



Thursday, 13 November 1952, at 3 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	263

Speeches by Mr. Sourdis (Colombia), Mr. Ammoun (Lebanon), Mr. Jooste (Union of South Africa), Mr. Eban (Israel), Mr. Entezam (Iran), Mr. Al-Jamali (Iraq) and Mr. Zeineddine (Syria)

President: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).

General debate (*continued*)

[Agenda item 8]

SPEECHES BY MR. SOURDIS (COLOMBIA), MR. AMMOUN (LEBANON), MR. JOOSTE (UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA), MR. EBAN (ISRAEL), MR. ENTEZAM (IRAN), MR. AL-JAMALI (IRAQ) AND MR. ZEINEDDINE (SYRIA)

1. Mr. SOURDIS (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): At the outset, may I discharge the pleasant duty of expressing to each and all the representatives of Member States of the United Nations the gratitude of my country, and particularly of the delegation which I have the honour to lead, for the election of Colombia to the Security Council. We shall endeavour, in the Council, to further the aims which justify the existence of the United Nations, and we shall also try by all means within our power to promote agreement among the members of the Council and to see whether the iron system which sometimes paralyses it by the frequent use of the right of the veto may in this way be eliminated.

2. I must also express to the Secretary-General, Mr. Trygve Lie, my delegation's appreciation of the invaluable service he has rendered to the cause of the United Nations and our hopes that the problem which has arisen as a result of his resignation may be satisfactorily settled.

3. At the fifth session of the General Assembly, the head of our delegation, Mr. Roberto Urdaneta Arbeláez, now President of Colombia, expressed our ideas on the nature and scope of the general debate in terms which I shall, if you will permit me, repeat in the belief that they are most timely. I quote: "The practice of beginning sessions of the Assembly with a general debate should be recognized as affording the governments represented here an opportunity to state early in the session their attitude on the most important items on the agenda; thus an idea may be obtained of the general outline of the proceedings of the most important organ of the United Nations, and the world, anxious to learn the views of the Assembly, can without

delay, form an opinion concerning the objectives of the Member States of the Organization and the responsibilities each one of them is prepared to assume".¹

4. Following this trend of thought, I think that statements in this kind of debate can be made with the utmost clarity and simplicity if we examine the items on the agenda in the light of the principles which inspired the establishment of the United Nations in 1945. A cursory glance at the first few pages of the Charter suffices to show that its postulates comprise what may be called without exaggeration the first code in the world with respect to human rights, moral principles and principles of good relations among nations for the purpose of ensuring universal and lasting peace. There are to be found all the standards which, if dispassionately and sincerely applied, could easily lead to the attainment of the aims upon which the Organization rests. These principles, with which you are all familiar, can be rapidly summarized as follows: to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, as the creature of God, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small; to uphold justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law; to promote social progress and better standards of life for workers in larger freedom; to encourage peoples to practise tolerance and to live together in peace with one another as good neighbours; to unite the strength of the nations to maintain international peace and security; to institute methods to ensure that armed force shall no be used save in the common interest; to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples; to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace; to suppress, by armed force, if necessary, any acts of aggression or breaches of the peace; to settle by peaceful means any situation which might lead to a breach of the peace;

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 285th meeting, para. 148.

to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples; to encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion; to fulfil in good faith the obligations arising out of the United Nations Charter; to settle all international controversies by peaceful means; to refrain from the threat or use of force against the integrity of independence of any State; to give assistance in any action in accordance with the Charter, and to refrain from giving assistance to any State against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

5. We shall not easily find a nobler, stronger or simpler statement of a body of international principles capable, if applied, of preserving mankind from the tragic and disturbing threat of war. When we consider the work so far accomplished by the United Nations, the enthusiasm engendered by the excellence of those principles must inevitably be darkened with some degree of scepticism in view of the patent fact that many of the previous declarations of nations have been forgotten, and even in some cases violated, by their conduct. The Colombian delegation has, of course, no intention of taking advantage of this general debate to make specific criticisms of particular countries, but it is a fact that wherever we look we find that one or more of these fundamental principles have been flouted.

