



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED
A/C.1/PV.940
14 December 1957
ENGLISH

Twelfth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND FORTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Saturday, 14 December 1957, at 2.30 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. ABDOH

(Iran)

Declaration concerning the peaceful coexistence of States [66] (continued)

A statement was made in the general debate on the item by:

Mr. Kuznetsov (USSR)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.940. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEM 66

DECLARATION CONCERNING THE PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE OF STATES (A/3673; A/C.1/L.198)
(continued)

Mr. KUSNETZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): May I first, in the name of my delegation, express our profound feeling of sorrow over the misfortune that has afflicted the Iranian people in connexion with the earthquake which occurred in that country.

With regard to the item concerning the peaceful coexistence of States, a large number of representatives of different States have spoken here, and, with a few exceptions, unanimous approval was given in favour of the principles of peaceful coexistence and co-operation among all countries, irrespective of their social structures or methods of life. This is not accidental because the idea of peaceful coexistence and peaceful co-operation among countries is one of the main requirements of the world. However, other statements were made here from which it could be understood that the governing circles of some countries are not pleased that this question has become the subject of discussion at this session of the General Assembly. Those representatives, having paid lip-service to the idea of peaceful coexistence, tried to evade the main issues and tried to prevent a business-like discussion of this issue, so important for the peoples of the world, by fabrications and false attacks. However, it can be noted with satisfaction that the Committee did not follow those representatives.

In this connexion, the Soviet delegation considers it essential to make certain additional comments with regard to the question of peaceful coexistence, and we are forced to do this because, together with the proper and business-like considerations that have been stated, certain incorrect statements were made which distorted the whole meaning of the problem and which represented the initiative of the Soviet delegation in a wrong light.

Among such statements was the statement made by the United States representative Mr. Lodge, and the spirit in which he presented his statement constituted one of the worst examples of the cold war. The brazenness with which the United States representative disposed of facts, history and truth show the low level to which the United States delegation sought to bring the discussion of this important political issue.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

We, and not we alone, have come to the conclusion and received the impression that if the statements of the representative of the United States prove anything, it is not that the ruling circles of the United States desire true peace, but rather the contrary. The speech to which I refer particularly bears out the fact that the United States is still afraid that real peace might establish itself. It is afraid of doing away with the policy of the cold war, the policy of military propaganda and the armaments race. It does not want to compete for the benefit of peace. It cannot live without causing hatred to break out among peoples.

I do not know whether the representative of the United States himself believes all these false statements with regard to the policy of the Communist countries, but if he does he has certainly fallen into an unenviable position because he has become the slave of his own American propaganda. Propaganda with the poison of its falsehood is ruining the happiness of many Americans.

If we are going to put aside all the falsehoods which have appealed to the representative of the United States and to look facts in the face, then we shall see more clearly who is in favour of peace and against war, and who is for war and against peace. But being afraid of the wrath of the people, all this is concealed behind peaceful phraseology, which only troubles clear waters and poisons the atmosphere in the United Nations, the Organization which was called upon to act in an entirely different direction.

We are not prepared, of course, to answer all these insinuations, but we consider it essential to dwell on a few of the points having a direct bearing upon the problem and the subject of peaceful coexistence.

Whatever the statements of the representative of the United States here in his effort to distort the true nature of things, he will be unable to disprove the peaceful nature of the policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and to conceal the aggressive imperialistic character of the policy of the governing circles of the United States.

The representative of the United States has attempted to represent the question of peaceful coexistence as a means aimed at undermining the current session of NATO in Paris. Yes, one of the reasons for introducing this question in the United Nations is precisely that its Members do not wish to see conferences at which are developed not plans for maintaining peace, but plans for new conflicts.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

But the fact that we are discussing here the question of peaceful coexistence precisely on the eve of the NATO session is the result of the action of the representatives of the United States, since as a result of the endeavours of that delegation the question of peaceful coexistence of countries has been placed towards the end of the work of the Assembly although actually it deserved being considered as the first item. As far as we are concerned, we can only be proud of the fact that the question of peaceful coexistence is being discussed here on the initiative of the Soviet Union, which in contrast to the United States has conducted and is conducting a peaceful policy over the last forty years of its existence, and sees in such a policy the only possibility for preventing the great catastrophe which is now hanging over the whole of humanity.

Being unable to say anything against the principles of peaceful coexistence, the representative of the United States has concerned himself with excursions into history; and since it has become customary for him, he has piled one ineptitude upon another and has in fact got into history as it were. Therefore, even the attacks upon the Soviet Union and its foreign policy on the part of the representative of such a country as the United States -- the governing circles are the initiators and the instigators of the present armaments race of the cold war -- have sounded here with a definite false note about them. They have turned out to be a very bad way of shifting the blame for the unsatisfactory international situation, and really it is a case of having the insane intellect trying to tell the sane intellect what to do -- the United States telling the Soviet Union what to do.

The representative of the United States has tried to prove that the present tension is allegedly the result of a policy of the Soviet Union and of the international communist elements and the result of similar dreams. It is known from the past that during the period which preceded the Second World War, fascism had utilized communism for covering up its own humanity-hating policy. For the purpose of establishing truth and in order that there may not be any more misconceptions about this, we shall dwell briefly upon the true reasons for the existing international tension.

How did it happen that only twelve years after the Second World War, the world is again under the threat of a yet greater and a more destructive war? Where are

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

the true reasons for that danger which is now threatening the world? The reasons, of course, must definitely be looked for in the fact that on international relations great effect is being made by the efforts of the imperialist circles of certain Powers, and in the first instance the United States, to foist upon other countries their own will, applying force or the threat of force, when they do not like the internal organization or the independent foreign policy of this or that country. Subjugating their own foreign policy to the establishment at any price for the achievement of benefits for their monopolists, these circles of the United States are conducting what is known as the policy from a position of strength. They are endeavouring to achieve domination over the majority of the countries of the world and are trying to hamper the forward development of humanity in accordance with the rules and laws of social development.

Covering themselves up with the shouts of anti-communism, they are conducting an aggressive policy towards world domination, hoping to get for themselves the world's sources of raw materials and markets. They are conducting a policy of liquidating democratic freedoms. They are threatening, in particular, under the guise of a newly invented doctrine of mutual interdependence, even the independence of certain developed capitalist countries. They are trying to place a new yoke upon the peoples who have now acquired their freedom.

Their relations with other countries are based on the principle of the strong suppressing the weak and applying for this purpose threats and military strength. It is understood that such a policy will inevitably be accompanied by an armaments race, the establishment of new military bases on foreign territory, and the organization of different types of military blocs with the inclusion into them of countries which are in military and political dependence of the stronger nations.

For ages and centuries there has been conducted a capitalist policy based on the right of the strong, a policy of continued wars and subjugation of weak peoples. Forty years ago the only masters in the world were a number of imperialist vultures who had dictated their jungle law to the rest of humanity. As a result, the forces which had acted against this system, which were in favour of the liquidation of the inequitable position and which were in favour of destroying or doing away with the exploitation of one man by another, and for peace and progress

was still weak at that time. The imperialist powers, and particularly the United States, would like to put that policy through at the present time as well. And precisely because of that, the aggressive circles of the United States and certain other Western Powers not only do not want to take realities into account and co-operate in the weakening of world tension and in doing away with the policy of the cold war which is poisoning relations between countries, but they are doing everything in their power in order to worsen still further these relations, to increase the lack of confidence and suspicion between countries and States, and to retain the world within a state of concern for the morrow.

With this view, they are creating all sorts of obstacles to the establishment of mutual agreements on the curtailment and elimination of armed forces and atomic weapons. The Western Powers -- the United States, Great Britain and France -- are principally responsible for the fact that talks on disarmament have come to an impasse. The constructive proposals of the Soviet Union are being met in the United States at the point of bayonets, as it were. The leading circles of the United States are ignoring such proposals of the Soviet Union, such as the conclusion of an agreement between the two countries in which there would be stated the strong opinion of both our countries to develop among them relations of peace and peaceful co-operation and coexistence.

These aggressive circles are endeavouring, whenever there are appropriate conditions, to create conflicts. They are hampering the peaceful relations of issues which existed from the war and which have arisen since. The United States has developed interference into the affairs of other countries to the level of a governmental policy and they are trying to dictate to them a course of action. We need not go very far for examples.

The 600 million people of China which have cast down the yoke of imperialism and capitalism, and which has taken its own destiny into itself -- has it ever attacked the United States, or has it ever grabbed any territory of the United States? Has it established any bases of its own near the United States? Has it ever tried to get Cuba, or Peru to attack the United States? No. We must say that we do not know of any actions on the part of the Chinese Peoples Republic to that effect. Where the workers and the peasants have taken power into their hands, they wished only for one thing, peace, the possibility of constructing and improving their lives without any masters of any kind who have been chased out of China and who are now being sponsored by the United States.

