



CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

General debate (*continued*)

Statement by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	317
Speech by H. M. Hussein I, King of Jordan	321
Speech by Mr. Nehru, Prime Minister of India	324

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

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: Before the General Assembly resumes the general debate this morning, I will call on the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, in exercise of his right of reply.

2. Mr. KHRUSHCHEV, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, (translated from Russian): In reply to the statements of certain speakers, I should like once again to make clear the attitude of the Soviet delegation towards one of the important questions placed before the United Nations General Assembly, at its present session, for consideration. I refer to the role and position of the executive organ of the United Nations which we propose should replace the post of Secretary-General.

3. I do this in order to refute those who have been misinterpreting our position, and also to clarify it for the benefit of those who have not yet fully comprehended the significance of our proposal, but would like to study it and understand it aright.

4. As you will remember, the United Nations was founded in 1945. The best minds of that time, at the victorious end of the Second World War, had debated how to establish normal relationships between States and how to create an international body capable of settling questions at issue between States or groups of States in such a way as to prevent relations from becoming strained and, *a fortiori*, to exclude the possibility of war. This was the main task which they designed for the United Nations.

5. The Charter of this Organization was drafted; it provided for the establishment of a General Assembly comprising all the States which accepted the United Nations Charter and met the requirements specified therein. For the solution of important questions, especially those giving rise to tension, a Security Council was created in order that it might remove this tension before it degenerated into friction and, *a fortiori*, into war.

6. The Soviet Union, China, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France—the great Powers of that time—were designated as the permanent members of the Security Council. It was stipulated in the United Nations Charter that the decisions of the Security Council required the concurrence of these five States. This was not a chance stipulation. It bespoke the wisdom the initiators and founders of the United Nations, who were having regard to the actual international situation at that time.

7. It is fifteen years now since the United Nations was created. Have there been any changes in the world since then? Yes, there have been tremendous changes. Anyone who fails to see this is in a state of lethargy and living in the world of fifteen years ago, with all his old views and concepts of world problems.

8. But we are not dealing—or rather, we should not be dealing—with those who are locked in a state of torpor. Those who have throughout this time been living and working with their peoples and States are aware that great social and political upheavals have taken place on earth. When the Second World War ended there were only two socialist States in the world—the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic. This Republic has unfortunately so far not been admitted to membership of the United Nations, and we should like once more to point out that this attitude to the Mongolian People's Republic is entirely unwarranted.

9. The United States of America, the leader of the capitalist world, emerged from the war the richest and economically the most powerful country. It lost less and gained more than any other country during the war.

10. During the first post-war years the Soviet Union had a powerful army but a shattered economy, and the imperialist Powers hoped that our State was, in effect, dying. They imagined that the existence of the socialist system as a reality would thus come to an end and that socialism would then be only a matter of theory and ideology. But all these hopes of the imperialists, colonialists and monopolistic capitalists proved to be illusions; they crumbled.

11. Not only did the Soviet Union rapidly regain strength, but it developed with a speed that astonished all mankind. We now train more than 100,000 engineers a year; we constructed the first atomic power plant in the world, built the first atomic icebreaker, which is successfully breaking ice in the Arctic Ocean, and were the first to send rockets into outer space. The achievements of the Soviet Union have shown how great are the advantages of the socialist system, and what boundless opportunities for the development of a people's talents are offered by socialism and communism.

12. The great country of China has set forth on the road of socialism, successfully developing its economy

and its culture. The People's Republic of China is yet another vivid example of the speed with which peoples liberated from imperialist oppression can gather their forces, consolidate their independence and do away with the economic and cultural backwardness of their countries.

13. The example of Czechoslovakia is particularly instructive. Even in the past Czechoslovakia was a highly developed, industrialized capitalist country. Bourgeois ideologists alleged that socialism could take root only in backward and under-developed countries. Czechoslovakia proved the falsity of these assertions and showed that even a highly-developed country, if it embarks on the path of socialism, gives its people unprecedented facilities for vigorous development and for the improvement of life.

14. Or take the example of the German Democratic Republic. Once on the road to peace, progress and socialism, the people of the German Democratic Republic were able to do away with monopolistic oppression and militarism. The German Democratic Republic is now a peaceable and rapidly developing country. It threatens nobody. The situation is entirely different in the case of Western Germany. Its economy is developing along capitalist lines, and those very same movements—revanchism, militarism, fascism—which dragged the world into the Second World War are arising there again. That country is a growing source of new war threats, and the policy it is pursuing is not peaceful but warlike.

15. These are just a few examples to show that socialism promises to all mankind peace, expansion, prosperity and a final escape from all the miseries and vices of capitalism. Socialism has earned for itself a permanent place on the planet; it has won the recognition and respect of the peoples.

16. The socialist States of Europe and Asia unite under their banners more than 1,000 million human beings, and demonstrate to the entire world the advantages of the new, youthful socialist system over capitalism, whose days are numbered.

17. I should like to draw the attention of representatives here in the Assembly to what would seem a simple question: how can we disregard the fact that, of the 3,000 million people making up the world's population, more than 1,000 million are living in countries most of which have created and moulded a socialist form of State during the last fifteen years? I hardly think that serious politicians can ignore the new social structure of the world, which is having such a decisive effect on present-day international relations.

18. If we recognize this unalterable fact—and only politically short-sighted persons can fail to do so—then it becomes absolutely clear that the structure of certain United Nations organs, which was perfectly proper when they were created and corresponded to the state of affairs in the world at that time, has now become obsolete. More than a third of the world's population is, so to speak, discriminated against in the organs of the United Nations—in the Security Council, for instance, and particularly in the Secretariat. Mr. Sukarno, President of the Republic of Indonesia, was perfectly right in what he said here [880th meeting] on this subject.

19. Besides the great and powerful phalanx of socialist countries in the international arena, there have now

appeared new young States which are following a neutral policy. These include the great country of India, which not long ago was a British colony; Indonesia, a former Netherlands colony; Burma, the United Arab Republic and the young States of Africa and Asia. They have now become independent countries and their populations total over 1,000 million. But the interests of these countries, too, are unprovided for both in the Security Council and in the United Nations Secretariat.

20. We are all living on the same planet, and must therefore find ways of restoring normal relations between all States and instituting co-operation with equal rights. And the United Nations should be the place, the forum, where this co-operation for the preserving of peace should be practised on the broadest scale and in the fairest way.

21. When, for instance, the Soviet Government raises the question of reforming the Secretariat, it is from a sincere concern to ensure the proper functioning of the United Nations so that the interests of the peoples of all countries are taken into account, and not the interests of one or other group of countries or, even, sectors.

22. The responsibility for interpreting and executing all the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council at present falls upon one man. But there is an old saying that there are not, and never were, any saints on earth. Let those who believe in saints hold to their opinion; we do not credit such tales.

23. So this one man—at the present time, Mr. Hammarskjöld—has to interpret and execute the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, bearing in mind the interests of the monopoly-capitalist countries as well as those of the socialist countries and of the neutral countries. But this is not possible. Everyone has heard how vigorously the imperialist countries defend Mr. Hammarskjöld's position. Is it not clear then, in whose interest he interprets and executes those decisions, whose "saint" he is?

24. Mr. Hammarskjöld has always been prejudiced in his attitude towards the socialist countries; he has always upheld the interests of the United States of America and the other monopoly-capitalist countries. The events in the Congo (Leopoldville), where he played a simply deplorable role, were merely the last drop which filled the cup of our patience to overflowing.