6. In the Far East, a peaceful country is the victim of unprovoked aggression. Elsewhere we hear the protests of an oppressed minority. In other parts of the world there are peoples demanding that the principle of self-determination shall be respected. Everywhere there is a cry for more effective economic and social technical assistance while, as time goes on, the limitation of armaments and subsequent disarmament seem to be impossible. Does this mean that we have lost faith in the great mission of the United Nations? It does not! As far as my country is concerned, my delegation can say, without false pride, that Colombia continues to have unwavering faith in the United Nations and in the great future it will enjoy if we are prepared, in the words of the Charter, to fulfil in good faith the obligations we assumed on signing it at San Francisco.

7. Disheartening as these facts may be, the United Nations has achieved one thing which in itself compensates for all the failures and discouragements and sustains our confidence in the future of the world under the guidance of the Organization. The old secret diplomacy, in which only a few States participated, in which public opinion played no part and the peoples were ignored, has, thanks to the United Nations, disappeared and been replaced by what may be called an "open-door diplomacy", in which the whole world participates, with the peoples of the world as spectators to judge our every action. The discussion of great international questions in meetings open to all has the inestimable advantage that our work is accompanied by the building up of world public opinion, which is an imponderable element of enormous importance for the satisfactory progress of world history. That fact alone, even if there were no others, would of itself be enough to confirm our unshaken faith in the efficacy of our Organization and our confidence in its dazzling future.

8. Turning to the specific items on the agenda, I propose to select and to say a few words about those which the delegation of Colombia considers to be most important and timely, since for practical reasons it is impossible to review the whole of our heavy programme of work. I propose, therefore, to glance briefly at the following: economic and social measures; admission of new Members; the question of the Union of South Africa; Tunis and Morocco; Korea and collective security; the limitation of armaments.

9. I shall start with economic and social measures. I should like to explain the Colombian delegation's views with regard to the application of Article 55 of the Charter in connexion with the economic development of the under-developed countries to promote "higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development". Colombia considers that these goals which the United Nations seeks to attain by means of international co-operation are essential to the maintenance of a genuine spirit of international solidarity, understanding and co-operation. The experience gained in the economic development of Colombia which is now proceeding provides striking proof of the value of international co-operation in this matter. At the same time, the anticipated results of the full development of our national resources show how desirable it is that such co-operation should be substantially and steadily increased.

10. The economic development of Colombia is being carried out along the lines recommended by the United Nations, since our efforts to develop our economy are being backed by financial assistance from both international bodies and private foreign investors and by external technical assistance. I refer to the execution, which is now proceeding, of Colombia's programme of national economic development, which was prepared on the basis of the studies undertaken by the mission sent by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and reviewed by a non-political committee of Colombian economists. This programme is being put into effect with the help of foreign loans and foreign experts, which help has been obtained in conformity with the spirit of the United Nations. The most important loans are those made by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the reconstruction of trunk highways and the construction of the river Magdalena railway, an undertaking of special economic significance to Colombia, and the loan granted by the Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas to the Paz del Rio iron and steel works, another undertaking of the greatest importance. We have also received constant assistance from the Export-Import Bank. As regards technical assistance, many experts whose services have been secured under agreements between my Government and the United Nations and specialized agencies are in Colombia co-operating in the execution of the plan. Experts furnished by the Organization of American States and the United States Government are also co-operating. In its present development programme, Colombia has thus received assistance from three different international programmes of technical assistance—the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, the programme of the Organization of American States and the Point Four programme.

11. From the outset, the economic development programme in Colombia has produced positive results contributing towards the improvement of economic and social conditions. For example, we have achieved real economic and monetary stability and a steady increase in agricultural and industrial production. These results are the outcome of a great many co-ordinated measures, including monetary control, exchange reform, selective credit measures, rationalization of the budget, the freeing of foreign trade and the provision of export incentives. To carry out the plan, a national planning committee, consisting of qualified statesmen belonging to the leading political parties, has been set up. A very important aspect of our economic development plan is the encouragement of private foreign investments. With this end in view, legislation was recently enacted approving new regulations regarding foreign capital and providing the broadest guarantees in regard to non-discriminatory treatment, complete freedom of investment in all sectors and the right to export capital and profits at any time. In view of these regulations and existing conditions in Colombia, it is reasonable to hope that foreign private capital will make an increasingly important contribution to our development.

