, at the presentation of his credentials, speaks of the common tasks and responsibilities of the Soviet Union and the United States—the giants of our times, as it was said here—for solving the most urgent problems of the present generation; but deeds should precede and accompany and follow such utterances.

101. Here I come to a crucial point. From most concrete and direct experiences with regard to Hungarian-United States relations, I know full well how at least seemingly insurmountable difficulties can be created by official organs of the United States in the way of normal contacts based upon a minimum of mutual confidence.

102. Since the United States delegation proposed the inclusion of the so-called question of Hungary in the agenda, and because our experiences in this respect reveal some aspects of United States policy in a more comprehensive way, I wish to inform the General Assembly of some developments behind the scenes.

103. On 13 September last, an Assistant Secretary of the Department of State made a statement before the European Affairs Sub-committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on United States policy regarding Eastern Europe. I do not wish to dwell on the general lines of this report, which makes it clear how policy-makers of the United States would like to use their diplomatic, political, economic and cultural contacts with socialist States against the established systems and lawful developments of these States; nevertheless it would be instructive to analyse these aspects of the report as well. I quote only one single sentence of it:

"Though we have made progress in our relations with Poland, we have been held thus far to a minimum of contact in such countries as Czechoslovakia, while in Hungary the impasse in our relations over the Hungarian problem in the United Nations has retarded the development of any effective programme of contact with or through the Government".

104. On the basis of this statement, one would rightly think that the United States wishes to develop an effective programme of contact with the Government of Hungary. In reality, a certain measure of development has taken place in recent months. On the basis of this statement, one would also think that the United States Government has a feeling that it is in an impasse which it would like to break. However, if anybody knows how the so-called question of Hungary has been repeatedly proposed by the United States, he will see that this is a vicious circle, and how vicious a circle it is.

105. The Permanent Representative of the United States, after the intervention of the Soviet delegation

in this general debate, came out with these words: "The sober seventeenth session has ended on the fourth day..." [1127th meeting, para. 164].

He must know much better than anybody else that in a certain sense of the word the sober seventeenth session had ended long before it started. On 18 August the United States delegation tabled its proposal regarding the so-called question of Hungary. And against what background? United States officials both in Washington and in Budapest were in constant contact with Hungarian officials to find ways and means of developing mutual relations. They made the impression that they were doing their best to convince us that they did not wish to interfere in the domestic affairs of Hungary.

106. Then suddenly the picture changed. It was common knowledge that, upon my invitation, the Secretary-General of the United Nations intended to pay a visit to Hungary at a time agreeable to both parties. I have to state that the Secretary-General made entirely clear his position of principle, and he never laid down any condition for his proposed visit. Upon his initiative we agreed that the visit should take place not before this session, but some time later at a mutually agreeable date. Thereupon word came from United States sources saying that the Secretary-General, in spite of his overburdened schedule, would come to Hungary before the session if we were willing to comply with certain United States demands. We have invited the Acting Secretary-General of the United Nations, and no third party has anything to do with this invitation. As to the United States, we have made it clear, and I do so once again, that we are ready to facilitate their getting out of the impasse—to use their own words—regarding our official relations; but under pressure and on unjustifiable preconditions there is no possibility of negotiating. We are in no hurry. Time is working for us.

107. The sad and regrettable experiences regarding this double-faced policy pursued in a narrow section of interstate relations throw light upon a more general and more important aspect of the problem of working out the basic principles of peaceful co-operation between nations coexisting in different social systems and with different historical backgrounds. In order to create the atmosphere of mutual confidence necessary for fruitful co-operation, all sorts of double-dealing have to be eliminated, and consistent adherence to the principles of coexistence has to prevail. The lack of consistency on the part of some Western policy-makers at many a critical stage endangers fruitful progress in several respects.

108. To make this clear in concrete facts, I have only to recall some recent and current international problems.

109. We all remember what the origin of the Laotian crisis was more than two years ago. The lawful Government of Laos proclaimed a policy of neutrality. In reply to it the United States introduced all sorts of counter-measures in and around Laos, creating a danger of local and international conflagration. When the failure of this policy became obvious, as a result of high-level negotiations the Western Powers also agreed to the strict neutrality of Laos, beneficial to the Laotian people and to the whole region of South-East Asia. And what happened? Even the American Press made it clear that the United States agreed to the neutrality of Laos in order to free its military strength for further intervention in South Viet-Nam.

What was the result of this concentration of forces in South Viet-Nam? It became clear even to some people in the United States, both private persons and officials, who had spent some time there in one or another capacity. From among the many witnesses I quote only one, but readers of the American Press may find many similar descriptions.

110. Last year a political scientist on leave from the United States spent a year in Viet-Nam and lectured as guest professor at the University of Saigon. After his return he made public his experiences there under the heading: "Terror in Viet-Nam—An American's ordeal at the hands of our 'friends'". That article was published in a New York periodical. He summarized his experiences in the following terms:

"In that entire year I never heard a single Vietnamese voice raised in defense of the Diem régime. High and low, government officials, professors, army officers and students condemned it and yearned for a change—a coup d'état which would rid them of Diem before the Communists crushed him. But America's absolute support of Diem precluded such a change. From the very beginning—when he seized power in 1954—we had been his chief prop. He has inherited a puppet administration and a puppet army, tainted with treason in the eyes of most Vietnamese because the French created them to bolster up Bao Dai. One by one, Diem subdued all dissident elements. Now alienated from a hostile population, he could rely only on servile lackeys and his relatives—notably his brother Ngo Dinh Nhu and his brother's feared and hated wife. Trusting no one, Diem was consumed with fear of disloyalty. This obsession helped paralyze his government; its vast administrative structure lay dead or was dying though still swollen with American aid funds on which the venal feed."