25. In fact, if the Secretariat and the Security Council had been differently constituted, no very tense situations would have occurred in the Congo.

26. In the first place, the colonialists would not have attempted to seize power again, and even if they had done so the United Nations forces would not only have thrown them out, but would also have created conditions in which the Parliament and Government of the Congo, lawfully elected by the Congolese people, could have functioned normally.

27. When the colonialists gave the Congo independence, they calculated that such independence would be a sham. But the Congolese Government decided to assert its political and economic rights in earnest. This infuriated the colonialists; they embarked on their military venture and decided, in effect, to im-

pose on the Congolese people the old colonialist order of things under the guise of a fictitious independence.

28. As I have said, the Congolese people unfortunately did not find in the United Nations a defender of their interests. What sort of fulfilment of the principles and purposes of the United Nations is this?

29. Mr. Hammarskjold used the armed forces of the United Nations not to support the legitimate Parliament and Government of the Congo, at whose request the troops had been sent, but to support the colonialists who were, as they still are, fighting against the Congolese Parliament and legitimate Government in order to fasten a new yoke upon the Congo. He used the United Nations troops in order to interfere in the domestic affairs of a young State. No one can tolerate any longer this arbitrary and lawless behaviour, whereby the United Nations has acted in the interests of colonialist groups. The remarks made in this connexion by the Chairmen of the delegations of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria, Ghana, the United Arab Republic, Cuba, Indonesia and others were perfectly justified.

30. In order to prevent any misinterpretation, I should like to repeat: we do not, and cannot, place confidence in Mr. Hammarskjold. If he himself cannot muster the courage to resign, in, let us say, a chivalrous way, we shall draw the inevitable conclusions from the situation. There is no room for a man who has violated the elementary principles of justice in such an important post as that of Secretary-General.

31. Some say that we should, perhaps, replace Mr. Hammarskjold by another, more worthy man. They reason as follows: let us admit that Mr. Hammarskjold made a great mistake; could we not correct it by substituting for him someone else? Of course we could do that. But should we thereby be guaranteeing the United Nations against a repetition of such mistakes in the future? I do not think so. We cannot expect any Secretary-General to be the impartial representative of three different groups of States.

32. Today, unfortunately, there is a one-sided trend in the work of the United Nations, in the work of its General Assembly and Security Council, and in that of the Secretariat. But while one group of countries, led by the United States, is dominating the scene, it is, today, not doing so by the right of the strong. These States have now lost the so-called right of the strong, for of the past strength on which they relied to keep the colonial peoples in subjugation there now remains to them only the image.

33. The real situation in the world today is that the strength of the two greatest Powers—the Soviet Union and the United States—is at least equal, and that if we also take the other socialist countries into account, as well as the former colonial countries, the peaceable States have on their side not only right and justice, but force. If we do not reckon with this fact, clearly the United Nations cannot function.

34. It will then, strictly speaking, lose all its meaning, for it will be unable to perform its most important task—that of preserving peace between peoples.

35. But why talk about the future? We can already see the results of the bias in dealing with questions before the United Nations, which is the consequence of the fact that it is dominated by the forces of the imperialist

States. The post of Secretary-General is occupied by a representative of the Western Powers; not once in all these fifteen years has a representative of the socialist countries been allowed to act as President of the General Assembly. But this is a situation which requires no great explanation!

36. The pressure of the imperialist countries on the General Assembly has been particularly evident in the way in which the question of granting China its legitimate rights in the United Nations has been dealt with. I have already spoken about this matter but I shall refer to it again for the benefit of those who are preventing the settlement of the question of participation by the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, for the benefit of those who, once again, are acting under pressure from the imperialist Powers. It should be clear to everyone that we must, at long last, correct this injustice. Without China there can be no disarmament; without China the United Nations cannot function properly.

37. It is important that the United Nations should be able to quench, in time, the flames of war wherever they may appear. How can it do this? Only by taking into account the interests of all three groups of States, and the interests of the colonial peoples. But at present the colonialists are doing all in their power to prolong the enslavement of the colonial countries; wherever the peoples have won their independence, the colonialists are trying to enmesh them, offering them a sham independence while in fact endeavouring to prolong the colonial régime.

38. In the present circumstances, then, how can we find one man for the post of Secretary-General of the United Nations who can take into consideration the interests of all three groups of States? In our view, this is impossible. Of course, if we are thinking in terms of devotion to the ideas of peace and love of mankind, we could find for the post of Secretary-General a man from the socialist countries, and such a man would truly reflect the most progressive ideas of mankind today, ideas for the preservation of peace. But we can say in advance that the Western Powers would have no faith in such a man, and that would be understandable.

39. But if we ourselves are prepared to admit that the appointment, to the post of Secretary-General, of a representative of the socialist countries would not create proper conditions for the functioning of the United Nations, how can the Western Powers ask us to believe in the impartiality of their candidate—in the present case, Mr. Hammarskjold? The neutral countries, too, wish to play their part in the United Nations; they want their interests to be protected; and these legitimate demands of theirs must be taken into account.

40. The only correct way, therefore, of solving this problem would be to create an executive organ consisting of three persons, representing the three groups of States, whose duty it would be to implement the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

41. Some will say: if the executive organ of the United Nations were to consist of three men, it would be paralysed. But the task of the persons appointed to this body would be precisely to take those wise decisions which would guarantee peace, and this means that they would have to take into account the interests

of all three groups of States. If decisions were taken with the interests of only one or other group in mind—decisions, for example, of the kind that are taken now, which are in the interest only of the imperialist States—they would be unrealistic. Let us look at the position soberly; the imperialist Powers are not really able to carry out such one-sided decisions, because they are not in a position to impose them by force.

42. Those who say that the Soviet Union is making proposals which will destroy the United Nations are judging the United Nations work from the standpoint of only one group of States. When we say that allowance must be made for the interests of the first, the second and the third groups of States, they reply that this means "destroying the United Nations". No, this is a fair request. If not today, then tomorrow, all peoples in the world will realize that the United Nations must take into account the interests of all States. The alternative is the dominance of one or other group of States; and that means, not the solution of problems but the aggravation of international tension, which might even lead to military conflict.

43. The endeavour of all men to secure peace on earth is sacred, and the best guarantee of peace is disarmament. It is for disarmament that all peaceable people are longing. We cannot replace it by control over armaments, without disarmament. If our proposals for disarmament were accepted, we should be ready to agree to any proposals of the West on international control.

44. But what exactly is meant by the control over armaments which Mr. Eisenhower, President of the United States, has proposed [868th meeting] to the Assembly and about which Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, also had something to say [877th meeting]? Control over armaments means recognizing that we must continue to have armaments even in the future. But it is obvious that, if armaments persist, at a critical moment all those who possess weapons will, voluntarily or involuntarily, reach for the holster, reach for these weapons. At a critical moment those who have weapons and adhere to a position-of-strength policy will not ask the Security Council or call the General Assembly to discuss whether or not they should use these weapons; they will simply use them. And if that should happen, obviously no Assembly will ever meet, because war will ensue with all its destructive consequences.

45. The very best guarantee of peace, therefore, is to abolish the means of destroying people—that is, to abolish armaments. The Soviet people sincerely wants this. We long ago said—through the lips of Lenin, the founder of the Soviet State—that we were in favour of disarmament. At this session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Government has again expounded its views and submitted specific proposals [A/4505] for your consideration.