12. At the present time, foreign investments in Colombia amount to over \$400 million, and a great many United States and European companies have started operations in Colombia in the course of this year. Since capital is by nature cautious and retiring, the figure affords a striking indication of the social stability enjoyed by Colombia. Of course, the increase in foreign investments also depends on factors beyond the control of my country, such as the taxation imposed in the United States and other countries on capital invested abroad, which we should like to see reduced in the interests of international economic co-operation. Given the satisfactory results of the collective assistance furnished to the Colombian economic development programme, my delegation wholeheartedly supports any action to strengthen such co-operation in the form of financing from public and private sources and the provision of technical assistance.

13. As one effective example of international co-operation for economic development, I must mention the success of the Expert Working Group on Iron and Steel Industry in Latin America convened by the Economic Commission for Latin America at Bogota last October. Twenty American and European countries sent delegations of the most distinguished persons in the realm of science, and there was a fruitful discussion of eighty-five papers on conditions and prospects in this basic industry.

14. As regards the admission of new Members, the Colombian delegation can only affirm the theory that, under Articles 4 and 27 of the Charter, the Assembly can admit a new Member even after a veto in the Security Council, if the other members of the Council, whether permanent or not permanent, voted for the recommendation for the admission of the new Member. My delegation which has just received the high honour of being elected to the Security Council by one of the highest votes on record, felt bound to express its opinion on this subject. We cannot accept an interpretation of those articles in accordance with other criteria than those which they themselves define in

language which is crystal clear. In the same way, we believe that when the Security Council, owing to the circumstances already referred to, fails to reach agreement on this subject, the General Assembly acquires competence to deal with it. One of the primary purposes of the United Nations should be to achieve absolute universality, which is impossible unless all countries meeting the requirements of Articles 4 and 27 can be admitted. Such countries as Italy, Portugal, Spain—though this last has not applied for admission—Austria and others, which have made so outstanding and decisive a contribution to human progress that the history of mankind could not have been written without them, are excluded from the Organization.

15. With regard to the question of the Union of South Africa, I have no intention of dealing with the substance of this thorny problem, since there will be an opportunity to do so in the committee, but I should like to refer to it because the solution found is of the utmost importance to respect for the dignity of the human person and the right of men to live in freedom which allows them freely to shape their own destiny. I do not wish in any way to criticize the illustrious South African nation, whose citizens have some most excellent qualities. I wish only, without criticizing or slighting anyone, to place on record my delegation's hope that with the co-operation and consent of that nation, we shall find a just formula which will in no way impair another principle of equal importance, that of non-interference in the domestic affairs of countries, to which Colombia has faithfully adhered since the first days of its independence and to which it will continue to adhere.

16. The questions of Tunisia and Morocco are similar. Here we are concerned directly with the so-called colonial policy, concerning which Colombia, as a result of its own history, has ideas and views which I need not repeat this afternoon. But although this historical reason may seem inadequate to some, I should also recall that the settlement of this problem is directly related to another fundamental principle of the United Nations. I fully realize, and I should like to say as clearly as I can, that it is one thing to formulate principles in the abstract and another to apply them in practice to concrete cases, many of which present complications that cannot easily be dealt with. As in the case of South Africa, my delegation is ready to co-operate in any solution which may meet with the approval of the parties concerned, because we are convinced that only thus can we achieve lasting settlement and preserve the essential principle of non-interference.