But we know something else, however. It is precisely the United States which has grabbed the Chinese island of Taiwan and the other Chinese islands, and which has concealed there, under the protection of its fleet and of its bayonets, the Kuomintang remnants in order to conduct undermining activities against the Chinese people. It is not the Chinese People's Republic which is preventing the United States from getting into the United Nations, but precisely the contrary is true. The United States is preventing the establishment of the right of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations, and it is weakening the possibility of our Organization to protect peace. It is not the Chinese People's Republic but the United States which is trying in every way to prevent the peaceful solution of the Korean and Viet-Nam issues. Korea and Viet-Nam as is known, are not the neighbours of the United States but the neighbours of the Chinese People's Republic. And it is not at all a question of indifference for the Chinese People's Republic whether its frontiers are going to be peaceful or whether the Seventh Fleet of the United States is in its waters and whether United States aircraft is flying overhead. It is not China but the United States with its spies and by other means which is directing its aeroplanes to fire on peaceful cities and villages.

Finally, we have not heard that the United States has concluded any agreement with at least one Government on the adoption of the principles of peaceful coexistence and that it had carried out such principles in practice whereas the Chinese People's Republic has recognized and is applying these principles in practice in its relations with India, with Burma and with all the other countries which are conducting a peaceful policy with respect to China. This has been stated once again by representatives of some countries.

As regards Tibet, to which reference was made by the United States representative, this is Chinese and not American territory and it is being peacefully united to its motherland. To speak of Tibet as a territory that has been taken over is to say that the United States, for instance, is grabbing the State of Arkansas, which has come into the news recently.

In the course of the present debates the representative of the United States and some other representatives referred to the events of last year's counter-revolution in Hungary. In this connexion, it will be necessary to remind you all of certain well-known facts. During the course of the whole post-war period, the United States, and a number of other Western Powers with them, has conducted a broad undermining campaign against the countries where the people had taken the power into their own hands. This activity, both open and covert, has been conducted by official bodies of the United States which obtained hundreds of millions of dollars for this purpose out of the national budget. This conduct, aimed at the overthrow of the Governments in the Peoples' Republics, was expressed in the so-called policy of liberation proclaimed of late by the United States Government. From year to year the intelligence organs of the United States have sent their spies into these countries and have used all the means of modern technology available to them; they have bribed and organized the struggle against the peoples' countries, and they have organized counter-revolutionary circles and cells from reactionary émigrés, as well as special armed units for precisely this undermining activity. A typical example of this policy of liberation was the armed rebellion of international and Hungarian reactionary elements for the purpose of overthrowing the People's Government of Hungary in October and November of 1956. This was an overt attempt by means of force of arms to undermine the power and the solidarity of the socialist countries and to wrest Hungary from its ranks and to transform it into a hotbed of war in Central and Eastern Europe. At the same time an attempt was made to attract the attention of the world from the aggression in the Middle East and from other adventures in other areas of the world. The Hungarian people gave a resolute answer to the counter-revolutionaries. There can be no doubt whatsoever that any adventure of international reaction or any attempt on the freedom and independence of any socialist country will be met with definite and resolute action on the part of all the socialist countries.

In order to conceal its own role in the Hungarian putsch, the representatives of the United States and of certain other Western countries initiated a broad campaign of fabrication against the Soviet Union and against Hungary. Yet the

nature of the relations between the Soviet Union and the countries of the peoples' democracies in Europe and in Asia is well known to all. These relations are of true fraternal love and co-operation and are based on a single purpose, the purpose of community efforts for achieving their aims. The single-mindedness of the countries of the socialist camp increases its powers, and that is precisely what causes concern to the politicians and arouses their ire and hatred. The adventures inspired by the aggressive forces of the West, and first of all by the United States, are directed not only against the socialist countries, but also against other countries which conduct peaceful and independent policies. It is only necessary, for instance, to look at the situation in the Far and Middle East in order to realize that.

The present international position is characterized by the fact that in Asia and in Africa during the last twelve years, more than 700 million people have taken off their colonial yokes and have established their own sovereign countries, countries which are having a great influence in international affairs. A great number of these new and independent countries are firmly coming out in favour of the retention and the strengthening of peace and for the abatement of international tension. The colonialists and monopolists do not like this at all. They would like in one way or another to retain the colonial system by inventing all sorts of doctrines precisely for that purpose. It is not the Soviet Union but the United States which has enunciated the doctrine of Dulles and Eisenhower, which provides not only for economic and political interference but also military interference of the United States in the internal affairs of the countries of the Near and Middle East. It is not the Soviet Union but the United States which is thrusting itself into these countries and establishing military bases there, which is thrusting economic dependence on them and making extraordinary profits from the operation and development of the natural resources of these areas, particularly in oil. It is not the Soviet Union but the United Kingdom, France and Israel which, with the support of the United States, carried out the military intervention in Egypt. It is not the Soviet Union but Turkey, which is a partner of the United States, the United Kingdom and France under the North Atlantic bloc, which has concentrated its forces on the frontiers of Syria as a result of which a dangerous position has been created, a matter which was discussed by our Organization.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

It is not the Soviet but the French forces which are shedding the blood of Algeria; it is not Soviet but British aircraft which is now throwing bombs on the peaceful population of Oman and Yemen. This was rather convincingly explained here in the Assembly by the representatives of many countries of the Middle East, and in particular by the representative of Syria, Mr. Zeineddine.

These are the facts, and not fabrications to which certain representatives have recourse in this forum. We cannot overlook the falsification of history which was admitted here by the representative of the United States, and particularly during the period before the Second World War. Does the representative of the United States think that all of us here are simpletons who have forgotten what the facts really were? The fact is that the Hitlerite imperialism and militarism which set off the Second World War was fired and bred on the gold of American banks. The plans of Dulles and Young directed the flow of gold into Germany.

Is it not known that the imperialist circles of the United States and of certain other countries had thrust Hitler against the Soviet Union, giving him as an hors d'oeuvre one country after another. The plans of the imperialists consisted then of the fact that Germany should be pushed onto the Soviet Union, and having bled them white, they would then be able to force upon them conditions which would be favourable to the American and the English monopolies.

Let us recall the position in this respect of the former President of the United States, Mr. Truman, who, on the second day after the attack of Germany upon the Soviet Union, stated:

"If we see that Germany is winning, then we should assist Russia; if Russia will be winning, then we would need to assist Germany. In this manner, let them kill as many of each other as possible."

The Soviet Union tried to establish collective security for repelling aggression, but this was not wanted by the circles of the Western Powers because they placed their class interests above the interests of their peoples and above the national interests of their countries. Life corroborated the fact that by foregoing the system of security proposed by the Soviet Union, the Western Powers thereby facilitated war. Is it not a fact that the United States is now defending German militarism because they want to use that as a primary means for attacking the Soviet Union and the countries of the Socialist bloc?

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

It is a fact that even the Hitlerite military criminals, such as Speidel, are now being invited to command the forces of NATO, including American forces. The representative of the United States has said that this is for the benefit of peace. But all the peoples of Europe are convinced that "Speidels" are much more needed by the American monopolies for the purposes of war. It is not accidental therefore that recently the Danes and Norwegians so courteously greeted General Speidel that he hardly managed to get out alive from these countries.

Apparently the governing circles of the United States like German militarism better than peace and tranquillity in Europe and in the whole world. But this is a dangerous policy and it does not reflect attempts at peace. The policy of strength and increase of world tension is, of course, certainly not a policy of common sense and of the sober taking into account of realities. It is a policy which did not and could not lead to the solution of any intricate international issues. It is a policy which goes against the interests of the peoples of the world, because it brings with it increased taxation and inflation, and the end result is a new destructive war.

There is no future behind that policy because it is of use only to the monopolies and to the aggressive forces which gain tremendous capital out of the armaments race. The policy of leading from strength is a dangerous game of playing with the fate of the world, or, as was expressed by one statesman, it is a game of billiards with hand grenades. An end should be put to this policy. The vital interests of all the peoples of the world and the whole of humanity require that imperialist principles be done away with in respect of international relations and that we should exclude war as a way of settling international problems. An end should be put to the cold war and to existing international tensions so as to ensure peaceful co-operation between countries independently of their social and political structure and ideologies.

We see such a course in the recognition by all the countries of the application of the principles of peaceful coexistence. The representative of the United States has gone into a discussion of socialism and capitalism, and into the purposes and qualities of this or that social order. As in other

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

cases which we have already mentioned, the representative of the United States has again referred to fabrications which are flights of his imagination. What did the representative of the United States prove in quoting certain words out of context which were stated by Lenin? Nothing whatsoever, apart from the fact that in 1920 the Soviet country had to defend itself when it was being attacked by the capitalist countries, those capitalist countries who tried, by fire and by the sword, without success, to destroy the achievements of the people and to re-establish for the future a regime of despotism and exploitation, which was cast down by the peoples of Russia in 1917.