46. I address to the Assembly, therefore, an urgent appeal to recognize the exceptional importance of the disarmament question for all peoples of the world, for those alive today and for the generations to come. The efforts of all countries and all peoples are required for the purpose of compelling the Governments of those countries on which agreement depends to put general and complete disarmament into practice.

47. Some say that Khrushchev and Eisenhower should be locked in a room and made to sit there until they

have reached agreement on disarmament. That, of course, is naive. We can sit there as long as you like, but if the President of the United States, and more particularly the group behind him, do not want to reach agreement, no smoke will come out of the chimney-pipe, as is wont to happen when a Pope is elected in Rome. And we are confronted, not with the problem of electing a Pope in Rome, but with the much more complicated matter of disarming and of removing the threat of war, a question which means life or death to millions upon millions of people.

48. It has been said that, after agreement on disarmament has been reached, international armed forces should be formed. We are, in principle, in agreement with this. But the question arises, who will command these forces? The United Nations Secretary-General? But in that case the taking of one-man decisions with regard to one operation or another will depend on the moral convictions, on the conscience of the Secretary-General. Is it really permissible for the fate of millions to be dependent on the actions of the one man occupying that post? We cannot rely on the conscience of the Secretary-General, for each of us has his own idea of conscience, his own understanding of ethics. The capitalist world has its own code of ethics, the communist world another, and the neutral countries a third.

49. In view of the circumstances, therefore, it is necessary to construct the United Nations apparatus in a way that reflects the true situation in the world and meets the interests of the peoples of the different groups of States. There can be no disarmament, there can be no international armed forces, in the absence of guarantees for all three groups against the misuse of these armed forces.

50. How can this be effected? We want no privileges for ourselves, but neither do we want others to have privileges at our expense. We want equal conditions for all. Accordingly, if the General Assembly really desires disarmament, if it wants the international bodies really to work in this direction for peaceful ends, then the United Nations apparatus must be so transformed that the United Nations Secretariat and the Security Council in all their work reflect the interests of the three basic groups of States, defend the interests of each and every State Member of the United Nations.

51. Some representatives are flinging about sharp words and harsh accusations to the effect that Khrushchev is destroying the United Nations. We reject these charges and state, quite specifically, that the Soviet Union's proposals are designed to strengthen the United Nations. We want the United Nations to be an Organization in which the interests of all the groups of the States belonging to it are really taken into account and protected on a footing of equality. And every United Nations activity should be based upon the principle of safeguarding peace throughout the world.

52. Those States which pursue their narrow group interests, at the expense of the interests of other groups of States, are striking a blow at the United Nations; if they persist in following this course, they will end by bringing the United Nations to destruction.

53. If the organs of the United Nations which are required to settle the most important international questions with due regard for the interests of all States, if these organs—the Security Council and the

Secretariat—settle these questions in a way which is detrimental to the socialist or the neutral States, then it will be only natural for these countries not to recognize such decisions but to rely on their own strength in order to defend their interests, the interests of peace.

54. This is the choice which now confronts the United Nations. Either we genuinely combine our efforts and do everything to strengthen the United Nations and thereby to secure the co-operation of all States towards the maintenance of peace; or we allow the United Nations machinery to continue to be controlled by those forces which reflect the interests and desires of the imperialist group of countries, a state of affairs which does tremendous damage to the cause of peace and international co-operation.

55. Those who support a policy of force and try, through the United Nations, to impose their will on others should clearly realize the position they occupy and their accountability to the world for the future.

56. I would say frankly to representatives at this session: "Do not be deluded by the high-flown words used here by Mr. Hammarskjöld and the representatives of the colonial Powers in an attempt to justify the bloody crimes committed against the people of the Congo by the colonialists and their myrmidons."

57. I should like to say that the representative of the United States, when he spoke here, was defending something which is old, rotten and already crumbling. Neither the representative speaking here on behalf of the United States, nor anyone else, can stop that natural process. You cannot make a dead man breathe. Colonialism has lived its day. Our duty is to put away this stinking corpse as soon as possible, thereby cleansing the atmosphere and creating in the world a better life for all. Our sympathies, I repeat, are with those who are fighting for their freedom and independence.

58. It has been said that Khrushchev is preaching rebellion. I am not preaching rebellion, because the question of rebellion against an undesirable order of things in one or another country is decided by the people itself. All I said was that, if the colonialists do not grant independence and freedom to the colonial peoples, then there is nothing for the peoples of the colonial countries to do but to rise against this shameful oppression, and all honourable people should stretch out their hands to help those who are fighting for their human dignity, against robbery, against the colonialists.

59. We offer our hand to all who are still suffering in the chains of colonial slavery. If that is considered as an incitement to rebellion, then I am proud of it and say: the freedom-loving peoples of the Soviet Union stretch out their hands to help the peoples who are rebelling against the colonialists, for their freedom and independence.

60. The whole world is disturbed today by the question of whether the disarmament problem will be solved, whether we shall succeed in settling this vitally important matter. We, for our part, firmly declare that we came here inspired by the most honourable intentions and ready to do all in our power to bring peace to the world—and not only peace, but friendship between peoples.

61. The Soviet Government will continue to work honestly in this direction, like a sower who sows so that the people shall have a good harvest. He chooses the best seeds and drops them into the soil. When he drops them thus, he cannot be sure that good and favourable spring and summer await them. No, he knows that the young shoots which will spring up from these seeds may encounter drought, storms and hurricanes. And it may even happen that some of these seeds will simply fall on stony ground.

62. But the sower cannot stop toiling. He cannot give up if the elements are working against him. He does not debate whether it is worth while to work, whether it is necessary to sow. Man lives and wants to live. And so he labours tirelessly to guarantee life for the living—a better life for the people.

63. So we, by the will of our people, have come here and are tirelessly sowing the seeds of peace. It may be that our seeds, too, will not everywhere fall on fertile soil. Indeed, I am convinced that a certain number of seeds will fall on stony ground. But all here have doubtless seen how a mighty pine-tree will grow on the stoniest, most barren-looking crag. It is hard to say where it obtains nutriment. Yet it grows!

64. We believe that if some of our seeds of peace fall on stony ground they will not all perish, because they are healthy seeds, seeds of human truth, and are planted in the name of truth and of the life of men. We are convinced that these seeds will grow, will bore through the stone and reach the nutritious soil, and develop into a sturdy, a powerful tree of life. We believe in life and shall fight for it, for the triumph of peace on earth.

65. We are convinced that the seeds of truth will reach the minds of those to whom we are appealing; we are sure that the men who are sowing the good seeds, the seeds of truth, the seeds of life, will be rewarded for their labour by the triumph of truth and the victory of the forces of reason and peace over the forces of war.

66. To this end we must tirelessly sow the seeds of truth; we must appeal to people to fight for this truth, to fight against evil droughts and storms. And if all will fight—all, and not one group of States alone—then this truth will be triumphant and peace will be secure throughout the world.

67. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker in the general debate this morning is His Majesty the King of Jordan.

68. H. M. HUSSEIN I, King of Jordan: First, allow me to congratulate the President on the confidence which has been placed in him by the General Assembly in electing him to this high post. I wish him the fullest measure of success in carrying on the great traditions of his office that have been established by his distinguished predecessors.

69. May I also take this opportunity to congratulate all the new nations on their independence and their admittance to the United Nations. Having won their freedom, may they preserve it forever, and may they prosper and grow strong with every passing year.