17. As for the Korean situation, we may regard it as the crucial question facing the Assembly at its seventh session, since it is a sad fact that in that question every principle of the Charter has been violated; at the same time, we can console ourselves with the thought that there is no question in which the future of the United Nations is so much at stake or in which the principal machinery for the preservation of world peace is being so thoroughly employed. This is not a case of imperialist war or of war for purposes of conquest. It is not a case of one national army fighting another. In Korea, perhaps for the first time in the history of mankind, the principle of collective security

and defence against aggression is being put to the test. The soldiers of the United Nations, under the Unified Command, are engaged, not in an international war, in the old meaning of that expression, but in what should rather be called a police action, to defend a State against unjust aggression and to engage in open warfare for the victory of the principles which guide and inspire the United Nations. It is this moral fact which confers upon the United Nations in its battle in Korea an authority which should in itself have been sufficient to bring the conflict to an end.

18. Since, as the States which are now closing the door to any possibility of concluding an armistice admit, the treatment of prisoners of war is the only remaining obstacle, the Colombian delegation can state its opinion on this point briefly and precisely. We consider that the prisoners should be released and repatriated, not by force, but in accordance with their wishes. We should like to express our earnest hope that in the debate now proceeding on this matter in the First Committee, a satisfactory formula may be found to answer the prayer of all the peoples of the world that this tragic bloodshed may be brought to an end.

19. I come now to the question of the limitation of armaments. The intervention of a country like Colombia in a problem of such immense complexity as the limitation of armaments and the resulting disarmament may seem somewhat out of place, because it is not the small countries which decide whether there is to be peace or war. But the fact that Colombia is a Member of the United Nations and one of the seventeen countries whose troops and warships are serving under the United Nations Unified Command and fighting the Korean war to defend collective security against aggression qualifies me, I believe, to make a few comments on this item on the agenda. Furthermore, the fact that Colombia is a small country places it in the happy position of being able to act with impartiality and without passion.

20. It has been said many times that if the great Powers were to devote to the organization and maintenance of peace the energy they devote to preparing for war, the destiny of man would be changed and the primary objective of the United Nations would be much nearer attainment. Consider for a moment how many social and economic schemes to raise the standard of living of the under-developed peoples could be successfully completed with even a fraction of the sums now being spent by the great Powers for war-like purposes. It is in the light of these considerations, of these arguments, that mankind must face the most tragic and terrible of questions—the alarming development of modern armament technique since science succeeded in harnessing nuclear energy.

21. Man is the only animal in creation endowed to some extent with the highly dangerous power of freeing himself from the laws of nature and even modifying them. The use of that power for good or evil sets his greatest moral problem. For the first time, man is in a position to make a weapon of such destructive power that he can not only instantly destroy his enemy, but may even end the history of mankind upon the earth by annihilating the human race. It is tragic that not even that prospect can make the great Powers regard

with awe and fear the employment of a weapon of destruction which may not only endanger the temporal life of men but even threatens the spiritual destiny of mankind.

22. My excuse for this digression is the profound anxiety with which the peaceful peoples of the earth regard the present frenzied armaments race. Only the implementation of the recommendations of previous sessions of the General Assembly regarding the limitation of armaments and disarmament can deliver mankind from this horrifying prospect.

23. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to express its most sincere wish for the success of the seventh session of the General Assembly. We promise other Member States to co-operate with them by complying unflinchingly with decisions validly taken by the Assembly and by the representative organs of the United Nations.

24. Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): Every year since this Organization came into existence, the confidence in it of the peoples of the world has been put to a very severe test. Lofty principles have been proclaimed, solemn resolutions adopted, but every meeting of the representatives of the nations has brought new disappointments and disillusionment to the world. Mankind's hopes, expressed at San Francisco, for a better world governed by the precepts of international morality and the principles of justice, are growing fainter day by day and at each session. What is more, the threat of war is looming on the horizon and the nations live in fear; in an atmosphere of extreme tension. The instrument devised for the defence of peace seems to be powerless before the mortal danger of a new conflict.

25. This threat hanging over the world is paralysing its economic and social development. A large part of man's every-day labour is being devoted to military preparations and the financing of defence. The armaments race between the great Powers is bringing with it an additional outlay in capital and manpower which might otherwise have been devoted to the economic life and to general welfare. The great Powers are not the only ones that feel the consequences of this outlay of energy. All countries particularly those known as the under-developed countries, are suffering very badly from the shortage of raw materials and the rise in prices.