111. So speaks an American witness about the experiences of his own ordeal in South Viet-Nam. The friendship of some Western policy-makers towards these venal individuals prevents the Viet-Namese people from benefiting from the implementation of the Geneva agreements of 1954, that is to say, from the reunification of Viet-Nam.

112. The case of Cuba illustrates even more vividly how hopeless it is for the time being to expect correctly negotiated agreements from the United States. The records of the United Nations show that at the time of the abortive invasion in April 1961 the United States delegation tried to prove, with every possible argument, that the United States had nothing to do with the invasion and was not responsible for the criminal adventure. Since that time official statements have made it clear that the invasion plan received the highest approval of the United States Administration and that even the United States Air Force was ordered to protect the invaders, except that the orders came too late.

113. In the present circumstances, projects of invasion, murder, killing and assassination, possibilities of direct military intervention, formation of special contingents of Cuban citizens in the United States Army and reprisals against countries maintaining trade relations with the valiant people of Cuba are everyday topics of all sorts of official declarations. A study of the origin of the United States problem with regard to Cuba bears out the most astonishing fact that United States policy-makers seem to forget entirely how American monopolies exploited large masses of the

Cuban people through long generations. Those times are gone for ever. Just as in Europe the so-called metropolitan countries with long colonial traditions have to realize that their former colonies have been liberated for ever and will never again become possessions of their old masters, so this hemisphere must also realize that Cuba will never again pass under the exploiting power of United States monopolies.

114. An essentially new relationship is open to development, and our best hope is that it will be wholly realized. As has been proposed several times by the Cuban Government, the United States should resume its diplomatic relations with Cuba and start coexistence and co-operation on negotiated terms in the spirit of the United Nations Charter. States with differing economic systems may and should live together as good neighbours.

115. Even in this hemisphere the old-fashioned relations between States, based upon exploitation of the weak by the strong, are vanishing. But the remains of the past are still vigorous. The United States Department of State a few days ago gave an astonishing indication of it—an astonishing indication indeed. It referred to the assassination of Rafael Trujillo. A former member of the Government of the Dominican Republic, Arturo Espaillat, was arrested in Canada and given a deportation order. On 19 September last he said in Canada that the United States had been behind the assassination of Trujillo. On the next day, 20 September, according to news agency reports, the State Department categorically denied this charge. And in what manner?

The report reads as follows:

"The State Department's Press Officer Lincoln White said: 'I have checked this out, and I am told these allegations are completely without foundation'."

He checked this out. At any rate the State Department has a careful Press Officer. One could congratulate him on his exactitude.

116. Yes, the old times are passing away, and a bright future of new relations may open between States living under different conditions in this hemisphere.

117. The new relations of good neighbourliness proclaimed by the United Nations Charter require peaceable negotiations and constructive proposals from the parties concerned in controversial issues. Cuba has offered its constructive proposals. What its powerful neighbour offers in return, however, does not inspire any hope so far.

118. In general, the readiness of the Western Powers to adhere to the principles of peaceful coexistence would be more explicit if they offered reasonable proposals for the solution of burning problems, either upon their own initiative or in answer to proposals made by other Governments.

119. In Central Europe, Poland, together with other socialist States, proposed the establishment of an atom-free zone. No constructive answer has come from the West as yet. The Warsaw Treaty Organization offered the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Powers a non-aggression pact. There has been no counter-proposal as yet. One is obliged to conclude that the NATO Powers have no programme for peace at all. On the question of Germany and West Berlin, the German Democratic Republic, together with the Soviet Union and other socialist States, proposed a

reasonable and realistic settlement to do away with the glowing vestiges of the Second World War in Europe. There is no realistic counter-proposal from the West as yet. Nobody could take as a counter-proposal what some Western policy-makers keep repeating about the continued presence, and standing firm, of Western occupation troops in West Berlin.

120. Let us suppose the impossible, that their proposal would be accepted. What would happen then? Would they like to stay there for ever? What would they be there for? They never say. The Western Powers have no peaceable programme for this question at all. One would suppose that their attention is wholly absorbed by military preparations.

121. A most recent indication of this is the official statement of the United States regarding its readiness to use nuclear weapons first in Europe for safeguarding its alleged interests. The successors of those responsible for the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki do not need to convince the world of their readiness to use nuclear weapons first. Tremendous and shameful experiences make us aware of this readiness without any new statement made to this effect by United States officials. They would be ready to do this if they were not afraid of terrible retaliation. Therefore, the Soviet proposal against propaganda for preventive nuclear war [A/5232] is wholly justified.