70. It is awesome and inspiring to stand before an Assembly of the nations of the world. I pray God that I may be worthy of the time and of the place. I pray that I may also be worthy of the Arab people, that I may in spirit and in word express their aspirations to

contribute to peace and justice in the world. Ours is a land of peace, the cradle of religion and of civilization itself. It was from our country that the first message of universal peace and good will was proclaimed.

71. Also, it was the Prophet of our people who long ago introduced into the world the doctrine that all human beings are equal under God. With such a tradition, we are determined to contribute to the world of the future, as we have to the world of the past.

72. It was our determination to do so, to revive the spirit of our ancestors, that led to the great Arab revolt—a revolt deep-rooted in the principles of peace, equality and freedom that are the very heart of Islam and of Arab nationalism. They are also the foundation upon which the United Nations was built.

73. So, as a representative of the Arab people, I have come to this Assembly to contribute what I can, and to state our position on the issues which are the subject of discussion before this body.

74. More specifically, there are four reasons why I am here today. First, I was deeply concerned over what seemed to be an obvious attempt to wreck the United Nations. Second, I wanted to be sure that there was no mistake about where Jordan stands in the conflict of ideologies that is endangering the peace of the world. Third, as the Head of a small nation, I felt that it was my duty to the other small nations of the world and particularly to the new Members of the United Nations, to share with them our experience in preserving the freedom which we, like they, fought so hard to win. Fourth and finally, I believed it to be my duty also to express my views on three vital problems in the Middle East affecting the peace of the world, namely, the growing tension between Jordan and the United Arab Republic, the independence of Algeria, and the still unsolved problem of Palestine.

75. It is needless to affirm that the United Nations presents the only hope of peace and freedom to humanity. This is of major significance to all the small nations of the world; yet, almost from birth, the Soviet Union has sought to destroy the United Nations, to hamper its deliberations, to block its decisions and, by rowdy tactics and petulant walk-outs, to damage the reputation of the Security Council and the General Assembly. The most recent illustration of this attitude towards the United Nations has been its performance at this session, and the attempt to weaken the powers of the Secretary-General, and the proposal to move the site of the Organization's Headquarters. These are only slightly concealed efforts to destroy the United Nations itself.

76. May I add that I heartily endorse the decision administered to Mr. Khrushchev by the vote of the General Assembly [resolution 1474 (ES-IV)] in its endorsement of the speedy and effective measures taken by the Secretary-General and his staff in handling the tragedy of the Congo.

77. No one who has followed the deliberations in the General Assembly for the past two weeks can fail to be aware of the significance of this session. The problems that confront us are not new problems—but as they have remained unsolved, they have so grown in magnitude that their continued existence threatens not the peace of the world, but its very life. I have no major plan for the solution of these problems. As a

country which owns no nuclear weapons and which can only suffer from nuclear warfare, Jordan merely beseeches the Powers involved to resume their labours and strive even in the face of all the obstacles in their path to find a formula or, better perhaps, a way of thought that will not only save them but save us all.

78. There are other problems, too, and one would indeed be blind if he did not realize that almost on every vital issue that confronts this body the nations of the world are being offered a choice. And there is no secret about what that choice is. It lies between becoming part of the Soviet Empire, subservient ultimately to the dictates of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, or standing as a free nation whose sole external allegiance is to the United Nations itself. That is the choice—and it is there for each and every nation to decide.

79. And may I say at once—and with all the strength and conviction at my command—that Jordan has made its choice. We have given our answer in our actions, and I am here to reaffirm our stand to the nations of the world. We reject communism. The Arab people will never bow to communism, no matter what guise it may seek to use to force itself upon us. Communism will never survive in the Arab world because if it ever did then it would have replaced Arab nationalism. There would then cease to be an Arab nation, an Arab world.

80. I believe that Arab nationalism is too deep-rooted in the love of God, the love of freedom and the concept of the equality of all before God ever to be supplanted by a system which denies the importance of these ideas.

81. Moreover, it is my firm belief that all nations which believe in God should meet in counter-attack against the common challenge to their very existence presented by communism. Not even the emotional power that comes from love of country, or the material resistance offered by material well-being, or the spiritual strength to be drawn from the concept of freedom—none of these, singly or alone, can meet the threat to peace presented by the totalitarian ambitions of communism. Not until those who honestly believe in God and in His dictates of love, equality and social justice unite to translate those ideals into action will communism be defeated and peace restored to the world. In the great struggle between communism and freedom there can be no neutrality. How then can we be neutral in our attitude toward two systems of government, two philosophies; one of which cherishes these concepts, while the other denies and stifles them.

82. In taking our stand with the free world, however, we do not forget our long struggle for liberation, nor could we support existing injustices being committed by some members of the free world. But in the setting sun of the old imperialism we are not blinded to the new imperialism of communism—one far more brutal, far more tyrannical and far more dangerous to the ideals of free people, to the concept of nationalism, than this world has ever known.

83. While we reject the doctrine of neutralism for ourselves, we respect the right of any nation to choose its own course of action; but we are wary of what appears in some instances to be the use of neutralism to exploit the division between communism and the free world. And we are also wary of the danger in

some cases of communist expansion under the guise of neutralism.

84. I come now to the problem of the Middle East, so vital to the peace of the world, and hence of major concern to the United Nations. In our part of the world, added to the problems of Algeria and of Palestine, there now exists a situation of which the General Assembly should be aware. I will not dwell upon it in unhappy detail, for to do so might increase rather than decrease the danger of intense conflict. Yet to let it smoulder, unnoticed by the United Nations, would be equally dangerous.

85. I feel, therefore, that I must discuss the tensions which exist between Jordan and the United Arab Republic. With other and more world-wide problems facing the General Assembly, it may seem to some rather presumptuous to introduce what may appear to be a local issue into its crowded schedule. However, no issue is entirely local; and as the world has now learned, no conflict of ideas or threat of physical conflict stops at the borders of those directly involved. Moreover, the principles which underlie it, as well as those which must be used to solve it, are applicable throughout the world. And as new independent nations find their freedom in increasing numbers, the effective application of these principles becomes of ever-increasing importance.

86. For me to remain silent, then, would be to encourage the continuance of a situation that could destroy the Arab nation and, in the process, lead to the involvement of the major Powers, and thus produce a world conflict.

87. It all began several years ago and at a time when Jordan, having just completely achieved its independence, sensed a new and most formidable threat to its freedom in the form of communist penetration into our area. Our warning to the people of Jordan of the threat to ourselves and to the Arab nation as a whole was the cause of Jordan being subjected to abuse, subversion and external pressure of many kinds. They grew in intensity—to the extent that we can only believe that the aim of our sister Arab State is our destruction.

88. Its Government, one would have supposed, would be as strongly dedicated to the goal of Arab unity as Jordan is. In fact, so menacing was the United Arab Republic's attitude towards Jordan and so constant were its attacks upon us, that on 21 August 1958, the General Assembly of the United Nations, in its third emergency special session, endorsed an Arab League resolution by which the United Arab Republic pledged itself to cease its campaign against us. Unhappily, it did not honour its pledge.

89. The attacks were resumed; incitements to overthrow our Government and assassinate our leaders were broadcast daily over their Government radio; borders between us were closed to damage our economy; and convicted traitors to Jordan were encouraged, or at least permitted, to engage in subversive acts against us.

90. The situation once again became so grave that the Council of the Arab League, of which the United Arab Republic and Jordan are members, adopted at one of its sessions a resolution calling upon its members to refrain from all activities that would disturb "fraternal relations". The day following the close of

that session, Jordan's Prime Minister, Hazza al-Majali, along with eleven others, including a child of ten, was killed by a bomb placed in his desk.