In this connexion, I should to recall that after it was established, the Soviet Government, in 1917, addressed itself to the participants of the First World War with an appeal to conclude a democratic peace. However, the Governments of the capitalist countries -- Britain, the United States, France, Germany and Japan -- did not want to listen to any peaceful coexistence with the young Soviet Republic. All the time they were deciding to do away with this new social system by means of direct military intervention. The forces of fourteen Powers, including the military forces of the United States of America, were directed against the Soviet Union. From the north, from the south, from the west and from the east, foreign military forces were hurled into our country. Along with this there was an instigation against the Soviet State by various Czarist generals who were supplied with arms and forces by the foreign Powers. Thus what turned out to be an all-socialist bloodless revolution was converted by foreign capitalist Powers into a five-year civil war which destroyed the country and upset its economy.

All this, however, did not provide any benefit to those who tried to destroy the new social structure in Russia. The people of our country gave a decisive blow to foreign intervention. Lenin referred to that difficult period in the life of the new republic when it was attacked by two groups of imperialist vultures, the German-Austrian group and the Anglo-American-French rapacious forces. Mr. Lodge quoted only a portion of the sentence. Lenin stated the following: "When two thieves struggle, an honest man gains from that".

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

Thus Lenin spoke of aggressors, of imperialist vultures, and referred to the historical truth of the fact that for the peaceful peoples of the Soviet Union, it was more easy for them to repel interventions, because those who intervened were fighting between themselves. Furthermore, Lenin showed that when the Soviet Union would become sufficiently strong, it would be able to bridle any imperialist aggressor. And that is truly the case.

Today, the Soviet Union is sufficiently powerful to be able to grab by the scuff of the neck any one who would try to attack it. But does that mean that the Soviet Union intends to attack anybody? Certainly not. Any attempts by the representative of the United States to strengthen in this case the fabrications in relation to the Soviet Union by taking quotations out of context are simply evidence of the fact that such methods are utilized only by people without goodwill and good faith. Similar methods were utilized by the United States representative when he tried to distort the statements of the Soviet leaders in relation to Mr. Khrushchev.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

As a matter of fact, this is not the first time. At the beginning of the present session, the Soviet delegation already had the opportunity of attracting attention to this circumstance. The representative of the United States on 13 December tried to prove something that could not be proved, namely, that peaceful coexistence for the USSR is allegedly a technique, a phase. The United States representative referred to the words of Mr. Khrushchev in his conversation with the American newspaperman James Reston regarding the fact that the Soviet Union is convinced that peaceful competition between socialism and capitalism will definitely result in a victory on the side of socialism and capitalism will inevitably be obliged to leave the historic arena. In referring to this statement, the representative of the United States first of all omitted one word. Which one do you think it was? It was the word "peaceful" which related to the competition. Moreover, he did not read the second half of the sentence of Mr. Khrushchev where the removal of capitalism from the historic arena was compared to what had happened earlier to feudalism, which gave way to capitalism. Thus the representative of the United States concealed the fact that Khrushchev spoke of the victory of socialism in peaceful competition and that the exchange of socialism for capitalism would be the inevitable result of the natural, normal development of human society.

In that interview with Mr. Reston, Khrushchev stated:

"It may be thought that the Communists are interested in war if it leads to the victory of socialism. But matters can be represented in this way only by our enemies. We are against such inhumanity. We Communists have never tried and never will try to achieve power by such horrible means. We base ourselves on the fact that for the victory of socialism wars are not needed."

With regard to the question of peaceful coexistence between Socialist and Capitalist countries, Khrushchev, in the same interview, stated:

"If the peoples of all the world will consciously direct all their efforts toward the prevention of a new war, they will be able to let the struggle between socialism and capitalism take the form of peaceful competition, and first of all economic competition -- in other words, competition in the field of peaceful production, in the raising of the living standards of the entire population of the world."

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

In the light of these convincing statements, what remains of the statement of the United States representative? The whole world sees and knows that peaceful coexistence for the Soviet Union is not a phase but a basic principle of its peace-loving foreign policy which was stated by Lenin right from the very first days of the existence of the Soviet State. Those who are well acquainted with the classics of Marxism and Leninism, the documents of the Communist Party, as well with the policy conducted by the Socialist countries in their achievements over a short historic period cannot but come to the conclusion, if they are honest, that the Socialist system, by its nature, is peace-loving and the most creative of all social systems which are known to history.

In this connexion, I should like to quote an excerpt from the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party regarding the question of peaceful coexistence. It is as follows:

"The Twentieth Congress of the Party considers very appropriate the line of conduct directed towards the fact that, on the basis of Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence, we should improve relations, strengthen confidence and develop co-operation with all the countries of the world. A great role in this connexion might be played by the well-known five principles of international relations recognized by many countries and by the broad layers of public opinion: mutual respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of others, non-aggression, non-interference in the internal affairs of others, development of intergovernmental relations on the basis of equality and mutual benefit, peaceful coexistence and economic co-operation. These principles constitute the best form, under present conditions, of relations between countries with different social structures and may serve as a basis for solid, peaceful relations between the countries of the world.

"The general line of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union has been and is Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social structures. Our Party is definitely against the outbreak of war. The Party bases itself upon the strong Lenin statement that the establishment of a new social order in this or that country is the internal matter of the country concerned. The Congress noted with satisfaction that

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

the principle of peaceful coexistence is being accepted on an ever broader basis. The suggestion is made to the Soviet people to pursue the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence with all countries irrespective of their social structures, to struggle for peace and for the establishment of confidence between countries by converting the slackening of tensions into a solid peace."

These are the policies which reflect the aspirations and the intentions of the Soviet people. This position in international relations is being adhered to unswervingly by the Soviet Union.

If the circles of the West, and particularly of the United States, are convinced of the benefits of capitalism, that is their business. Nobody can hold that against them. But it is not for them to determine whether Socialist structures should or should not exist in other countries. Let us leave that decision up to each nation, and then it will be easier to effect peaceful coexistence.

The Soviet people are resolutely in favour of peace and peaceful coexistence because they believe in their structure, in their authority and in the fact that socialism will prove its advantages in peaceful competition with capitalism. The leading governing circles of the Capitalist countries, and in the first instance of the United States, believe in capitalism. If they are not afraid of competition between the two systems, if they are convinced of the success and the advantages of their system, then by all means let us try in practice to effect this kind of co-operation. Then we will see that this is not propaganda but life itself. This would be in the interest of the peoples both of our country and of the rest of the world.

By the whole of its existence and its activities for forty years, the Soviet Union has proved that it is in favour of peace and friendship between countries. The exporting of revolution is only a myth and a fabrication established in the entrails of the military propaganda of the Western countries in the interest of those who go against the principles of humanity. This is understandable, too, because socialism does not contain any antagonistic and inhuman contradictions such as the Capitalist countries try to utilize for war. The Socialist countries do not need to expand or any wars to secure markets or

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

sources of raw materials or spheres for capital. This is distinct from the position in the Capitalist countries. The Socialist countries do not know of classes of social groups who are interested in the armaments race and in the outbreak of wars. Under conditions of socialism, there are eliminated social and national oppression and the domination of strong peoples over weaker peoples once and for all. We have put an end to racial prejudices and chauvinism, which is prevalent in Capitalist countries which forcibly dominate other countries.

The Soviet State, with its peace-loving foreign policy, has become the chief obstacle to the outbreak of war. Its system is having a greater effect on the international position and is inspiring the peoples of the world with regard to peace and international security. If the peaceful coexistence of the Socialist countries with the countries of the Capitalist system has been interrupted, it occurred as a result of the armed aggression upon our country by the imperialist countries.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

More than half of these forty years was used by the Soviet Union to repel these foreign attacks on the part of Western Powers and to eliminate the effects of such attacks. The fact that this is incompatible with peaceful coexistence is an artificial argument by means of which those who are against such coexistence, namely, the circles of the imperialist countries, are trying to hoodwink the people of the world into thinking that. This is not a new tactic, however, and we are convinced that whoever loves peace and international security will not be hoodwinked by this means used by the propagandists of aggression and suppression.

Attempts are being made to show that the Soviet Union, and not the United States, the United Kingdom and France, is guilty of causing the international tension. Definite proof is required from the Soviet Union of its love for peace. However, if proof should be required of the fact that one is peace-loving, that proof is not lacking on the part of the Soviet Union, which is not threatening anyone. The proof is required from those who in the next few days behind the stone walls of the Paris headquarters of NATO will be dreaming up new schemes of war. It should be sought from the State Department, from Mr. Dulles, who invented the "brink of war" policy which has already four times brought the United States and the world as a whole to that brink beyond which one can see the great chasm of war. It is precisely the aspirations of the leading circles of the United States to world leadership that are harming the situation. Were it not for the attempts of the United States monopolists to achieve world domination, there would be no divided Germany, there would be no divided Korea, there would be no divided Indo-China and there would be no NATO, SEATO and other similar aggressive groups. All this is due to the policy of leading from strength, and this policy has a "Made in America" and not a "Made in the Soviet Union" stamp upon it.