122. The Western Powers have not shown as yet their readiness to accept more than the mere expression "general and complete disarmament". In whatever form they make new proposals, these overtly or covertly include their attempts to legalize intelligence activities and to have a free hand to continue experimenting with nuclear weapons, at least in underground tests. I cite only one instance: in their most recent programme<sup>7</sup> submitted at the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, they introduced the principle of percentage for abolishing certain types of armament. But in order to ascertain what 30 per cent of a certain type of armament means, it would be necessary to count the whole existing stockpiles of weapons in advance. As a result of such a disarmament system, legalized spy activity would precede any step of disarmament. Only a basic reappraisal of the Western proposals could convince us that the Western Powers have departed from their views regarding control of armaments and moved towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

123. My delegation would like to hope that the new initiatives of the Soviet Union introduced at this session in order to narrow the gap between opposing views will open new and hopeful possibilities for fruitful negotiations on general and complete disarmament. The fact that many delegations welcomed the proposals of the eight neutral Powers<sup>8</sup> for the cessation of all nuclear weapon tests gives rise to the hope that under the effect of sound arguments the Western Powers will accept those proposals as a basis for an early agreement.

124. The more concrete and realistic solutions that are proposed by competent Powers for peaceful negotiations on crucial issues, the greater will be the mutual confidence which is so necessary for constructive international co-operation. It would improve the

<sup>7</sup> See *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for January 1961 to December 1962*, document DC/203, annex 1, sect. F.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, sect. J.

present situation if peaceable and concrete proposals were submitted by those quarters which were rather reluctant to accept the stubborn facts of peaceful co-existence and whose imagination has so far concentrated almost exclusively on warlike measures. One should expect that even the present session of the General Assembly will witness such a comforting change. The time has come when the world would like to know whether the Western Powers have any programme of their own for a peaceable world, under the principles of peaceful coexistence.

125. The United Nations in a certain measure has recently shown improvement towards creating a general atmosphere and international contacts favourable to peaceful coexistence. One of the main reasons for this favourable trend certainly is to be found in the changing composition of this Organization. The participation of representatives of newly independent nations in the work of the United Nations has contributed a great deal to eliminating artificial cold-war issues and to paying more attention to real issues that confront us as crucial problems endangering international peace and the living conditions of people. One only has to compare previous sessions, where so many of the new Members were not yet represented, with the present session, and the contrast becomes self-evident. I cite only one instance. The question of West Irian has had a long history in this Organization. The debates on that issue ended every year with proposals which did not win the necessary majority. The present composition of the United Nations, with the presence of so many newly independent nations, has made it possible in an indirect way for a negotiated settlement to be brought about. In the present atmosphere there has been no open opposition in this hall to the solution of the just cause of Indonesia.

126. A further gain for United Nations activities will be the presence of the newest Members: Rwanda, Burundi, Trinidad and Tobago, and Jamaica. To their delegations I extend in this spirit the good wishes of my delegation.

127. Within only a few hours the General Assembly will welcome in this hall the delegation of the great Algerian people, and in our hearts we will pay tribute to the heroes who sacrificed so much for great human ideals during so many years of fighting for freedom and independence. We are looking forward with warm expectation to the arrival of the delegation of Uganda as well.

128. The universality of this Organization is being completed step by step in a rather quick development. The most scandalous defectiveness of this process is the absence of the delegation of the People's Republic of China. We have no right to speak and to act as a world Organization as long as China is not represented here. The longer the United States manoeuvres prevent China from being represented here, the greater the damage which the position of the United States delegation in this Organization will have to suffer.

129. The growing universality of this Organization has improved its work in many respects indeed. But on the main issue of peace and war, the opening of the road to general and complete disarmament, it has remained ineffective so far. If common efforts fail to help this Organization to get out of this deadlock, the fate of the League of Nations will be shared by the United Nations. I should like to express the hope of my delegation that the powerful will of nations for consolida-

ting peace and security will help this Organization make at least some progress. In this respect it will be helpful when the Secretariat and all the principal organs of the United Nations are reorganized so as to reflect more precisely the existing three types of States having special historical backgrounds and different systems of their own.

130. The improvement of the activity of this Organization has been reflected in a certain measure in the way the attempted cold-war attack against Hungary was met here. If particular political links had not bound some delegations to act against their own conviction, the picture would be more favourable. Beyond the new composition of this Assembly, the main source of the change for the better lies certainly in the growing effects of the factual life of Hungary which counteracts previous allegations fomented against us. Here in this hall there are many representatives who have a great deal of experience in governmental affairs. They understand me when I say that results like those witnessed today in Hungary cannot be achieved without the full participation and support of the great masses of the people. We are preparing at present for a new Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party. It will summarize the achievements made so far and it will consult the whole nation about the steps of further development; so that even better news may be spread about Hungary in the future. As to international affairs, the directives for the preparation of the Congress point out:

"The foreign policy of the Hungarian people is guided by the principle of peaceful coexistence. We strive to create a still more intimate relationship with the countries with which we already have friendly ties; we want to have friendly relations with the countries with which these relations are now normal or correct, and we seek to establish normal relations with the countries with which our relations are, for the time being, unsatisfactory or even bad."

The present session of the General Assembly may help my delegation a great deal to realize these highly constructive goals.

131. In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to extend to you and to your colleagues the best wishes of my delegation, wishing you much satisfaction in helping this Assembly to strengthen real international co-operation for the preservation of peace and security in the world.

132. Mr. SPAAK (Belgium) (translated from French): It is a generally accepted rule that a speaker in the general debate begins by extending his congratulations to the President on his election. This is a rule with which I most willingly comply. Mr. President, I have had the honour and privilege of knowing you for a very long time. You are certainly one of the most distinguished figures in the Organization. Everyone who knows you appreciates your dignity, loyalty and spirit of tolerance. The Assembly has undoubtedly done you a great honour in electing you its President. But by so doing, it has also demonstrated its wisdom. We are all happy to work under your guidance.