91. I will restrain myself—and it is with great difficulty that I do so—from saying any more on this subject. I should like only to add that I find considerable significance in the fact that our troubles with the United Arab Republic date from the time that I denounced the growing menace of communism in the Arab world. Moreover, I detect a significant parallel between the tactics that have been used against Jordan and those employed by communism all over the world.

92. It is no secret that the policy of the Soviet Union is to split friend from friend, to divide nation from nation in order to achieve its goal of total world domination. The United Arab Republic, in seeking to dominate our part of the world, has adopted, as part of its policy of "neutralism", some of the methods of the country of which it is most fondly neutral. Should it succeed, either as a neutral or as an openly avowed communist ally, it will destroy the very basic aims of the Arab nation.

93. These aims may be difficult to understand for those outside our Arab world, possibly because we are inept at defining them clearly to others. Or perhaps it is because our ideals, as yet unattained by us in our world, and having been attained by others in theirs, have been forgotten by them. Nevertheless, we have set forth our ideas in a joint effort. They were partly embodied in the resolution of 1958 [1237 (ES-II)], adopted on the proposal of the Arab States, and in a resolution of the Arab League adopted at the meetings at Shtoura.^{1/} To both of them the Republic was a party, and both of them have been consistently violated by it.

94. The point which I wish to make is this. If, as the creation of the United Nations suggests, our hope for more freedom, more co-operation, and what we often refer to as a better world, and even survival, lies in adherence to mutually agreed ways of dealing with one another, then we must find better ways than we now have to bring our combined weight of opinion quickly and effectively to bear upon whatever nation transgresses these agreed inter-relationships. I do not suggest that there is anything new in this idea; it is simply the idea of government by law applied to the actions of sovereign States. Yet to me, as the leader of a small nation much beset by outside pressures, it is a concept which is worthy of re-emphasis at this time, for I believe that it is in the successful application of this idea that the survival and progress of my country and so many other small nations will in the end be decided.

95. The United Nations is the only instrument which is capable of applying this idea successfully, and should it fail in general to fulfil this responsibility, the small nations will perforce have to solve their problems in their own way. This would be the worst kind of retrogression towards the kind of "might makes right" world which we have for so long struggled to leave behind us.

96. Before I go on to the subjects of Algeria and Palestine, a final word about the United Arab Re-

^{1/} The Arab Foreign Ministers Conference, held at Shtoura, Lebanon, from 22 to 28 August 1960.

public. While Jordan would naturally welcome evidence of United Nations support of its position, which it believes to be based upon the principles on which progress towards better relations between nations must rest, Jordan does not expect or request any special or immediate response from the United Nations to what I have said. If we can collectively devise and carry out better means than we now have to ensure the integrity of smaller nations and to guarantee their ability to improve their lot, free from outside interference, then I believe we shall have progressed. If what I have said contributes to this end, then it will have been worth saying.

97. The tragedy of Algeria remains grave and shows signs of becoming graver. Here again, the problem is that of refusing to recognize the right of the people to determine their own future. This is the very essence of freedom. The United Nations cannot afford to take a passive position in this matter any more than it was passive about Korea or about Hungary.

98. In one sense, the problem is far more serious because a party to it is a member of the free world. The appeal to France to uphold what it seems to have neglected, its own tradition of liberty, freedom and equality, must be no less vigorous because it is a member of the free world; in fact, it must be more so because of that.

99. There is no doubt that a large and impressive number of the French people is wholeheartedly in favour of permitting our Algerian brothers the choice of their future. May the French Government soon reflect by its actions the same belief, and extend to the Algerians the right of self-determination promised by the President of France. By such action, France will win back its place among the nations which will fight for freedom. There will never be a better world if principles continue to be compromised. We must put an end to useless bloodshed. Enough wrong has been done and the road of ignoring the continuation of wrong is a dangerous one. The people of Algeria are entitled to their right of self-determination.

100. The third of the three problems in the Middle East is Palestine. The world's conscience seems to have closed its eyes in a rather shameful manner, and for far too long, on a tragedy of humanity so serious in its magnitude that over a million Arabs of Palestine have lived for twelve years ignored by a world that has not as yet seriously attempted to help them to return to the most essential and sacred right in life—human dignity.

101. The original failure of the United Nations to permit a people the right of self-determination in 1947 has left in its wake this still sorrowfully unresolved situation. There is no question in the mind of any just and impartial observer that the Arab people of Palestine were wronged by the partitioning of Palestine and by the subsequent establishment of the State of Israel. It was morally wrong and politically unjust then; it is no less so today. The world is too prone to accept a "fait accompli" as a basis of policy.

102. Jordan, which has born the brunt of the Palestine problem, stands at the forefront of those who demand that the rights of the Palestinians be restored to them without fail. As everyone here is well aware, there still exist various resolutions, those of 1948 [194 (III)] and 1959 [1456 (XIV)], for example. Yet nothing has been done to persuade Israel to live up

to them. Here again, the United Nations must enforce its will upon a Member which refuses to abide by its decisions. There will be no real peace in the Middle East without an honourable, just solution to the Palestine tragedy and the complete restoration of the rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

103. I said earlier that we in Jordan are not neutral between right and wrong, or on our belief in God, and I ask that the God in whom we believe will send down on this General Assembly His blessing and that from it we may have the courage to decide wisely and fearlessly the questions that lie before us.

104. Mr. NEHRU, Prime Minister of India: I am a newcomer to this Assembly and not accustomed to its ways and conventions. I seek, therefore, the indulgence of the President, and the indulgence of the members of the Assembly for what I have to say.

105. I have listened attentively and with respect to many of the speeches here, and sometimes I have felt as if I were being buffeted by the icy winds of the cold war. Coming from a warm country, I have shivered occasionally at these cold blasts.

106. Sitting here in this Assembly chamber, an old memory comes back to me. In the fateful summer of 1938 I was a visitor at a meeting of the League of Nations in Geneva. Hitler was advancing then and holding out threats of war. There was mobilization in many parts of Europe and the tramp of armoured men was heard, but even so the League of Nations appeared to be unconcerned with the shadow of war and discussed all manner of topics, but not the most vital subject of the day.

107. War did not start then. It was a year later that it descended upon the world with all its thunder and destructive fury. After many years of carnage that war ended and a new age, the atomic age, was ushered in by the terrible experiences of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Fresh from these horrors the minds of men turned to thoughts of peace and there was a passionate desire to put an end to war itself.

108. The United Nations took birth on a note of high idealism, embodied in the noble wording of the Charter. There was this aspect of idealism, but there was also a realization of the state of the post-war world as it was then, and so provision was made in the structure of the Organization to balance certain conflicting urges. There were the permanent members of the Security Council and the provision for great-Power unanimity. All this was not very logical, but it represented certain realities of the world as it was. Because of this we accepted it. At that time many large areas in Asia, and even more so in Africa, were not represented in the United Nations, as they were under colonial domination. Since then the colonial part of the world has shrunk greatly and we welcome here many countries from Africa in their new freedom. The United Nations has become progressively more representative, but we must remember that even now it is not fully so.

109. Colonialism still has its strong footholds in some parts and racialism and racial domination are still prevalent, more especially in Africa.