Mr. Lodge in his statement here spoke about capitalism and socialism. As regards the considerations advanced by the United States representative with reference to socialism. I could not decide which was actually the greater: his complete ignorance or his desire to twist the facts. For instance, the

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

representative of the United States attempted to turn upside down the significance of the word "socialism" and its interpretation. The opponents of socialism have frequently tried to make this word sound bad by using all sorts of means, by inventing all sorts of things, but I think that never has such an original accusation been advanced, not to say more, that the whole issue lies in the improper interpretation of the Russian word "socialism". There is no linguistic problem about the Russian word "socialism". Socialism has been successfully achieved in the Soviet Union, and the socialist structure is being embraced by many other countries, such as Albania, Hungary, China, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, the German Democratic Republic, the Mongolian Democratic Republic, Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia. If forty years ago socialism was chosen by the peoples of only one country, Russia, the socialist system today exists in countries with a total population of more than 950 million -- more than one-third of the whole of humanity. The success of socialism in these countries has led to the establishment of a society in which the exploitation of man by man is liquidated. There are no longer any exploiting classes, and there is established the highest form of democracy: democracy for the workers and for the whole people. In the countries coming within the framework of socialism, the productive forces grow rapidly, and national wealth is being developed, and all this is directed towards one purpose, the maximum satisfaction of the needs of the people. Socialism means the flowering of culture and science, friendship between peoples, and the drawing of the greatest masses of the peoples towards the Government of their own country. Socialism indicates peace because a socialist society, by its very nature, cannot conduct any policy other than the policy of peaceful co-operation which would be based on equality of rights, mutual respect and non-interference in the internal affairs of others.

From the example of the Soviet Union and of all other socialist countries, it can be seen by anyone who does not close his eyes to it that the socialist system brings greater benefits to mankind, both of a spiritual and of a material kind. So strong is the attractive force of socialist society and the ideas it

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

contains that attempts are even made to put up the shingle of socialism on the house of American capitalism, in the hope of confusing those who do not know. There is also the invention of those who defend capitalism by calling it "people's capitalism". This, of course, is an absurd name and, if translated into all languages, it would have a meaning similar to "fried ice". The ideas are incompatible. Such cheap means cannot be used to distract attention from the true state of capitalism. This is understandable. The peoples do not believe in assurances of the fact that capitalism has regenerated and has now become good; they judge on the basis of their own bitter experience, from the misery, the suffering and the humiliation that capitalism brings to them. In this connexion, to use the expression of Mr. Lodge, all the people are "from Missouri". Nobody will be confused by the empty words with regard to modern capitalism. The broad masses of the world, even if earning profits under the eyes of the Governments, struggle against trusts. Much could be said about the concentration of power in the large monopolies of the United States, the lack of balance in all branches of the economy, the destruction of small enterprises, the decrease in earning power, the increased unemployment and the increased insecurity as regards the future.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

It may also be asked of the United States representative -- who tried once again to introduce fabrications regarding the democratic structure of the socialist countries -- how many workers' representatives there are in the Congress of the United States, how many representatives of those who are the producers of all the wealth. As far as we know there is not a single one. The wonderful American way of life is preventing millions of people in the United States from enjoying the elementary human rights simply because their skin is not white. In the conditions which obtain in the so-called American democracy the country is being governed by certain financial circles which are thrusting the United States along the path of aggression and of the preparation of a new war.

The true nature of capitalism, to which reference was made by the United States representative, is still better known by the colonial and dependent peoples. Even in these days millions of people are condemned to live in really poor conditions, while the wealth of their countries and their work is being exploited by the monopolies of the United States. The difference between socialism and capitalism is very evident, and it does not argue in favour of the latter.

One of the techniques used not infrequently by the opponents of peaceful coexistence is their attempt to diminish in one way or another the value of the principles of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. This we have seen in the First Committee. Yet, no matter what the adherents of the policy of positions of strength try to do, this has been recognized by the world at large.

If we look at the map of the world it is not difficult to see that the principles of peaceful coexistence have prevailed in international relations between countries which encompass more than half the population of the world. From Czechoslovakia and Albania to the West, to China and the Korean National People's Republic to the East; from Finland and the northern borders of the Soviet Union, down to Egypt and thence to Indonesia; over the whole of the expanse of the European, African and Asian continents, peoples of socialist and non-socialist countries have proclaimed mutual respect for territorial integrity, non-interference in one another's domestic affairs, equality and the right to mutual benefit. All these principles have been proclaimed by all these peoples. In a word, they have proclaimed peaceful coexistence.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

The adherents of peaceful coexistence are many millions of people in those countries whose leading circles are acting as its opponents. They are men and women, young and old, peasants and workers -- millions and millions of simple people who hate war and wish to defend peace.

In conclusion, I would point out that the duty of our Organization is to assist the further development and spreading of the principles of peaceful coexistence and, particularly, their implementation in everyday life. Then peace and international security will be secured and guaranteed, and that is a purpose for which we should try to overcome all obstructions and all barriers. There is no way to peace and the prevention of a new war except peaceful co-operation of countries -- that is, peaceful coexistence.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The general debate on the question under discussion is closed. Nevertheless, the representative of Portugal has expressed a wish to speak on the draft resolutions, and although the debate which we have just concluded related both to the draft resolutions and to the item generally, I shall, if there is no objection, call upon him now.

Mr. GARIN (Portugal): My delegation intends to vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.198. In so doing, it is merely reflecting that which has been the traditional policy of Portugal and has become a constant factor in our international dealings.

In the world of today the need to consolidate the uneasy peace in which we are living goes even beyond the predicament posed by the new military technology. The easing of international tension and the creation of an atmosphere of understanding and good will would permit the peoples of the world, tired of conflicts and hatreds, to apply their economies to a planning for the future, for a better life and for a better world.

However, peaceful relations among States in keeping with the principles and spirit of the United Nations Charter and the intense aspirations of all the peoples of the world, require more than words and intentions. They demand the abandonment of hostile propaganda; non-intervention in the internal life of States, respect for international treaties and conventions; reciprocity in the matter of concessions and facilities; and guarantees of the rights of all. In the absence of these we would not be able to say that we live in a world governed by laws.

(Mr. Garin, Portugal)

The events of the last few years clearly indicate that the greatest contribution to this end must now come from those who, by their actions and contrary to their words, have unfortunately shaken mutual good faith. Yet it appears to be the duty incumbent upon all of us to continue to hope that from their theories of peace honest practice of it will eventually come. Without that true good faith any sincere measures to relax tension might indeed contain in themselves the germ of destruction for some.

It is in this context that my delegation will cast its vote.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The time has come to take a decision on the proposals before the Committee. The Committee has before it the draft resolution which occurs in document A/3673, presented by the Soviet Union, and another draft resolution which appears in document A/C.1/L.198.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): As you have just now reminded representatives, Mr. Chairman, there are two draft resolutions before the Committee, which has now come to the voting stage. On account of the lateness of the period at which our draft resolution was introduced the Committee agreed that the general debate and the discussion of the draft resolution might go together. My delegation, both on its own behalf and on behalf of the other sponsors, made brief observations about the draft resolution yesterday and reserved its position with regard to full explanations.

We do not consider that, in view of the considerable debate lasting over six meetings, one a long one, it is necessary for us to elaborate on the substance of the draft resolution. At the same time, we would like to make these few observations before addressing a request to the mover of the other draft resolution.

First of all, as I said yesterday, few of us would have expected, though some might have hoped, that there would have been less acrimony, but there are those of us who are probably less experienced and more optimistic by temperament, while there are others who have greater experience.

FGB/ns

A/C.1/PV.940
34-35

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

In view of the great differences in political systems and economic organization, in view of the military alliances, in view of the suspicions and the ideological conflicts that have gone on between various groups and nations in the world throughout the last so many years, and the general fate of other resolutions in the Assembly, even at this session, it is not at all surprising that we should have had grave differences of opinion. But, even with all those differences of opinion, there has not been one voice raised here against the substance of what has been put forward in document A/C.1/L.198, or against the consideration of the general problem raised under item 66.

My delegation submits that the controversy that has ranged around as to what are the problems to be resolved, that they will be resolved -- whether peoples have any commitments in this way will be observed, and also the different estimates of the performance of parties, and so on -- these very differences call for the kind of toleration, for the kind of mutual respect, for the kind of non-interference in the affairs of other people, that this resolution asks for.

My Government and my delegation yield to no one in their uncompromising opposition to the system of imperialism. But at the same time we do not think that a State which owns an empire, owns colonies, therefore can be excluded from a system of co-existence. Similarly, the first preambular paragraph of the resolution speaks of "developing peaceful and neighbourly relations among States irrespective of their divergences or the relative stages and nature of their political, economic and social development". I think that, in view of some private conversations that have gone on in regard to some translations of the resolution, we should like to say that, both in regard to this paragraph and the third preambular paragraph, when we speak about divergences and the equality and sovereignty of States, we mean that States large and small, States powerful and otherwise, States that are in a backward stage of economy or in an advanced stage of economy, States that have one kind of political system or another kind, all must come under the considerations set forth in this resolution. This is the background against which the co-sponsors have put forward this resolution.