133. It has been a long time since I have taken part in the general debate. May I be permitted at the outset to make a comment that may seem somewhat bold and reckless? I wonder whether this general debate is really very useful, whether it truly serves the cause of our Organization and the cause of peace. This debate

provides an opportunity to confound once again propaganda with diplomacy, the art of affirming with the art of convincing. Everyone comes to this rostrum to set forth the whole range of his concerns and his anxieties; in doing so before an audience which is naturally quite favourably disposed to publicity, he adopts the most intransigent position on almost every subject, thus cutting off any possibility, once we resume the more normal and discreet forms of diplomacy, of arriving at compromises and of trying to reach valid arrangements.

134. And yet, we must not make any mistakes or fall into error. If I had to sum up in a few words my feelings about the international situation, I would say that there has perhaps been a fundamental improvement, but that the immediate future still gives cause for great anxiety. There has been a fundamental improvement in the international situation because it seems to me that the two most important problems which have dominated the work of this Assembly for many years are being resolved—the first rather slowly, the second fortunately more rapidly and in a more satisfactory manner.

135. The problem the solution of which is progressing rather slowly is that of the fundamental relations between East and West. The question in which noteworthy and as yet definite progress has been made is that of decolonization. Nevertheless, as regards East-West relations, there are a few signs—a few glimmers of light, as yet still faint—which would seem to indicate that the situation is in the process of being settled. It seems to me that the two groups have indeed shown a greater desire for understanding, a greater desire for agreement.

136. I think that the communists no longer believe—if they ever did believe—in the aggressive desires of the West, in this monstrous and stupid idea that the West could think of settling its differences or disputes with the communist world through the use of force and resort to war. Each time that the communist world shows any sign of comprehension, each time that it adopts a more friendly language, the West seizes the opportunity and tries, through an increased understanding of what is happening in the communist world, to find a solution and bring their positions closer together.

137. I readily admit that, for its part, the communist world has in the past few years proposed at least two ideas to which the West has perhaps not attached sufficient importance. I believe that Mr. Khrushchev should be commended for having partly based his foreign policy on two ideas which he now considers to be essential: that war is no longer inevitable and that we must live in accordance with the principles of peaceful coexistence.

138. In stating that war is no longer inevitable, Mr. Khrushchev has rendered a great service and he should be praised for having clarified, in a rather daring and courageous way, a point of communist doctrine. I was raised on the principles of socialism, and I remember that when I was young my friends and I always repeated a sentence of Jaurès in which we believed deeply: "Capitalism contains war just as a cloud contains rain." We thought and feared at that time that war was inevitable in the world in which we lived.

139. In correcting that position, in stating that war is no longer inevitable and in stating a point of doctrine and a point of controversy, even in the communist

world, Mr. Khrushchev has, I repeat, rendered us a considerable service for he has put an end to the idea that a certain evolution of history was automatic and terrible. In stating that war can be avoided, he has, to a certain extent, made us more responsible for our actions.

140. Of course, it is not enough merely to make such statements. Having said them, we must endeavour to make our actions conform to this new principle.

*Mr. Seydoux (France) Vice-President, took the chair.*

141. I believe also that we in the West should not reject too hastily or too disdainfully the statement which the representatives of the communist world constantly repeat—that they wish to live in peaceful coexistence. I promised myself, I took an oath to myself—and I hope that I will keep my pledge—that I would not engage in polemics during my statement in the general debate. I must therefore say immediately that this expression of "peaceful coexistence" is the expression of an idea to which we cannot say "no". After all, if one of your potential adversaries were to come to you and say "I wish to live with you in peaceful coexistence", how could you say to him: "No, I wish to live on another basis—which can only be that of violence and war."?

142. Of course, we must try to understand what lies behind this proposal of peaceful coexistence, and, above all, we must ask ourselves whether the definition given today by the communist world is an adequate one and whether it can serve as a basis for the solutions which must be found to the problems confronting the world. I do not think I am being unfair to those who speak of peaceful coexistence when I say that the definition they have given of that expression seems to me to be singularly narrow and inadequate. They have frequently stated that: "Peaceful coexistence is something that replaces war by way of competition in all fields—ideological, political, social and economic." This kind of peaceful coexistence is certainly better than a hot war, and it is even better than the cold war. But in my view, it is by no means enough.

143. The fact of the matter is that East-West relations will in the last analysis be improved only when the idea of peaceful coexistence, as it is described and defined nowadays, is countered and replaced with the idea of indispensable co-operation. It is not enough in seeking to solve the great difficulties of the world to live in peaceful coexistence; sooner or later, we shall have to achieve a voluntary co-operation. It seems to me that in this respect a favourable trend is becoming apparent which will soon lead the communist world to expand the very narrow definition it has given of peaceful coexistence until it splits open. I should not reject without very careful consideration this desire to give peaceful coexistence a doctrinal form, nor would I reject the proposals which are made to us for meetings and world conferences in order to examine, for instance, problems of trade [see A/5219]. If we are able to make some progress in this field—and let no one be upset by this—then there will be not only peaceful coexistence, but also genuine co-operation. For these reasons, although we hear many rash statements made here, statements which shock and sadden us, my optimism enables me to see, on the whole, a ray of light.