110. During these past fifteen years the United Nations has often been criticized for its structure and for some of its activities. These criticisms have often had some justification behind them, but looking at the broad picture I think that we can definitely say that the

United Nations has amply justified its existence and repeatedly prevented our recurrent crises from developing into war. It has played a great role, and it is a little difficult now to think of this troubled world without the United Nations. If it has defects, those defects lie in the world situation itself which, inevitably, it mirrors. If there had been no United Nations today, our first task would have been to create something of that kind. I should like, therefore, to pay my tribute to the work of the United Nations as a whole, even though I might criticize some aspects of it from time to time.

111. The structure of the United Nations when it started was weighted in favour of Europe and the Americas. It did not seem to us to be fair to the countries of Asia and Africa, but we appreciated the difficulties of the situation and did not press for any changes. With the growth of the United Nations and with more countries coming into it, that structure today is still more unbalanced. Even so, we wish to proceed slowly and with agreement and not to press for any change which would involve an immediate amendment of the Charter and the raising of heated controversies. Unfortunately, we live in a split world which is constantly coming up against the basic assumptions of the United Nations. We have to bear with this and try to move ever more forward to that conception of full co-operation between nations. That co-operation does not and must not mean any domination of one country by another, any coercion or compulsion forcing any country to line up with another country. Each country has something to give and something to take from others. The moment coercion is exercised, that country's freedom is not only impaired but also its growth suffers.

112. We have to acknowledge that there is great diversity in the world and this variety is good and is to be encouraged, so that each country may grow and its creative impulse may have full play in accordance with its own genius.

113. Hundreds and thousands of years of past history have conditioned us in our respective countries, and our roots go deep down into the soil. If these roots are pulled out, we wither, but if those roots remain strong and we allow the winds from the four quarters to blow in upon us, then they will yield branch and flower and fruit.

114. Many of the speakers from this forum have surveyed the world scene and spoken on a variety of problems. I should like to concentrate on what I consider to be the basic problem of all. If necessity arises we may, with the permission of the President, intervene later with regard to other problems. My own mind is naturally filled with the problems of my own country and our passionate desire to develop and put an end to the poverty and low standards which have been a curse to our hundreds of millions of people. To that end we labour, as indeed other under-developed countries are also doing.

115. Seated here in this tremendous and impressive city of New York, with all the achievements of modern science, technology and human effort, my mind often goes back to our villages in India and my countrymen who live there. We have no desire to imitate or to compete with any other country, but we are firmly resolved to raise the standards of our people and give them the opportunities to lead a good

life. Even though this fills our minds, I do not propose to speak to you on this subject here because there is something else that is of even greater importance, that is, peace.

116. Without peace all our dreams vanish and are reduced to ashes. The Charter of the United Nations declares our determination "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", and "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights... and for these ends to practise tolerance and live together in peace and with one another as good neighbours".

117. The main purpose of the United Nations is to build up a world without war, a world based on the co-operation of nations and peoples. It is not merely a world where war is kept in check for a balancing of armed forces. It is much deeper than that. It is a world from which the major causes of war have been removed and social structures built up which further peaceful co-operation within a nation as well as between nations.

118. In the preamble to the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization it is stated that wars begin in the minds of men. That is essentially true, and ultimately it is necessary to bring about this change in our minds and to remove fears and apprehensions, hatreds and suspicions.

119. Disarmament is a part of this process for it will create an atmosphere helpful to co-operation. But it is only a step towards our objective, a part of the larger effort to rid the world of war and the causes of war. In the present context, however, disarmament becomes of very special importance for us all, overriding all others. But we must always remember that even in pursuing disarmament we have to keep in view our larger purpose.

120. For many years past there has been talk of disarmament, and some progress has undoubtedly been made in so far as plans and proposals are concerned. But still we find that the armaments race continues, and so also the effort to find ever more powerful engines of destruction. Fear and hatred overshadow the world. If even a small part of this effort was directed to the search for peace, probably the problem of disarmament would have been solved by this time. Apart from the moral imperative of peace, every practical consideration leads us to that conclusion, for as everyone knows, the choice today in this nuclear age is one between utter annihilation and the destruction of civilization, or of some way to have peaceful coexistence between nations. There is no middle way.

121. The world consists of a great variety of nations and peoples differing in their ideas and urges and in their economic development. All of them desire peace and progress for their people, and yet many of them are afraid of each other and therefore cannot concentrate on the quest of peace. We must recognize this variety of opinion and objectives in the world and not seek to coerce or compel others to function according to our own particular way. The moment there is an attempt at coercion, there is fear and conflict and the seeds of war are sown. That is the basic philosophy underlying the attempt to avoid military or other violent methods for the solution of problems. That is the main reason which impels those countries who are called "unaligned" to avoid military pacts.

122. If war then is an abomination and the ultimate crime which has to be avoided and combated, then we must fashion our minds and policies accordingly and not hesitate because of our fears to take steps forward. There may be risks but the greatest risk is to allow the present dangerous drift to continue. To achieve peace we have to try to develop a climate of peace and tolerance and to avoid speech and action which tend to increase fear and hatred.

123. It may not be possible to reach full disarmament in one step, though every step should be conditioned to that end. Much has already been done in these discussions of disarmament; but the sands of time run out and we dare not play about with this or delay its consideration. That, indeed, is the main duty of the United Nations today, and if it fails in this, the United Nations fails in its main purpose.

124. We live in an age of great revolutionary changes brought about by the advance of science and technology. Therein lies hope for the world and also the danger of sudden death. Because of these advances the time we have for controlling the forces of destruction is strictly limited. If within the next three or four years effective disarmament is not agreed to and implemented, then it may be too late and all the good will in the world will not be able to stop the drift to certain disaster. We may not therefore delay or postpone the consideration of this vital problem.

125. In the context of things today, two great nations, the United States and the Soviet Union, hold the key to war and peace. Theirs is a great responsibility. But every country, small or big, is concerned in this matter of peace and war and therefore every country must shoulder this responsibility and work to this end.

126. It is easy to criticize the action or inaction of any country; but this criticism does not help us much; it only increases tension and fear, and nations take up rigid attitudes from which it is difficult to dislodge them. The issues before the world are too vital to be left to a few countries only or to be affected by personal likes or dislikes. In order to deal with these big issues effectively we have to take big and impersonal views. It is only the United Nations as a whole that can ultimately solve this problem.

127. Therefore, while all efforts towards disarmament must be welcomed, the United Nations should be closely associated with them. The question of disarmament has been considered at various levels. There is general disarmament and the ending of test explosions of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. So far as test explosions are concerned, considerable progress has been made by the Conference^{2/} which has been meeting in Geneva. Indeed, it would appear that an agreement has been reached there on many basic issues and only a little more effort is needed to complete this agreement. I suggest that a final agreement on the subject should be reached as early as possible. That is not, strictly speaking, disarmament, but undoubtedly any such agreement will bring a large measure of relief to the world.

128. Disarmament must include the prohibition of the manufacture, storage and use of weapons of mass destruction, as well as the progressive limitation of conventional weapons. It is well to remember that there

is a great deal of common ground already covered, and the various proposals made by different countries indicate this common ground, but certain important questions have not yet been solved. Behind all this lies the fear of a surprise attack and of any one country becoming stronger than the other in the process of disarmament. It is admitted that disarmament should take place in such stages as to maintain broadly the balance of armed power. It is on this basis only that success can be achieved and this pervading sense of fear countered.