There is no doubt that it would have been far better if some of the observations that came up in the debate could perhaps have been left unsaid. That may apply to some of our own observations. But that takes place in every debate. However, in view of the sharp differences that exist in regard to these matters, I think that the Committee can congratulate itself that, by and large, there has been unanimity of opinion not only with regard to the substance of the resolution in document A/C.1/L.198 but also in regard to the desirability of the Committee's adopting it unanimously.

There have been one or two observations to the effect that "There is no use in passing a resolution" or "This cannot do any harm". Speaking for my delegation, that is not a point of view shared by the Government of India. It is not just a

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

matter of passing a harmless resolution. That is not what we have met here to do. This is a constructive effort. Who would say that the Assembly, in calling upon all States "to make every effort to strengthen international peace and to develop friendly and co-operative relations and settle disputes by peaceful means as enjoined in the Charter and as set forth in this resolution", is merely doing something harmless? After all, on any subject, however important, that comes before the Assembly, all that it can do under the Charter and all that it can do in the light of the actual realities, the political situation in the world, is merely to make recommendations, to make requests, to call upon people, to express wishes and hopes.

The co-sponsors could have phrased it some other way, not "to make every effort". If they were not realistic, they could have put it in the form of an injunction. But it is recognized that sovereign States have to make their own decisions -- conditions vary -- and, whatever resolutions we may pass, it can only depend upon the public opinion of the world as a whole and the opinion of Governments in each of the separate States.

We should therefore like to remove any impression that may exist that this is a resolution to which everybody can put his hand because it cannot do any harm. In our opinion, that would be a wrong approach to this problem. The very first preambular paragraph reads:

"Considering the urgency and the importance of strengthening international peace and of developing peaceful and neighbourly relations among States ...".

Now, when something is urgent and important, it is not sufficient just to pass a harmless resolution. I should therefore like to say in all seriousness that my Government and, I am sure, our co-sponsors have not submitted this resolution, nor do the majority of those who have spoken on the matter regard the resolution, as merely an exercise in polemics or something that we might do when we go away.

Having said that, my delegation would like to echo the thought expressed by the representative of Iran when he said that if this resolution had support and whatever each Government can throw behind it, if a call went out from this Assembly on the lines of the last operative paragraph which I have just read out,

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

this Assembly, which has not succeeded in resolving deadlocks on some of the most important matters which are still pending, whatever may be our resolutions, while it would not find a solution for them, would have done something to kindle further hopes and the desire for further effort, and it would enable delegations to take to their countries and their Governments a more hopeful view of our work at the United Nations.

It is in this way that we look at this. For ourselves, our country carries many labels, according to the way people like to look at us. Some people call us "neutralists". I do not know why. If we are neutralists, others are belligerents. Neutrality is a concept that exist only in terms of war. If we are outside of war, it means that other people are in the war. That is not the case. But sometimes we are regarded as unrealistic and perhaps putting forward sentiments -- the sentiments of people, particularly in the modern world, of States, whatever their formal forms of government may be, where masses of people have become involved in their economic and political organization, are as important as any articles of a constitution. Very often, it is that sentiment which is exploited by mass leaders, as in the case of Hitler, and which often gears nations behind wrong efforts. If they can be geared behind wrong efforts, it is possible, in the wisdom of this Assembly and by the guidance of Member States, that they can be geared behind good efforts. We do not dismiss national sentiment, popular feeling, the call for effort -- all these things -- as not valuable.

The debate has also shown that the so-called five principles, about which I said yesterday that the Government of India does not attach any particular magical importance to this numeral or to the phraseology that is contained in them -- what is more important is the substance: that we have to live in this world together, the togetherness being compulsory on this planet, but it is our duty to translate that togetherness into something more dynamic, something more constructive and something more real.

Therefore, I say that the debate has revealed that, more particularly in the newer countries of the world which have come into world politics, which have been liberated from colonial rule in the past -- some of them that are outside the

HA/gm

A/C.1/PV.940
39-40

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

great military combinations of the world -- smaller States which, even though sometimes disposed to be near one or the other of the military groups, can express themselves yesterday here, today there, in very strong terms in support of the necessity of co-existence.

Our neighbour -- not our very near neighbour, but our neighbour in Indochina and the State of Laos, has in the last few days, after a whole year of effort, brought about in their own frontiers a triumph and achievement in the way of reconciling political differences, without the majority surrendering its view to the minority or the minority erasing itself.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

This does not seem to all of us a miracle because it is continually going on in our countries, but in the conditions that obtained there in 1954, in which my country and Government were associated in bringing about a solution, we have in the example of Laos, where there are all the different conflicting approaches to which reference has been made in this Assembly, a triumph and an achievement not necessarily under the auspices of any ideology. Instead, there were the leaders of two groups, one large and territorial with other competences, the other smaller but virulent, led by men who, though they belonged to the same family had different ideologies. After a whole year of negotiations there is now, we hope, a united Government in that State. The representative of Laos made reference to this matter. We are happy that he did so because it shows that even under difficult circumstances, geographically, ideologically or otherwise, given the will, it is possible to find a way out.

The debate has also shown that the vast majority of the representatives in this Committee are willing to vote for the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.198. This does not in any way abbreviate the allegiance of the Government of India to the five principles as set forth in the Soviet draft resolution, because they originated with us and we are not running away from them. Our purpose here is not to impose a form of words, a creed, or a formulation to which we have given adherence or which we may think is superior. Like all decisions in this General Assembly, we have to get the greatest common measure of agreement for a course. It was for that purpose that, with the enlightened and distinguished assistance of the delegations of Sweden and Yugoslavia, and also because of the consultations that have gone on between various other Member States, not least, those of the United States and the Soviet Union, we put forward this draft resolution.

But the sponsors alone take the responsibility for its formulation. It does not represent a compromise with anybody. It is not a middle way between two positions. It is the formulation of a position which is in conformity with the Charter, in conformity with the five principles, and, what is more, in conformity with the immediate and important demand of the time if the world is to have some hope of survival, either from war or the fear of war and all its consequences.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

We would, therefore, make an appeal to the representative of the Soviet Union, the representative of a mighty country which, in the last forty years -- and I have no inhibitions about saying this -- whatever may be the form of government and whatever incidents may have taken place, has transformed a comparatively backward people into a powerful nation. There can be no doubt on that. It was part of the grand alliance of the United States, the United Kingdom and other countries only a few years ago. We ask this representative, in view of his known and professed adherence to the fundamental ideas and in view of the fact that his country itself introduced this subject as an item, to enable the General Assembly to adopt this draft resolution unanimously, not so much for the edification or enlightenment of representatives sitting here, but as a contribution to the coming togetherness of the world as a whole and of the peoples of the world. Therefore, we would ask the representative of the Soviet Union, whether, in these circumstances, the delegation of the Soviet Union and those which have supported it whether they would agree to the Chairman giving priority to our draft resolution.

It is well known that, in view of the sentiments expressed, the large majority, more than the half which is all that is required under the rules of procedure, would vote for this draft resolution, but as it is a coexistence resolution, it would be far better if we could avoid the procedure with regard to priority that would require a vote. Therefore, in all sincerity and in all earnestness, I would make this appeal to the mover of the other draft resolutions and to his supporters, not because we ask them to consider that this formulation is better than theirs, but we ask them to consider that this formulation is the best that we can do in the present set of circumstances, and because the unanimity of adherence of a large number of nations is far more important than any guilting of the lily.

With these thoughts in mind, I make that appeal, and if the response is favourable I hope the Chairman will proceed to the vote. If the response is not favourable, and I do not expect this, because we know the great dedication of the movers of the draft resolution and their friends to this cause, then we would have to consider what next we would have to do. But we have been associated with them in the promulgation of this for twelve or eighteen months

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

after 1954, and we have also been responsible, as I said yesterday, for bringing about modification in regard to ideology and other differences. In view of all that, we do think that the appeal I have made on behalf of the Government of India and of our two co-sponsors will find a favourable response.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation has no objection to the proposal that the joint draft resolution should be voted upon first.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): As I wanted to point out to the Committee a few minutes ago, the Committee has two draft resolutions before it, the Soviet Union text contained in document A/3673 and the three-Power draft resolution, document A/C.1/L.198, submitted by India, Sweden and Yugoslavia. The representative of India raised the question of priority for the three-Power draft resolution, and the Soviet representative has stated that he has no objection to that priority being given. Therefore, it remains for us now to take a decision on the three-Power draft resolution.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I wish to say a few words on the question of my delegation's attitude to the draft resolution that is now about to be put to the vote. My delegation considers that the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union expresses the principles of peaceful coexistence in a more precise and more consequential way than does the three-Power text. Therefore, we would have preferred the adoption of our text by the General Assembly. Nevertheless, the three-Power text as a whole does express the ideas of peaceful coexistence and contains nothing which is not acceptable to the Soviet delegation. Therefore, we have no reason to object to the text of the draft resolution submitted by India, Sweden and Yugoslavia, and we shall vote in favour of it.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The Committee will now vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.198.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Finland, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaya (Federation of), Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian SSR, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian SSR, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia

Against: None

Abstaining: China

The draft resolution was adopted by 75 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes, the first of whom is the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In view of the result of the vote on the joint draft resolution of India, Sweden and Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union delegation will not press for a vote on the draft declaration which it has introduced.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): In view of the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union, there is no need for the Committee to take a decision on the draft declaration introduced by his delegation.