144. Fortunately, the other matter which has caused such a great concern to this Assembly—that of decolonization—is almost concluded. I would ask those



who, with good reason, are interested in this matter to have a little patience and understanding. I ask this with all the more objectivity since, so far as my country is concerned, the question seems today to be finally and definitively settled. Together with all of you, I am particularly gratified at the admission to this Assembly of the new countries Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, and, of course, Rwanda and Burundi. I am under the impression that the question of Rwanda-Urundi, which took up so much of our time and effort in the course of this year, has now been solved. I take this opportunity to thank once again those who have listened to me, and in particular those who have heard me and placed their trust in me. In coming to this rostrum today, I believe I can state that the confidence they showed in my country and my Government was not misplaced.

145. There remains of course, the question of the Congo which is distressing and most serious. But there again, in so far as Belgium is concerned, we note a great change. What a change when I think that it is hardly more than a year ago that I re-established contact with the Organization, took the floor in the Security Council and had arduous discussions with the Secretariat. It is a great satisfaction for me to be able to say today how much I value the action of the Secretary-General, to what extent I believe that he is pursuing the proper course; how right I think he is when he proposes his plan for reconciliation and when he acts with understanding and firmness at Leopoldville as well as at Elisabethville. I believe that in so doing, he is serving not only the interests of the Congo, but also those of the Organization and the cause of peace. What a satisfaction it is for my Government and for myself personally—a veteran of the Organization—to find myself today no longer in a violent and sterile opposition, but, on the contrary, resolved to collaborate with all my strength for the success of the reasonable ideas which the Secretary-General has undertaken to interpret.

146. You see therefore that we have reason to hope and reason to have confidence in the future. However, there are all the immediate difficulties which remain outstanding and weigh heavily upon us. There is disarmament, there is Cuba, there is Berlin. These are unquestionably important and essential questions. But I am convinced that they are not insoluble. What makes it so difficult to find a solution is not so much the importance of the questions themselves, but rather our manner of dealing with them which has been and is still the wrong one.

147. International politics continues to be dominated in all camps by the fear—I would even say, by the terror—of being made a dupe or of being deceived. What prevents things from getting better is the fact that there is a complete lack of confidence on all sides; it is, in actual fact, a certain fear. President Roosevelt certainly knew what he was saying when he stated in a famous speech that one of the most essential things was that of freeing the world from fear. If we have made so little progress, it is the cold war which bears the major share of responsibility. Ladies and gentlemen, have you not had enough of the cold war? Are you not weary of these continually repetitive speeches that we have been hearing year after year, in which the same arguments are presented in exactly the same manner, and in which the same accusations, although refuted twenty or a hundred times, are nevertheless presented with the same conviction?

148. And the pity of it is that it would need so little to transform this atmosphere. It would merely be necessary to agree to apply a few simple but fundamental principles. It would be necessary, when speaking from a rostrum such as this, when going into a committee, when trying to solve an international question, to be convinced that no one is ever completely right or completely wrong. It would be necessary to approach a discussion with the conviction that one's adversary was not necessarily a fool or a rogue. It would be necessary to agree to hear him in the hope that by listening to him one would come to understand him. And if we were to apply these few principles, which are principles of reason and wisdom, principles of common sense, just for a short time, for a few months, merely for the sake of experiment, many things which today seem to have no solution would suddenly appear almost simple and easy to solve.

149. Of course, the Berlin situation is important. It is a fundamental matter for the Western world, and I presume for the communist world also. But when one looks at the things on which there is now agreement and at what still remains to be done, it is sometimes astounding and disturbing to see what a short distance there is between a happy outcome and a possible catastrophe. In dealing with such serious matters, we should not be obdurate, we should not consider questions of prestige, we should distinguish what is primary from the secondary, set about solving the real issues and have the courage, from time to time, to expose false problems for what they are. I believe, however, that all that is still possible, and I hope, or rather, I believe, that if we could—all of us, I do not discriminate—apply the principles which I have just stated we could find the required solutions.

150. I apologize; all that was merely introductory. It is not the substance of my speech. I have come to this rostrum mainly to speak to you about the European Common Market and about Europe. And I shall try not to do so in any polemical spirit. What I should like to do is to give you an explanation, for it seems to me that those who have given their views on the Common Market here have expressed many fears and made many mistakes. I want to try and give you an explanation because I am profoundly convinced that what is happening in Europe is of exceptional importance. If we succeed in establishing, not just the Common Market, but a united Europe, we shall have witnessed the birth of a historical phenomenon of world importance, a phenomenon which is, I believe, as important as the communist revolution, as important as the liberation of the peoples of Africa and Asia. The Common Market and a new united Europe, this is an event of a nature to modify, nay to change, the policy of the entire world.

151. I should like, if I may, to make one preliminary remark. I am rather surprised, I admit, but quite satisfied all the same, that not only references and allusions have been made to the Common Market in so many statements, but that the Common Market has been taken as one of the fundamental topics in the present debate. I am rather surprised because the Common Market has been in existence for five years. When we began to set it up in 1954, when we signed the Treaty of Rome in 1957,<sup>2/</sup> it did not seem to me that the world attached so much importance to our venture. I do not recall having received as Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, any warnings from those

<sup>2/</sup> Treaty to establish the European Economic Community, dated 25 March 1957.

who now seem so apprehensive. They left us to it, they left us to go ahead, and I believe I know the reason. They left us to it, they left us to go ahead, because nobody thought that we were going to succeed. The whole undertaking seemed so extraordinary, so daring: to succeed, a few years after a European war, a world war which had left us profoundly divided, shattered and hostile toward each other, in overcoming our differences and working together to find a solution to our problems—that seemed to almost everyone an unrealizable dream. And the world remained, you will admit, fairly indifferent to our venture. It was mistaken. But today it is again making a mistake, believe me, in attaching too much importance to us.