129. There is an argument as to whether disarmament should precede controls or whether controls should precede disarmament. This is a strange argument, because it is perfectly clear that disarmament without controls is not a feasible proposition. It is even more clear that controls without disarmament have no meaning. The whole conception of controls comes in only because of disarmament. It is not proposed, I hope, to have controls of existing armaments and thus in a way to perpetuate those armaments. It must therefore be clearly understood that disarmament and a machinery for control must go together, and neither of these can be taken up singly. It seems very extraordinary to me that great nations should argue about priorities in this matter and make that a reason for not going ahead. Therefore, both questions should be tackled simultaneously and as parts of a single problem.

130. Success may not come immediately, but it is, I think, of the greatest importance that there should be no gap, no discontinuity, in our dealing with this problem. Once there is discontinuity, this will lead to a rapid deterioration of the present situation and it will be much more difficult to start afresh.

131. A proposal [A/C.1/L.251] has been made that this question of disarmament should be referred to a group of experts. One can have no objection to such a reference, but, in fact, experts have been considering this matter during the past many years and we have the advantage of their views. In any event, any reference to a committee of experts should not lead to any postponement of the major issue. Any such delay would be disastrous. Possibly while the major issues are being considered by the United Nations commissions or other committees, a reference of any particular special aspect might be made to the experts. What is important is that the United Nations at this present juncture should ensure that there is adequate machinery for promoting disarmament and this machinery should function continuously from now onwards.

132. The fear of surprise attacks or accidental happenings leading to dangerous consequences is undoubtedly present. That itself is a reflection of the climate of cold war in which unfortunately we are living. The best way to deal with this fear is to reduce this international tension and create an atmosphere which will make it very difficult for any surprise attack to take place. In that atmosphere, even some accidental happening may not lead to a final crisis.

133. In addition to this, such other steps as may be considered necessary for the prevention of surprise attacks should be taken. Thus, if there is an agreement on the subject of nuclear tests and the use of vehicles immediately the danger from surprise attacks will be greatly lessened.

^{2/} Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons. The Conference began its work on 31 October 1958.

134. While disarmament is by far the most important and urgent problem before the United Nations and is a subject which brooks no delay, we have to face today a situation in Africa, in the Congo (Leopoldville), which has led the United Nations to assume heavy and novel responsibilities. Everyone present here, I am sure, warmly welcomes the coming of independence to many parts of Africa and to many peoples there who have suffered untold agony for ages past. We can see very well that the United Nations has shown its readiness to help them in various ways.

135. There are three aspects of these African problems. First, there is the full implementation of the independence and freedom that have been achieved. Secondly, there is the liberation of those countries in Africa which are still under colonial domination. This has become an urgent task. Today, some of these countries are almost cut off from the outside world and even news is not allowed to reach us. From such accounts as we have, the fate of the people there is even worse than we have known in other parts of Africa. Thirdly, there is the question of some countries in Africa which are independent, but where that freedom is confined to a minority and the great majority have no share in it and, indeed, are suppressed politically, socially and racially in defiance of everything that the United Nations and the world community stand for. Racism and the doctrine of the master race dominating over others can be tolerated no longer and can only lead to vast racial conflicts.

136. Recent developments in Africa have indicated the great danger of delay. It is not possible any longer to maintain colonial domination in any of these countries, and I think it is the duty and the basic responsibility of the United Nations to expedite this freedom. There is a tremendous ferment all over the continent of Africa, and this has to be recognized and appreciated and met with foresight and wisdom.

137. The question of the Republic of the Congo has come before us especially and cast on the United Nations difficult responsibilities. The first thing that strikes one is the utter failure of the colonial system which left the Congo in its present state. Long years of colonial rule resulted in extracting vast wealth from that country for the enrichment of the colonial Power, while the people of the country remained utterly poor and backward.

138. What is the role of the United Nations in the Congo? The situation there is a complicated and frequently changing one, and it is not always easy to know what is happening. Disruptive forces have been let loose and have been encouraged by people who do not wish well to this newly independent State. Some footholds of the old colonialism are still engaged in working to this end. It appears that many thousands of Belgians, including military men, are still in the Congo, more especially in Katanga Province. Because of past colonial history, this is particularly unfortunate and is likely to be considered a continuation of occupation, by whatever name it may be called. Also, it is an encouragement to the disruption of the State. We must realize that it is essential to maintain the integrity of the Congo for, if there is disintegration of the State, this is bound to lead to internal civil war on a large scale. There will be no peace in the Congo except on the basis of the integrity of the State. Foreign countries must particularly avoid any interference in these internal affairs or encouragement to one faction against another.

139. The role of the United Nations is a mediatory one: to reconcile and to help in the proper functioning of the Central Government. Help in the development of the Congo is again a tremendous and long-term problem. Ultimately it is the people of the Congo who will have to produce their own leadership, whether it is good or bad. Leadership cannot be imposed, and any attempt to do so will lead to conflict. The United Nations obviously cannot act all the time as policeman, nor should any outside Power intervene. There is at present an elected Parliament in the Congo, though it does not appear to be functioning. I think that it should be the function of the United Nations to help this Parliament to meet and function so that, out of its deliberations, the problems of the Congo may be dealt with by the people themselves. Decisions must be those of the Parliament as representing the people of the Congo, and not of others. The functioning of Parliament may itself lead to the ironing out of internal differences. I hope that it will be possible soon for the Congo to take its place in the Assembly of the United Nations.

140. The Security Council has repeatedly laid stress on Belgian military personnel's leaving the Congo. These decisions have apparently not been given full effect. This is highly undesirable. It seems to me of great importance, in view both of past history and present conditions, that every type of Belgian military or semi-military personnel should leave the Congo. The General Assembly might well consider sending a delegation to the Congo to find out what foreign troops or other personnel, apart from those sent on behalf of the United Nations, are still there and how far they are interfering in local affairs.

141. Recently an emergency special session of the General Assembly considered the situation in the Congo and made certain suggestions. I think that the resolution [1474 (ES-IV)] adopted by the emergency special session has rightly indicated the broad lines of approach, and the basic principles laid down in it should be implemented.

142. The Congo situation has emphasized the increasing responsibilities of the United Nations. Not only have military forces been sent there, but the problem of the development of a huge country has become partly the responsibility of the United Nations. These responsibilities cannot be shirked, and it may have to be considered how best to shoulder these responsibilities.

143. Two aspects have to be borne in mind. The broad policies in these grave matters must be laid down by the General Assembly or by the Security Council. In so far as executive action is concerned, it would not be desirable for the executive to be weakened when frequent and rapid decisions have to be made. That would mean an abdication of the responsibilities undertaken by the United Nations. If the executive itself is split up and pulls in different directions, it will not be able to function adequately or with speed. For that reason, the executive should be given authority to act within the terms of the directions issued. At the same time the executive has to keep in view all the time the impact of various forces in the world, for we must realize that unfortunately we live in a world where there are many pulls in different directions. The Secretary-General might well consider what organizational steps should be taken to deal adequately with this novel situation. It has been suggested

that some structural changes should take place in the United Nations. Probably some changes would be desirable, as I have indicated above, and because of the emergence of many independent countries in Asia and Africa. But any attempt at bringing about these structural changes by an amendment of the Charter at the present juncture is likely to raise many controversial questions and thus add greatly to the difficulties we face.

144. It should be possible for us, even within the terms of the Charter, to adapt the United Nations machinery to meet situations as they arise, in view more especially of the increasing responsibilities of the United Nations.

145. If, as I earnestly hope, disarmament makes progress, then another domain of vast responsibility will come to the United Nations. It will have to be carefully considered how this responsibility is to be discharged. Possibly several special commissions, working together under the umbrella of the United Nations, might be charged with this task.