Mr. MALOLES (Philippines): My delegation would like to make it unmistakably clear that, in voting for the joint draft resolution, what we have voted for is a declaration on peaceful coexistence. That means exactly what every word and phrase says in the true democratic sense as we understand it and as has been interpreted by the representatives of the United States, Peru, Spain and many others who have spoken here. And we have an abiding sense that these words carry with them all the high purposes and good intentions that go with them in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of India on a point of order.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I do not wish to explain my vote because I am one of the movers of the draft resolution, but I should like, on behalf of my Government and, I feel sure, on behalf of our co-sponsors, to express our sense of appreciation to the delegation of the Soviet Union for allowing the joint draft resolution to be voted upon first, and also for not pressing for a vote on its draft resolution.

I should also like to repeat what I said yesterday, that we are in the debt of the United States for saying, when the draft resolution was moved yesterday, without any inhibitions whatsoever that the United States delegation warmly supported the draft resolution.

We hope, therefore, that this draft resolution will now go forward not merely as a form of words, but carrying behind it the faith that is represented by these votes; because faith is not merely taking a chance with destiny, it is some glimpse of reality, however dim it may be.

Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): My delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that its provisions do not in any way derogate from the provisions of the Charter or the Declaration of the Bandung Powers on the international conduct of States.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Since no one else wishes to explain his vote, I can say that the Committee has finished its consideration of this question of peaceful coexistence among States. The Rapporteur will submit the report on this question to the General Assembly.

CONCLUSION OF THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): At the moment when our work is coming to an end I should like, on behalf of the Committee, to thank sincerely the members of the Secretariat, whose devotion, whose knowledge, whose experience and whose team spirit have greatly facilitated our task. In particular, I would pay tribute to the Secretary-General, whose integrity and wisdom have won him the respect of everyone. He has shown great interest in our work by attending our deliberations in so far as his functions have enabled him to do so, and he has placed all of his experience at the service of the Committee.

I should like also to express gratitude to the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Protitch, whose competence and efficiency have been of great value to us.

My thanks are also addressed to all the members of the Secretariat, who, in one way or another, have made such valuable contributions to the work of the Committee: our Deputy Secretary, Mr. Narayanan, a member of the Political Department, the interpreters, translators, précis writers, verbatim reporters and the Press Section, without whose assistance it would have been impossible for us to finish our work.

I should like also to express my gratitude to the Vice-Chairman, Mr. de Barros, who has so ably conducted our work during my absences. I would express also my thanks to the Rapporteur, Mr. Matsch, for the patience which he has displayed in following so closely the debates and for the accuracy with which he has submitted the reports of the Committee to the General Assembly.

MW/rf

A/C.1/PV.940
49-50

(The Chairman)

Lastly, I should like to express my gratitude to the members of this Committee for their good will, their co-operation, their friendly and courteous attitude, and the tone of moderation and the high level which they have generally tried to maintain in our debates. This has made my task as agreeable and as easy as possible.

If at times during our deliberations I thought it my duty to intervene in a desire to ensure the perfect application of our rules of procedure, I hope that my colleagues will have understood the spirit in which I have done this: it was in order to adhere fully to our rules of procedure, which is an essential condition for carrying on the delicate task which had been entrusted to us by the General Assembly.

If the deliberations of this Committee have not always come to concrete results, it remains true that through an exchange of views expressed in the open, the members of the Committee have been able to learn the positions of their colleagues, which will certainly contribute to a rapprochement of points of view and to the possible eventual settlement of questions which are still pending.

I express my deep satisfaction in noting that we have been able to finish our work with the unanimous adoption of a resolution, and this after constructive and praiseworthy efforts had been made. This resolution asks us to make every possible effort to promote international peace, by the development of relations of friendship in conformity with the Charter. It is with pleasure that I have been able to note that we have succeeded in doing something concrete and specific. Thus, our work finishes on this note of hope, hope which is an expression of the fervent desire of all peoples of the world to see peace and international security placed on a very firm footing.

Mr. MALOLES (Philippines): Mr. Chairman, first I should like to express the deep sympathy of my country towards the disaster that has just befallen yours.

As we bring this session to a close, I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to join those delegations who will in time express their sincere felicitations and congratulations on your successful chairmanship of this Committee. Our delegation's confidence in your stewardship has been fully justified by the splendid manner in which you have conducted the business of the First Committee of the General Assembly. It takes more than a combination of tact and ability to sit as an impartial chairman of each deliberation. The difficult task you have discharged not only with brilliance but with élan and an approach has made the discussions here the model and pattern for the other Committees. This is a credit and an honour you richly deserve, and my delegation would like to make a

public testimonial of your singular achievement. You will recall, sir, that it had been my **high privilege** to second your nomination to this high post. You not only justified our expectations, but you have also surpassed our fondest hopes that you would have the necessary patience, equanimity and calm to guide the Committee in its deliberations.

I should also like to add our felicitations to our Secretary-General, to our Vice-Chairman, to the Rapporteur and to each and every member of the Secretariat: the stenographers, the clerks and translators who have made it possible to carry out fruitful and easy discussions of the problems before us, and without whose help our proceedings here would not have been possible.

Mr. THORS (Iceland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, as well as the delegations of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, besides my own delegation. Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to congratulate you on having so efficiently led us to the completion of our work and to thank you for the brilliant, determined yet modestly courteous and completely impartial way in which you presided over our meetings. This Committee has had many most difficult and tremendously important items on the agenda. It is greatly due to your eminent leadership that we have succeeded in discussing them all extensively and mostly on a high level of responsibility, and I am convinced you have fulfilled the endeavours and hopes of each and all members of the Committee to attain a fruitful and beneficial result. This may not have been achieved in all cases -- that only time can tell. But the Committee cannot fail to note with appreciation and thanks your official and private efforts to lead the Committee to positive, realistic and successful achievements. For all these, Mr. Chairman, we want to express our thanks and all our kind wishes for your continued success wherever you go and in every sphere of your future activities.

Our thanks also go to our Vice-Chairman, who only through your limitless energy and efficiency has not had more opportunities to grace the Chair and direct our work. We also want to thank our Rapporteur for his never-failing and studious attendance and constant vigilance, as well as for his useful and impartial reports.

AP/gd

A/C.1/PV.940
53-55

(Mr. Thors, Iceland)

We who for years have had the privilege of sitting on this Committee know full well how much the Committee owes to Mr. Protitch for his guidance of our work and for the preparation and arrangements of our meetings and programmes. It is hardly possible to think of the Political Committee without Mr. Protitch sitting in his chair, with his watchful eyes over us all and his helpful hand always stretched out to each and every one.

Our thanks also go to all the other able representatives of the Secretariat sitting near the Chairman's table, and elsewhere in our midst. They are all to be praised and thanked.

Finally, we have been honoured and pleased to see the Secretary-General almost constantly with us here, despite all his heavy duties. We are aware of his good and gracious influence on our meetings and deliberations. May I thank you all.

Mr. DRAGO (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): In the absence of the representative of Paraguay, Mr. Pacifico Montero de Vargas, who at this moment is in the Plenary Assembly, it is an honour and a pleasure for me to convey to the Chairman, Ambassador Abdoh, on behalf of the Latin-American group of countries our sincere congratulations on the impartiality, the wisdom and courtesy with which he has conducted our deliberations and facilitated the work of the delegations.

It is also a great pleasure for me to convey our congratulations to the Vice-Chairman of our Committee, Mr. de Barros who, on a number of occasions, has replaced the Chairman and has done so with the same brilliance. I should also like to congratulate in the same way Mr. Matsch who once again has acted as Rapporteur with the efficiency we all know is characteristic of him.

I should equally like to extend to Mr. Protitch and to the staff of the Secretariat our sincere appreciation for their competence and dedication to their work.

I should not like to conclude without expressing to the Government and people of Iran the sympathies of the Latin-American countries for the calamity that has befallen them, a calamity which we regret with all our hearts.

Mr. LOUTFI (Egypt) (interpretation from French): It is with great satisfaction that I take the floor on behalf of eleven Arab delegations, firstly, Mr. Chairman, to thank you for the kind words that you have been good enough to extend to the members of the Committee and to tell you, on the other hand, of the admiration that we feel as regards the excellent manner in which you have conducted the work of this Committee. During many long debates, Mr. Chairman, you have displayed a complete knowledge of the rules of procedure as well as excellent tact in their application. Moreover, your wisdom, your firmness interwoven with courtesy have led to making our work even more efficient.

We were fortunate enough to have you as Chairman, and we are proud that you have been able to discharge your and with success, which was not difficult to foresee.