152. It seems to me that there is one idea which must be refuted at once, and that is that there is now no chance of a country solving its economic problems unless it is a member or associate member of the Common Market. This is doing us much too much honour, all at once, and I am going to give you an explanation in a minute. All your fears and criticisms can be summed up under three main headings: The Common Market is an economic bloc established in order to support NATO, which, in the language of the cold war—still often used—is an aggressive bloc, and thus the Common Market is merely a means of furthering an aggressive policy. The Common Market is a gathering together of rich countries, which are also selfish, have no interest in the rest of the world and are going to base their prosperity on the ruin of others. Finally, the Common Market is the latest, the most subtle and probably the most treacherous form of neo-colonialism.

153. I shall now analyse these three arguments, these three main charges. I shall try to answer these arguments. But first, I must, if you will forgive me, remind you of a little history, because if you do not understand something properly, you may draw completely wrong conclusions about the Common Market.

154. The Common Market is not an end in itself. The Common Market is merely a stage that we wanted to reach in order to arrive one day at a new political organization of Europe. The Common Market is intimately linked, intimately bound up with the idea of a united Europe. It was in 1948, long before there was any talk of NATO, that the European idea was revived in Europe. I say "revived" because it was an idea that existed already in the period after the First World War. Even then, a certain number of persons, probably the shrewdest and most alert, realized that an attempt must be made to reconcile France and Germany, that politically and economically Europe must be given a new face. Aristide Briand was certainly the most famous and most wholehearted supporter of this idea.

155. We failed between the two world wars. We failed because there were too many sceptics. We failed because memories of past history still weighed too heavily on a torn and divided Europe. We failed, also, because of the abominable new political theories which arose to oppress Europe. We failed, and the Second World War was our punishment.

156. After the Second World War, some people thought that the task should be taken up again, that the effort should be resumed, and this time, thank God, it seems that we may succeed. You see, for us Europeans—and I hope you will try and understand this—the two European wars seem more and more to

have been two civil wars. There was no conqueror in the European wars: there were only the conquered. And after these two defeats, it was not difficult for us to visualize the decline of a Europe torn, convulsed by the birth of communism, the decline of a Europe torn and convulsed by the profound and violent anti-colonialist movement, and finally, the decline of a Europe impoverished by the two wars.

157. You will, I hope, excuse me, you will allow me not to, you will not insist that I give you a picture of the political and economic decline of Europe. It is a subject which I find far from agreeable and one that does not necessarily have to be discussed very often.

158. But despite that political and economic decline, we could not believe that this was the end, that there was nothing to be done, that we must give way to this movement, this current of history. And we had two main ideas. First, in order to build a new Europe, we must reconcile France and Germany. Three times disputes between France and Germany had shattered Europe, at the end of the nineteenth century and in the first half of the twentieth, and we were all aware that if this reconciliation could not be achieved on a deep and solid foundation, we might one day again experience the tragedies we had lived through. Today the reconciliation of France and Germany has been achieved.

159. But seeing what was going on in the world, we also felt—and for me this feeling is becoming a more profound conviction with every day that passes—that it was not possible nowadays to give one's people the standard of living to which they aspire and which they deserve without belonging to a very large community. It is not for nothing that the principal Powers in the world today are the United States and the USSR. It is not for nothing that those who look ahead can already gauge the position to be occupied one day by India or China. This is no longer the time, this is not the century for countries with 9 or 10 million inhabitants. Nor is it any longer the time, I believe, for countries with 40 or 50 million inhabitants. In order to give what one can, in order to succeed as one would wish, it is necessary to be part of a large community. And it is on the basis of these simple ideas that we have tried, that we are still trying to build Europe.

160. We have tried to do it politically by setting up the Council of Europe. We have tried to do it economically by establishing the European Coal and Steel Community,<sup>10/</sup> and now, above all, by setting up the European Common Market.

161. It was in 1955, at Messina, that the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the six countries of Little Europe, of the Community, decided, with the utmost audacity, that one of the fundamental aims of their European policy was to set up a common market. At that time, I think, those who believed that we would have any success were rare and we began our work in an atmosphere of general indifference. I cannot tell you why, I cannot tell you in detail how things happened. No matter, it is the result that counts, and today the Common Market exists. What is the reality that we and others find before us today? It is that in establishing the Common Market, we have, already, created the strongest trading unit in the world—stronger than the United States, stronger than the USSR. If the United Kingdom joins us in the near future, as I hope and believe it will, and if we succeed in developing

<sup>10/</sup> The Treaty establishing this Community was signed in Paris on 18 April 1951.

our customs community into an economic community, we shall not only be the strongest trading unit, we shall also be a unit perfectly comparable from the standpoint of production with the United States and Soviet Russia. This event now taking place is indeed of world importance.