26. It is said that the United Nations has done a great deal in the economic and social fields, but we are now in a position where the uncertainty of life in many countries, and political anxiety, have dealt a heavy blow to the plans of our Organization.

27. Must we believe, in the face of this failure in the political as well as the economic field, that our Organization, which came to life at the end of one of the most horrible wars and was set up to prevent any repetition of such events, had in it the seeds of its own destruction; or should we not rather admit that we ourselves have warped an Organization which was perfectly designed to fulfil our aims?

28. This question comes before us in the midst of the tragic Korean war, which may spread dangerously if it is not speedily ended. If, in the light of these events, we were collectively to examine our consciences as

sincerely as possible, should we not realize that we are to a large extent responsible? Those who drew up the Charter at San Francisco clearly saw the aims we had to pursue. They laid down the principles and provided for the various institutions and organs designed to achieve these aims. But have these principles always been respected without reservation, have these organs and institutions all been established and have they functioned in accordance with the constitutional provisions of the Charter?

29. That is what it all comes down to, and I think that we must hesitate about the answer. The General Assembly has given serious attention to this question since 1949. At its fourth session, it adopted a resolution [290 (IV)] entitled "Essentials of peace", in which it stated that disregard of the principles of the Charter was primarily responsible for the continuance of international tension. The Assembly realized the necessity of repeating that serious statement at its fifth session, in the resolution [377 (V)] entitled "Uniting for peace", of 3 November 1950. We have, therefore, all admitted in these two resolutions adopted in two successive years that the fundamental principles of our Charter have not been universally observed, and we have twice emphasized that the non-observance of these principles is the primary reason for the continuance of international tension.

30. This, as I said, is a serious conclusion, but the Assembly added to it another, no less serious, in its resolution "Uniting for peace", namely, that the decisions of the United Nations were not being implemented. It stated its conviction that "enduring peace will not be secured solely by collective security arrangements against breaches of international peace and acts of aggression, but that a genuine and lasting peace depends also upon the observance of all the Principles and Purposes established in the Charter of the United Nations, upon the implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and other principal organs of the United Nations intended to achieve the maintenance of international peace and security".

31. In these circumstances, are we not entitled, each time that one or several Members of the United Nations fail to observe the principles that govern us or the resolutions I have just mentioned, to confront them with their responsibilities and urge them to reconsider their attitude? It is our earnest wish that the States to which we must point out the need to observe a certain principle or to implement a certain resolution could convince themselves that the United Nations is acting solely in the higher interests of peace, the brotherhood of peoples and the happiness of mankind. These States must in fact be convinced of this since they gave their full and complete support to the two basic resolutions—"Essentials of peace" and "Uniting for peace"—and thereby emphasized the great importance, the absolute and vital necessity, of observing the principles and decisions of the United Nations in order to ensure the peace.

32. The principle which dominates the whole of our international life is undoubtedly the principle of equality. This basic principle goes to the very roots of our Organization. It is the basis on which the United Nations was built: the equality of races, the equality

of peoples, the equality of individuals. For the United Nations cannot be anything but a society of equals in a universal democracy, as we are and should be in each of our individual countries equal citizens in a national democracy. This equality which the Charter has emphasized by repetition and which constitutes, so to speak, the very soul of our Organization, without which it could not live, this sovereign equality, applicable to all races, nations and individuals, carries with it the triple corollary of non-discrimination on grounds of race, respect for the rights of peoples and respect for the rights of individuals.

33. What attitude has been adopted towards these three related principles, which the Assembly certainly had in mind when it drafted the two resolutions I mentioned before? We realize that the racial problem, with which we shall start, involves formidable difficulties in certain countries, that it is the result of the weighty heritage of centuries, that all peoples have not reached the same stage of culture and social progress. But is not that an added reason for increasing the efforts both on the national level and with the help of the United Nations, to promote that ideal of equality which is at the very basis of our modern civilization? For our Organization can help to apply this principle of non-discrimination on grounds of race, which is set forth in the Charter, in an atmosphere of tranquillity and serenity, by means of the friendly collaboration which should prevail among the peoples and which is one of the aims of the United Nations. Let us not then reject this possibility of collaboration, let the countries concerned generously accept this help which is offered to them.