I should like to associate myself with the tributes that you have extended to our excellent Vice-Chairman, Mr. de Barros, and our Rapporteur, Mr. Matsch, who for the second time has successfully discharged these responsibilities,

(Mr. Loutfi, Egypt)

to the Secretary-General, to whom it is superfluous to add another word of tribute, and to Mr. Protitch, our active Under-Secretary, as well as to all his collaborators, those whom we have had the occasion to meet and those that we never see. In conclusion, I should like to express my fervent wishes, Mr. Chairman, for your continued success, for your prosperity, your personal happiness and that of your family.

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) (interpretation from French): It may appear somewhat out of place for the delegation whose representative was appointed to the Chairmanship of this Committee to address congratulations to him. However, I should like to tell you, Mr. Chairman, how much the delegation of Iran is proud of your success and touched by the congratulations just extended to you.

I find myself less ill at ease in congratulating the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that you did not leave your Chair very often. But in the days when, owing to the Asian flu, you were unable to attend the Committee meetings, Mr. de Barros showed us with what authority, courtesy and impartiality he was capable of in presiding over our debates. The best proof of our appreciation for Mr. Matsch is that we have re-elected him unanimously for the second time to the post of Rapporteur. I hope that he will be able to follow the example of his eminent predecessor and that he will become, as Ambassador Thor Thors, the permanent Rapporteur of our Committee.

Those who, like myself, have had the privilege of knowing Mr. Protitch very well, know to what point his advice is invaluable. I would be very grateful if he would accept the congratulations of my delegation and if he would convey them to his eminent colleagues, those who are in this room and those who are absent.

In conclusion, I should like to say that I have just received from the representative of Afghanistan, showing to what extent our countries are closely linked, a note asking me to associate his delegation with the words of congratulation which I have just expressed.

Dr. ISMAIL (Federation of Malaya): As a new member of the group of independent nations which constitute the Commonwealth of Nations, my delegation has been asked to offer, on behalf of the Commonwealth delegations, here a vote of thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, the Rapporteur, the Committee Secretary and the other members of the Secretariat. I shall do so with great pleasure. Before doing so, may we offer you, Mr. Chairman, and your countrymen, our deep sympathy and convey our sorrow for the calamity which has struck your country.

As a baby who first sees the light of day, my delegation has looked with awe and wonderment at the proceedings of this all-important First Committee of the General Assembly. We have looked with wonder and fascination at the eloquence of all representatives, at the wisdom of India, at the practical approach of the Western Powers to the pressing problems discussed here, at the oratorical excellence of our Latin-American colleagues, at the firmness of the Arab delegations, at the persistence and thoroughness of our Soviet friends and, finally, at the moderation which characterized each debate in this Committee.

We looked also with awe and with some anxiety at the problems which confronted the Committee and the limited time within which it had to deal with them.

However, just as a new-born child feels reassured at the sight of its parents, so were we assured when we looked at the way you have graced the Chair. You have been firm yet flexible, strict yet tolerant, quick yet without haste. Your relationship with all of us here, throughout the proceedings of this Committee, is, if I may say so, the embodiment of coexistence. If we all go back to our countries with a picture of this First Committee in our minds, with you in the Chair, I am sure that the idea of co-existence can be translated into practical reality.

Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand): Mr. Chairman, many people have been wondering whether our Committee would finish its work in time for the General Assembly to close its session on the date fixed.

I have been among the optimists but the real reason for my confidence lies in your own outstanding ability as Chairman.

We have had many difficult and delicate questions to deal with, including Asian-African questions, for which absolute impartiality and, what is more, confidence of all in such impartiality, are required.

You, Mr. Chairman, have fulfilled this exacting requirement with complete success, to the satisfaction of all of us.

I will not refer to the masterly knowledge of the rules of procedure which you have shown in your guidance of our proceedings.

But I cannot refrain from paying a high tribute to the spirit of goodwill which you have inspired and spread among us, while keeping us firmly concentrated on our task.

(Prince Wan Waithayakon, Thailand)

You have shown us what a Chairman should be: suaviter in modo, fortiter in re -- agreeable in manner, firm in substance. As a member of the Asian-African group, I am very proud that the first Asian Chairman of this most important Committee has acquitted himself of his task with such signal success. I am happy to join with my colleagues in offering you, Mr. Chairman, my warmest congratulations and good wishes.

I also wish, on behalf of my delegation, to express our deep appreciation to the distinguished Vice-Chairman and the distinguished Rapporteur, and our cordial thanks to the Secretary-General, to the Secretary of the Committee and all the members of the Secretariat who have devoted all their time and effort to help the work of this Committee.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, I should first of all like to congratulate you and thank you. You have presided with courtesy and with a spirit of impartiality even when the problems were not easy ones. You have worked for many days, and certainly for many long nights, with all the devoted members of the Secretariat, and you have given of yourself. You have always been patient and have always distinguished yourself by good will.

On the part of the United States, we wish to express to you, as well as to Mr. de Barros, Mr. Matsch, Mr. Protitch and all your assistants, our sincere thanks and our best wishes for your future.

Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland): Mr. Chairman, may we of Poland thank you for having presided over our meetings with patience, great tact and very able skill. You have continued a series of excellent Iranian chairmanships which now becomes a tradition here. You have brought honour to your country, an ancient nation with a long historical tradition, which is now experiencing tragedy. You did service to the United Nations and assisted everyone of us in our work. We would equally like to extend our same sentiments to the Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur, and, of course, we should like to express our deepest gratitude and sincere thanks to Mr. Protitch and all of his silent collaborators in the Secretariat, including, of course, the interpreters who translate our United Nations English into

(Mr. Winiewicz, Poland)

excellent French, Russian, Spanish and Chinese, and, of course, to the précis-writers who tactfully suggest to the Press what to write about our speeches, and which the Press does not always follow, to our regret.

We sincerely trust that your efforts and our efforts contributed at least some constructive ideas and solutions to the cause of peace, which all the people in the world desire to strengthen. I know that there are more of us here who would wish that there were more success in our work, but that is not your fault, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOPER (Liberia): Mr. Chairman, permit me to express to you my deepest condolence for the calamity that has befallen your country and people in the form of an earthquake. We hope the damage and casualties are less than reported in the Press, not so severe.

It is somewhat strange to have to express condolences and the next moment congratulations, which I propose to do. But the choice is not mine. It is one of the strange tricks of fate, which is timely and nicely put by the poet when he writes:

"Toiling, rejoicing, sorrowing, onward through life we go -- each morning sees some task begun, each evening sees it close."

May I now add my voice to the many before me in expressing my appreciation and hearty congratulations to you for the wise statesmanlike qualities, as well as for the diplomatic skill in which you have guided our discussions in this controversial Committee, with such poise, calm and dignity.

It must be a source of pride to your fellow countrymen to produce such a brilliant and outstanding statesman and diplomat like yourself, characterized by your personal charm and kindness.

May I wish you a happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year, abundant health and a fruitful and long life devoted to the service of your country and humanity in general.

In conclusion, I wish to express my gratitude to the Secretary-General, the Vice-Chairman, the Rapporteur, the Secretary of this Committee and his staff for the devoted and painstaking service they have rendered us.

Mr. TSIANG (China): Mr. Chairman, I request you to accept and to transmit the sympathies of my delegation to your fellow countrymen who have suffered from the earthquake. During the past many weeks you have presided over the proceedings of this Committee with wisdom, fairness and courtesy. My delegation thanks you and congratulates you on your great success. My delegation also wishes to thank the Vice-Chairman who has occasionally but very courteously presided over this Committee. Our thanks also go to our very objective, efficient and fair-minded Rapporteur. Finally, we thank the Secretary of this Committee, Mr. Protitch, and his many colleagues and co-workers in the Secretariat, whose services are in some respects known to us, but in many cases they are not even known to us.

Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)(interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, our delegation values highly your impartiality and masterfulness, which you have so successfully used in conducting the work of the Political Committee. Although the results desired have not been achieved in respect to all the items considered, you have endeavoured to make those results more significant. We wish to congratulate you and all your collaborators and, first of all, your colleagues, the Vice-Chairman, the Rapporteur and the untiring Mr. Protitch, as well as all the assistants, including the interpreters. Without your assistants, the great machinery of our Committee would be unable to work smoothly.

On behalf of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, I should like to express my sympathy to you and to Mr. Entezam as regards the disaster which has occurred in your country.

Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (France)(interpretation from French): On behalf of the delegations of Austria, Spain, Ireland, Italy and Portugal, who have done me the honour of entrusting me with this task, as well as on behalf of the French delegation, it is a pleasure for me to thank you and to congratulate you for the authoritative way, the competent way, the clear and efficient manner and the impartiality with which you have conducted the debates of this Committee through often difficult

(Mr. Georges-Picot, France)

moments, until we have reached this happy conclusion which will probably permit the General Assembly to finish its work at the planned date, which is really an excellent performance, to use a sport term.

We knew, when electing you as Chairman of the First Committee, that you had all these qualities in your person, but it is always a pleasure to see reality correspond and even exceed what one hopes to find.