162. I now turn to the objections, fears and accusations voiced in certain quarters. It is being said, for instance, that the Common Market has been established in order to provide NATO with an economic infrastructure for its aggressive policy. That is a typical assertion in the cold war style, which would be of little importance were it not for the fact that it might lead those who sincerely believe such an explanation into the most serious errors of political judgement. It is, however, the easiest of all arguments to demolish. If the Six can be accused of anything, it is certainly not of wishing to provide NATO with an economic infrastructure, but rather of having taken a step which might have disrupted NATO and created conflicts and stresses within the Atlantic alliance. For, after all, what is the Common Market? It consists of six countries—France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and the three Benelux countries—which are assuming special commitments with respect to one another and accepting a much fuller and closer integration than has ever been carried out or contemplated by the countries of the Atlantic alliance. So in Europe I have been hearing frequent and sometimes quite forceful complaints, for instance, from our Scandinavian friends, who have been drawing our attention to the danger of the emergence of separate economic blocs within the Atlantic alliance. If this united and integrated Europe one day comes into being and becomes a historical and geographical reality, the position of the United States and Canada in NATO might be altered and these two countries might feel isolated.

163. These are problems of which we are, of course, aware and dangers which we appreciate. We are firmly convinced that we shall be able to solve all these problems and avoid all these dangers. I beg of you, however, to discard the absurd and utterly false idea that the Common Market has been conceived and established to serve as an economic basis for an aggressive Atlantic alliance.

164. The second argument, though no more valid, is much more readily understandable. It seems to me that many of you are disturbed by the idea that the Common Market in its present form, and doubtless a fortiori in the event of its expansion, might become a closed, self-sufficient and egoistical community whose development might impoverish the rest of the world.

165. I can appreciate this fear and cannot assure you that there would be no danger should we be so foolish as not to realize that it is absolutely essential for us in Europe to avoid such a development. In an attempt to convince you I might read out the articles of the Treaty of Rome. You would see that they provide a reply, in words it is true, to the fears you have expressed, and that nothing smacks less of self-sufficiency and egoism than the text of the Treaty of Rome. Words, however, have only a relative value and perhaps it might be better for me to make an attempt—for which I apologize—to give you a few figures to show that your fears are unfounded and in any case exaggerated.

166. The implementation of the Treaty of Rome, far from harming world trade, has, on the contrary,

created greater opportunities. I should, for instance, like you to note that, between 1957 and 1961, the index of trade of all Third countries—the name we give to countries which do not belong to the European Economic Community—rose from 100 to 107, whereas the index of trade between countries in the Community and Third countries reached 117. This goes to prove that while the trade among us has, of course, shown a considerable and totally unexpected increase, our trade with the rest of the world, far from diminishing, has grown more than the trade of countries which do not belong to the Common Market. The truth of the matter is that when a community of men in a particular part of the world—and, believe me, what is true of Europe today will one day be true of Africa and Asia, I am firmly convinced of that—experiences a rising standard of living, that does not mean poverty for others but the opening up of avenues to new prosperity.

167. More specifically, it has been said that, in any event, the Common Market is directed against the countries of eastern Europe, against the communist world. What is the truth of the matter? It is that trade with the east European countries increased by 67 per cent between 1958 and 1961 and, in particular, trade between the Common Market countries and the Soviet Union increased by 84 per cent during that period. You may retort by saying that this expanded trade was attributable to our exports, but that we have become self-sufficient and opposed to imports from those countries. I shall quote one last figure to disprove this assertion: the Community's imports from the east European countries have risen by 59 per cent since 1958. These are not words but facts; this is the truth, a truth which serves to belie the charges made and to allay the fears expressed in this hall.

168. The last argument which is, perhaps, the most important of all, is that the Common Market is the latest form of neo-colonialism. I should like to devote a few moments to this subject and to the term "neo-colonialism" itself.

169. I fear that references to neo-colonialism may produce new misunderstandings and new sources of difficulty in this assembly of Governments and peoples. It seems to me essential that we should if possible reach complete agreement on what constitutes this neo-colonialism which is wanted neither by the newly liberated peoples nor by the peoples of Europe. In addition to agreeing on definitions, however, we must, of course, also be certain that our likes or dislikes relate to the same things. Until now—and I apologize if my information is inadequate—I have never come across a clear and positive statement or definition of what constitutes neo-colonialism. Would I be mistaken, however, if I was to say that neo-colonialism does not exist if the relations between, say, a European people and an African or Asian people rest on a footing of complete equality and if, in negotiating with this African or Asian country, the European country is resolved that any economic agreement which may be concluded should contain no conditions relating to internal or external political matters? Is a country which negotiates on such a footing of complete equality and is resolved to lay down no political conditions of any kind acquitted of the sin of neo-colonialism? If my negative definition of neo-colonialism is correct, I can assure you that in the relations between the Common Market—the European Economic Community—and the African countries which trust us, there is not a shadow or trace of neo-colonialism.

170. What we are discussing is, of course, a vital and, I would add, an inspiring matter. It is a great event that the six countries of the Community can now negotiate with eighteen African countries which have attained independence on the future relations between the African and the European countries. It is a splendid and inspiring thing that the resentments, disappointments and disillusionments of colonialism and anti-colonialism should be disappearing so rapidly and that we should be trying, equally rapidly, to build anew together for the common good.

171. The agreement we are discussing has not been completed; it must be completed and concluded before the end of the year and, let me tell you, this will be done. What will its foundations be? Agreement has already been reached on the principles, aims and objectives of the association. The first requirement is that the discussions should take place between sovereign States negotiating on a footing of equality. The purposes and objectives of the Treaty of Rome are restated and amplified: strengthening of the economic independence of the associated States, since such economic independence is the soundest foundation for their political independence; diversification of the economy and industrialization of the associated States; expansion of co-operation and trade between the associated States and the Community as well as of inter-African cooperation and trade, for we believe that the principles which are valid for ourselves are equally valid for Africa and Asia; agreement in principle on the rules to be applied to trade; introduction of reduced preferential tariffs as from 1 January 1963; the maintenance of prices within the Community; concerted action by the Six and the African States to stabilize the world market prices of the principal tropical commodities.