146. I have referred to the situation in Africa and to the Congo, as it is an immediate issue for us, but I should like to make it clear that neither this immediate issue nor any other should be allowed to delay the consideration of what I consider the most vital issue facing us in the world, that is, the disarmament issue.

147. I do not propose to deal with many other matters here but, in view of the controversy that is at present going on in the General Assembly, I should like to refer briefly to the question of the proper representation of China in the United Nations. For a number of years India has brought this issue before the United Nations because we have felt that it was not only improper for this great and powerful country to remain unrepresented but that this had an urgent bearing on all world problems, and especially those of disarmament.

148. We hold that all countries must be represented in the United Nations. We have welcomed during this session many new countries. It appears most extraordinary that any argument should be advanced to keep out China and to give the seat meant for China to those who certainly do not and cannot represent China.

149. It is well known that we in India have had and are having, a controversy with the Government of the People's Republic of China about our frontiers. In spite of that controversy, we continue to feel that proper representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is essential, and the longer we delay it the more harm we cause to the United Nations and to the consideration of the major problems we have before us. This is not a question of liking or disliking, but of doing the right and proper thing.

150. In this connexion, I should like to mention another country, Mongolia. When we are, rightly, admitting so many countries to the United Nations, why should Mongolia be left out? What wrong has it done, what violation of the Charter? Here is a quiet and peaceful people working hard for its progress, and it seems to me utterly wrong from any point of principle to exclude it from this great Organization.

151. India has a special sentiment in regard to Mongolia, because our relations go back into the distant past of more than 1,500 years. Even now there are many evidences of those old contacts and friendly re-

lations between these two countries. I would earnestly recommend that Mongolia be accepted in this world assembly of nations.

152. There is one other matter to which I should like to refer, and that is Algeria. It has been a pain and a torment to many of us in Asia, as in Africa and possibly elsewhere, to witness this continuing tragedy of a brave people fighting for its freedom. Many arguments have been advanced and many difficulties pointed out, but the basic fact is that the people have struggled continuously for many years at tremendous sacrifice and against heavy odds to attain independence. Once or twice it appeared that the struggle might end satisfactorily in freedom by the exercise of self-determination, but the moment slipped by and the tragedy continued. I am convinced that every country in Asia and Africa and, I believe, many countries in other continents also, are deeply concerned over this matter and hope earnestly that this terrible war will end, bringing freedom in its train for the Algerian people. This is an urgent problem to which the United Nations must address itself in order to bring about an early solution.

153. Two or three days ago [880th meeting] I presented, on behalf of Ghana, the United Arab Republic, Indonesia, Yugoslavia and India, a draft resolution [A/4522] to the General Assembly. That draft resolution is a simple one and requires little argument to support it. It does not seek to prejudice any issue. It does not seek to bring pressure to bear on any country or individual. There is no cynicism in it. The main purpose of that draft resolution is to avoid a deadlock in the international situation. Every representative present here knows how unsatisfactory that situation is today and how gradually every door and window for the discussion of vital issues is being closed and bolted.

154. As the draft resolution says, we are deeply concerned with the recent deterioration in international relations, which threatens the world with grave consequences. There can be no doubt that people everywhere in the world look to the Assembly to take some step to help to ease the situation and lessen world tension. If the Assembly is unable to take that step, there will be utter disappointment everywhere, and not only will the deadlock continue but there will be a drift in a direction from which it will become increasingly difficult to turn back.

155. The Assembly cannot allow itself to be paralysed in a matter of such vital importance. The responsibility for this deadlock has to be shared by all of us, but in the circumstances as they exist in the world today a great deal depends upon the two mighty nations, the United States and the Soviet Union, and if even a small step could be taken by them the world would heave a sigh of relief. We do not expect that by the renewal of contacts between these two great countries some solution is likely to emerge. We do not underrate the difficulties of realizing all this, and after giving a great deal of thought to these matters we decided to share our apprehension with the Assembly and to suggest this step which undoubtedly will help to ease tension.

156. The draft resolution has not been placed before this Assembly to add to the controversies already existing, nor to embarrass anyone, but solely with the desire, anxiously felt, that something must be done.

We cannot meet here in this Assembly and sit helplessly by, watching the world drift in a direction which can only end in catastrophe.

157. Last night I received a letter [A/4529] from the President of the United States in which he was good enough to deal with this draft resolution. I presume that the other sponsors of this draft resolution have also received a similar reply. This reply has appeared in the Press. I am grateful to the President for writing to me in reply immediately after receiving our communication. Although this reply does not indicate that any contacts such as we have recommended are likely to take place in the near future, I should like to point out to this Assembly that the President has not wholly rejected the idea.

158. The door is still open for consideration, and the President of the United States has expressed his deep anxiety to help in the lessening of international tensions. The President has pointed out that:

"...the chief problems in the world today are not due to differences between the Soviet Union and the United States alone, and therefore are not possible of solution on a bilateral basis.

"The questions which are disrupting the world at the present time are of immediate and vital concern to other nations as well." [A/4529.]

159. May I respectfully express my complete agreement with what the President has said? We are convinced that these great questions cannot be dealt with on a bilateral basis, or even by a group of countries. They are of intimate and vital concern to the entire world and to all those who have gathered here at this General Assembly session from the four corners of the earth. It was because of this feeling that some of us ventured to put this draft resolution before the General Assembly. If the matter were of concern only to two countries, then perhaps no necessity would have arisen for us to raise it here. Nor did we think that a mere renewal of contacts would lead to some magical solution. Such a solution will come only after long and arduous labour in which many countries participate. But we did think that, in this present situation of dangerous drift, even a small approach on behalf of the two great representatives of two great countries would make a difference and might mark a turn of the tide.

160. Oppressed by the growing anger and bitterness in international relations, we wanted to find some way

out, so that further consideration might be given to these problems. We have suggested no remedy, no particular solution, in our draft resolution. But we did feel, and we still feel, that the General Assembly should consider this problem and try its utmost to find a way to remove the new barriers that have arisen.

161. As the President of the United States has rightly stated, the importance of these matters is such as to go beyond personal or official relations between any two individuals. We are dealing with the future of humanity, and no effort which might improve the present situation should be left undone. It was with that intention that we put forward the draft resolution, as a part of the efforts that should be made to open the door for future consultations, not only between the two eminent individuals who are mentioned in the draft resolution, but by the world community.

162. I earnestly appeal to the General Assembly to adopt the draft resolution unanimously at an early date, and I trust that it will do so. In this world, enveloped and bedevilled by the cold war and all its progeny, with problems awaiting urgent solution, I have ventured to add my voice in appeal. I do believe that the vast majority of people in every country want us to labour for peace and to succeed. Whether we are large or small, we have to face large issues, issues vital to the future of humanity. Everything else is of lesser importance than this major question. I am absolutely convinced that we shall never solve this question by war or by the mental approach which envisages war and prepares for it. I am equally convinced that if we aim at the right ends right means must be employed. Good will not emerge out of evil methods. That was a lesson which our great leader, Gandhi, taught us—and, though we in India have failed in many ways in following his advice, something of his message still clings to our minds and hearts.

163. In ages long past, a great son of India, the Buddha, said that the only real victory is one in which all are equally victorious and there is defeat for no one. In the world today, that is the only practical victory. Any other way will lead to disaster. It is therefore this real victory of peace, in which all are winners, that I should like the Assembly to keep before it and to endeavour to achieve.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.