34. In our view, the rights of peoples raise two problems which deserve very careful consideration: the right of peoples to become Members of our Organization, and the right to self-determination, to decide their own fate.

35. The right to membership in the United Nations is one of the rights that Jean-Jacques Rousseau or Locke, had they thought of it, would have called a natural right. But it is a right, a legal concept, which is of as much interest to the United Nations itself as it is to the country concerned, because its application would ensure universality of membership. This concept presided, as it were, over the birth of our Organization, and if it is applied in a spirit of broad understanding it should ensure the full development of the United Nations. It is, in fact, one of the essential conditions for the smooth functioning of the United Nations that the provisions of Article 4 of the Charter, regarding the admission of new Members, should be carried out in the light of this concept of universality.

36. Obviously, in invoking this principle, we are in no way suggesting that every applicant must be admitted. What we mean is that the criterion of admission should be universally applied, so that all those deserving admission should be admitted. In these circumstances, is it not strange to see the United Nations admit to membership a State which owes its origin to violence, the boundaries of which are uncertain and the territory undetermined, a State which has not yet proved its peaceful aims, whereas other nations are excluded, nations with glorious pasts, such as Italy and Spain, mentioned a short while ago, countries that

gave birth to a legal system which, coming into its full flower, in its own turn, gave birth to our Organization? By what right do the Members of the United Nations exclude these other members of the international community? At a time when protests are being made against racial or religious discrimination, and the United Nations is being called upon to put an end to such discrimination, which still exists in most parts of the world, we have here the United Nations laying itself open to the charge of political discrimination.

37. My delegation does not wish to ignore the difficulties with which the question is fraught in the Security Council; neither does it for the moment wish to consider what would be the best, if not the most effective, way of ending the deadlock. However, it does wish to emphasize that the doors of the United Nations should be wide open to all peace-loving nations. It will be a great day in the United Nations when the countries which are waiting on the threshold are finally given a brotherly welcome.

38. We now come to the right of peoples to self-determination, a right which is mentioned in the request submitted to the General Assembly concerning Tunisia and Morocco by the group of delegations of which mine is one. This right, which was proclaimed more than a century ago in two great revolutions, the French Revolution for the subjugated nations of Europe and the American Revolution for the colonies of the new world, is today being extended to all nations of the world through the Charter. After Europe and America, and responding to their call, Asia and Africa are now awakening. At the call of new ideas, a new life is throbbing through these two vast continents.

39. The Charter, as I said, wishes to extend to all nations this right which was formerly limited to some of them. Two hundred million men await this happy ending. The law-makers of San Francisco were trying, as I said a moment ago, to create a universal society. All the peoples of the world are included in the great concept which led to the creation of the United Nations. Even though certain countries were not considered fit to belong to the United Nations as Members, because they were less advanced or under-developed, or for any other reason, they were not excluded from the universal society. They remain, at different levels, members of the great international family, whether they be bound by international treaties, placed under the Trusteeship System, or simply classified as colonies.

40. While awaiting their independence, these countries, these territories, are under the protection of the United Nations, of which they form an integral part. We cannot, therefore, countenance this plea of lack of competence which was put forward both with regard to the problem of racial discrimination and to the claims of Tunisia and Morocco. I take pleasure in recalling these words of the leader of the United States delegation [380th meeting], that no one "disputes the right of a dependent people to ultimate self-government". "That right", he said, "is enshrined in the Charter, and the obligation to help fulfil that right rests with each of us...". And Mr. Acheson went on to say, in order to express with even greater clarity his concept of the competence of the United Nations: "What is the proper role of the United Nations in these matters?