172. I digress briefly—to tell you and to give you proof—that we Europeans have nevertheless learned something. The old kind of aid to the under-developed countries, the kind that has been given for all too long, is a thing of the past. The practice of buying basic commodities at low prices and then, conscience-stricken, of making grants or loans to those not treated entirely fairly is a thing of the past. We have come to see that this is not the way to gain the friendship and co-operation of the erstwhile colonized peoples. And when I say today that the European Economic Community will be among the first to tackle the real and fundamental problem, that of stabilizing the prices of the basic commodities produced in the African countries, I do so with a sense of pride and satisfaction.

173. To continue, the agreement confirms that the associated States will be able to fix customs duties in keeping with the requirements of their development and the needs of their industrialization. It is said that, although we are ready to buy their tropical and agricultural products, we will seek to prevent their industrial development. The utter falsity of this accusation is demonstrated by the fact that, under the treaty we are discussing, our own frontiers are thrown wide open to their goods, and we then go on to tell them that if they must protect their young industries, they are entitled to do so. Is it possible to show a greater understanding of their interests and their future? Lastly, a large fund is to be established, larger than the one that has existed during the last five years, which nevertheless amounted to as much as \$580 million or—this is more impressive—to Belgian Fr. 29,000 million. There will be more than that in the next five years. We shall

allocate these funds in the most rational and reasonable manner; we shall continue technical assistance and, lastly, we shall establish a set of institutions linking these countries and ourselves: a council of the association which will have the right to take certain measures affecting the association, a parliamentary conference comprising the members of the European parliament at Strasbourg and an equal number of parliamentarians from the associated countries, and a court of arbitration. The conference will be advisory and its main function will be to make recommendations. The three institutions will be established on a basis of equality between the Community and the associated countries.

174. I ask you objectively, honestly and sincerely: is this colonialism or neo-colonialism? It is not. New relations are being established between sovereign countries for their common good, but these agreements are modern agreements which go beyond the now inadequate concept of bilateralism.

175. This is what we are offering to the African countries which may want it. We extend a warm welcome to such countries. If, for political or economic reasons, others feel that they must seek a different basis for their relations with us, we do not hold it against them; we understand them and are ready to help them and to follow their progress along the path of their own choice.

176. This is what the Common Market means; this is the only true explanation of the Common Market, which I was anxious to give you. I admit, however, that in addition to giving you this explanation, I also wished to show what the new Europe may be like. You are uneasy; you find us too rich and you fear that we are selfish, but you are wrong. The new Europe cannot stand before the world as an association of rich and selfish countries. If we fall into that error, we shall never regain our rightful place in the world; we would be detested and hated. Not only would we be detested and hated but, let me tell you, we would also be fools. Our countries are exporting countries which live, prosper and progress solely through our relations with the rest of the world. You may rest assured that we have understood this and that we know that bankruptcy for our customers would mean bankruptcy for ourselves. An attempt to unite Europe is an attempt to break through the too narrow frontiers of today's world. Uniting Europe does not mean retreating into a theory of self-sufficiency but, on the contrary, it means traversing a stage, perhaps an essential stage, towards universality. A united Europe is a new Europe; it is no longer nineteenth century Europe. "The stupid nineteenth century" a French writer has called it. I do not know whether it was stupid or not but perhaps it was unjust and cruel. In any event, Europe finds it hard to bear the legacy of the nineteenth century, and we are working patiently and quietly for its elimination. Social injustice is beginning to disappear in our countries. In our countries the crudest excesses of the capitalist régime, colonialism, imperialism and narrow aggressive nationalism are things of the past. We have a new outlook; we are finding an outlook better suited to our traditions, to the message of love which was brought to us 2,000 years ago, and to our long struggle for democracy, freedom, tolerance and respect for man.

177. Welcome us without fear but, on the contrary, with confidence and joy because we extend our fraternal hand to everybody, everybody without exception.

178. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the United Kingdom representative who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

179. Mr. CROWE (United Kingdom): I regret that the Foreign Minister of Venezuela should have seen fit to express his claim to part of the territory of British Guiana in such detail, and to have made such strictures on the Arbitration Tribunal of 1897. As the General Assembly knows, an item on this subject has been inscribed on the agenda and has been allocated to the Special Political Committee for discussion. My delegation, while surprised that the Government of Venezuela should wish to raise this matter, did not formally oppose inscription. I do not wish to anticipate the discussion in the Special Political Committee, but in view

of the terms used by the Foreign Minister of Venezuela, I feel bound briefly to reserve the position of my Government on this matter.

180. The Government of the United Kingdom regards the question of the western boundary of British Guiana with Venezuela as finally settled by the arbitration award<sup>11/</sup> which followed the treaty of 2 February 1897,<sup>12/</sup> under article 13 of which both Governments pledged themselves to accept the Tribunal's award as a full and final settlement.

*The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.*

---

<sup>11/</sup> *British and Foreign State Papers*, vol. 92, 1899-1900, p. 160.

<sup>12/</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 89, 1896-1897, p. 57.