We should also like to thank the Vice-Chairman, Mr. de Barros, who presided with such distinction over some of our meetings, and the experienced Secretary of this Committee, who has a very delicate task to discharge, and we have placed full confidence in him to discharge this task. Of course, I am also thinking of my former colleagues in the Secretariat, the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Protitch, Mr. Naranayan, and all the members of the Secretariat who played such an important role in the proper operation of the work of the Committee.

To all of you: thank you, all our best wishes and all our congratulations for a job well done.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): May I, on behalf of the Soviet delegation, express my gratitude to you for your experienced, qualified and competent leadership of the work of this Committee. In spite of the great number of difficult and delicate matters, with your patience and your impartiality, you have assisted in the finding of solutions to all procedural and other difficulties.

May I also express the gratitude of my delegation to the Vice-Chairman, Mr. de Barros, to the Rapporteur, Mr. Matsch, as well as to the Under-Secretary, Mr. Protitch, who, with untiring efforts, have made the work of our Committee a success. I should also like to express the gratitude of my delegation to the elements of the Secretariat who served this Committee. I want particularly to make reference to and to thank the interpreters who have done wonderful work by their interpretation into Russian. We know that sometimes it was very difficult work, but they coped with it in an excellent way.

Mr. KIDRON (Israel): Mr. Chairman, the delegation of Israel expresses its sincere sympathy to you and, through you, to the Government and people of Iran in this hour of their grief and sorrow.

We also wish to be associated with the expressions of appreciation and admiration which have been tendered to you, to your colleagues Mr. de Barros and Mr. Matsch and to the members of the Secretariat from Mr. Protitch and Mr. Narayanan on for the wise, courteous, impartial and tolerant manner in which the affairs of this vital Committee of the Assembly have been conducted. We have been indeed in excellent hands.

My delegation wishes you and your associates the best of good fortune in the coming year.

Mr. NINCIC (Yugoslavia): It is my sincere pleasure to be able to associate the delegation of Greece, which has done the honour of asking me to speak on its behalf, and my own delegation with the well-deserved tribute that has been paid to you here for the truly masterful manner in which you have conducted our frequently arduous debates. We who have had the privilege of sitting on this Committee under your Chairmanship will long remember the firm yet benevolent manner in which you have presided over our efforts which, a short while

(Mr. Nincic, Yugoslavia)

ago, ended on what I think is a hopeful note. Our sincere thanks also go to our able Vice-Chairman, Rapporteur and to your other collaborators headed by Mr. Protitch and Mr. Narayanan.

Mr. ULLRICH (Yugoslavia): Before I commence my task in connexion with the closing of our last meeting of the First Committee, I should like to turn to another point over which the Czechoslovak delegation cannot pass in silence.

Today we learned about a great disaster in the western part of Iran caused by an earthquake. There have been losses of human lives in the hundreds and wounded in the thousands. For many tens of years there have been happy relations existing between our countries not only in an official way, but also through many delegations from Czechoslovakia which went to Iran to carry out their tasks in trade and industry. I had previously intended to stress these considerations of mutual advantage and peaceful coexistence at the very end of our deliberations on the last question. Instead, I must say they are at the basis of our sincerity in expressing to you the deepest sympathy of our delegation in your bereavement. May I extend to you, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania the same expression of deep sympathy in respect of this sorrowful event.

May I now associate myself on behalf of my delegation and on behalf of the delegations of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania with all those who have expressed their appreciation of the tact and skill with which you, Mr. Chairman, have conducted, guided and directed the work of our Committee. We extend to you our thanks. At the same time we wish to extend our thanks to the Vice-Chairman, the Ambassador of Brazil, and to the Rapporteur, the Ambassador of Austria. Further, we should like to express our thanks to the Secretary-General, the Committee's Secretary and all the staff of the United Nations and, last but not least, to the interpreters because without their collaboration it would have been impossible to complete our task.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all the representatives around this table will agree with me that this is the best part of the Committee's proceedings. It is the one occasion when sovereign States do not mind having their sovereignty violated if, either expressly or otherwise, we assume to be speaking for everybody. What is more, even an impartial Chairman will not call me to order nor consult the rules of procedure.

We are very happy on behalf of the delegation of India and of the delegation of Afghanistan, with whom we have the privilege of being asked to be associated, to convey to you, Mr. Chairman, our tribute for the way you have presided over these deliberations. You have done honour to the Committee and to your country. You will allow me to recall that the first association of most of us who have come from your part of the world was at Bandung when you were not nearly the conciliatory personality that you are today. So it is surprising what Bandung has done for people. Since that time, it has been my privilege and that of my colleagues to be associated with you in many ways in the work of the United Nations.

We were happy when your name was suggested for the Chairmanship of this Committee. While each year we have the privilege of thinking that we have a very good Chairman, this year we think we had an extremely good Chairman. This is not a comparison because all the Chairmen were good, and if it were not so, we would never say they were not.

We would like to associate with this tribute one or two facts. We had a somewhat disturbing time last night when it was felt that on account of the pressure of business there might be some variation of procedure impinging upon the rights of minorities, freedom of speaking and so on. It is only right to say that a tribute is due to you for the way you handled this matter, especially since you banked upon the sleepiness of the representatives.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

In a similar way, I should like also to convey our tributes to your Vice-Chairman and to the Rapporteur, who have been at your side to assist you in the performance of your duties; and to the Secretary-General, whose presence at these meetings helps us remind ourselves of the unity of the work of the United Nations as a whole and the importance of the work of the First Committee. My delegation wishes especially to mention the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Protitch, the senior Director of the Political Affairs department, and all those others who were on the rostrum and, even more, those who were not on the rostrum, who have made the work of this Committee possible.

Mr. Chairman, while speaking on behalf of the delegation of India and that of Afghanistan, which has requested that its name be specifically associated with ours, I feel sure that I express the sentiments of all of us, more particularly those who come from Asia and Africa and other places and with whom we have been associated in the last three or four years more intimately.

Mr. de BARRCS (Brazil), Vice-Chairman of the Committee (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, I have been most touched by the generous expressions that you have just addressed to me. It has been a great honour for me to work at your side and at the side of the eminent Rapporteur and Mr. Protitch.

I should like also to thank the representatives of the Philippines, Iceland, Argentina, Egypt, Iran, the Federation of Malaya, Thailand, the United States, Poland, Liberia, China, Ukrainian SSR, Israel, Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, India, France and the other Member countries on whose behalf the representative of France spoke, for the kind words of congratulations which they addressed to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the honour of being your successor without ever having replaced you, and it is indeed so difficult ever to replace you. The Committee knows full well, as it has just shown, that it owes a debt of gratitude to you, as well as to the Rapporteur and to the indefatigable Secretariat. I am grateful to the Committee for the honour of representing it at your side.

Mr. MATSCH (Austria), Rapporteur of the Committee: Mr. Chairman, may I express my sincere thanks to you and to all the representatives who have kindly referred in such flattering terms to my function as Rapporteur. It was an honour and pleasure to serve this Committee.

The SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Secretary-General, I should like to express the thanks and the gratitude of myself and the Secretariat for the warm words of appreciation that you and the members of the Committee have expressed for the work that has been done in the discharge of its duty to the Organization. Our thanks are due first of all to yourself, the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur. You made our task most pleasant and light. Our thanks are also due to the members of the delegations represented on this Committee, who have accommodated themselves at all times to the many requests that have emanated from you and which we have conveyed. May I once again express to the Committee and yourself my deep gratitude and that of my colleagues of the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Although the head of my delegation has had the opportunity of presenting his thanks to those representatives who offered their condolences in connexion with the disaster which has befallen my people, since some other representatives have been kind enough to offer their sympathy to my delegation either by letter or orally or in statements in the Committee, I wish in return to express my sincere thanks to the representatives on this Committee for their expressions of sympathy to the people of my country. It is true that, according to the dispatches received, great suffering has been wrought upon a large number of my compatriots, but I am quite sure that these statements of sympathy so warmly expressed within this Committee will not fail to soothe their afflictions. I am most touched by these expressions of sympathy, and I am sure that the head of my delegation, Mr. Entezam, will transmit them to my Government.

(The Chairman)

In this connexion, may I add a word. If the scourges of nature cannot be controlled by man, we have, nevertheless, the power to multiply our efforts in order that a horrible catastrophe shall not break out over humanity -- a scourge whose control, fortunately, is still in our hands. Perhaps that might be done within the spirit of the resolution which we adopted unanimously a few moments ago.

It only remains for me now to express to you once again my sincere thanks for the kind words which you have so generously addressed to me and to the other officers of the Committee. May I express particularly my gratitude to my natural superior, Ambassador Entezam, whose wisdom, perspicacity and amiability have always been a source of inspiration for me. I am particularly touched by what you have said, and this encourages me to devote all of my efforts more and more to the cause of the United Nations. This being said, I wish all my colleagues the very best of season's greetings and say bon voyage to those who must return to their homes and countries.

We have now concluded our examination of the items which have been allocated to us by the General Assembly. Before adjourning this meeting I should like to announce that the Assembly will begin in a few minutes' time the examination of the question of Cyprus.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.