When specific disagreements arise as to the adequacy of the progress being made by a dependent people toward self-government, the responsibility for settling such matters lies in the first instance with those immediately concerned. This is not to say that the United Nations is without responsibility to assist in the achievement of peaceful solutions."

41. As far as competence is concerned, it has been said that Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter prohibits the United Nations from intervening in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a State. But we know that the competence of the United Nations is the result of a partial abdication of sovereignty by Member States in favour of the Organization. I do not think that anyone will contest this view, which was already accepted at the time of the League of Nations. Consequently, while it is laid down, in Article 2, paragraph 7, that the United Nations is not authorized to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a State, intervention is provided for in certain cases. These cases are in the first place governed by the provisions of Article 73, on Non-Self-Governing Territories. No one has contested the explicit right of the United Nations to supervise the action of the Powers which assume the administration of these territories. But reference should also be made to the text of Articles 10, 11 and 13, which provide that "the General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter", namely, "any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security" or those which contribute to "the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms". These articles, after all, merely promote the ideal of a society in which all nations will collaborate in a spirit of solidarity for the common welfare.

42. It is true that by proclaiming the rights of the less advanced peoples and placing them under its protection, the United Nations has also shown them how to progress towards independence and the stages that they must traverse along the sometimes lengthy road that leads them to it. The freeing of Europe, shaken by revolutions, did not take place in one day. And the Charter, in its provisions which are applicable to the whole world, has indicated the conditions which must be fulfilled by Non-Self-Governing Territories in order to accede to complete sovereignty. Unfortunately, the criterion of independence, implying as it does various concessions and basic reforms, still remains to be decided. That is why our discussions are sometimes tinged with bitterness when we discuss this subject with the administering Powers.

43. The more advanced States, which have been granted the noble privilege of guiding the less developed countries towards the achievement of their legitimate aspirations, have sacred obligations to the international community, to history and to their own conscience. It is to this national conscience of the great peoples, to whom civilization owes so much, that we address our plea for an era of collaboration between them and the United Nations, in a work which is both political and profoundly human.

44. After equality of races and peoples, come the equality of individuals and their fundamental rights. No one can deny the importance of the work of draft-

ing and the publicity which the United Nations is carrying on in that connexion. As I pay tribute to that assiduous and fruitful labour, I should like to express the hope that all States will do their best to grant the earliest possible enjoyment of these rights both to their own nationals and to the populations whom they administer.

45. So far as we are concerned, in Lebanon, we have extended human rights to their utmost limit by granting women the right to vote.

46. I shall not further prolong this review of the principles based on the equality of races, peoples and individuals, the non-observance of which has been recognized as dangerous to the peace of the world.

47. But we have been told that the failure to carry out United Nations resolutions similarly weakens the foundations of international security. That is true in the case of more than one resolution. I do not want to return here to the resolutions on Palestine refugees, a question which has been discussed at length in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and which will be taken up again when the report of the Conciliation Commission for Palestine is examined.

48. Need we, however, recall, session after session, the famous resolution on Jerusalem [303 (IV)], or should we henceforth be silent on the matter? Even had we wished to remain silent, Israel's action would have broken the silence. On the eve of this session, it decided to transfer its Ministry of Foreign Affairs from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. For once, the Powers reacted energetically, and the half-executed decision was revoked. Nevertheless, the failure to carry out this decision endowing Jerusalem and its territory with an international régime is not only a challenge to the United Nations, it is also a constant threat to peace and a dangerous example which already perhaps has had unfortunate consequences. The example and the consequences concern us most in our present discussion. For the occupation of the territory of Jerusalem by armed forces constitutes an act of aggression, in the legal meaning of the word, which has so far gone unpunished. My delegation had occasion to stress that in the discussions on the Korean problem. Indeed, if the system of collective security had been employed to repel aggression in the case of Jerusalem as it was employed two years later in the defence of South Korea, the aggression against the latter might never have taken place. Let us limit ourselves to that reflection and analyse the last question we raised.

49. Have all the agencies and organizations intended to achieve the aims of the United Nations been set up, and have they all functioned in accordance with the provisions of the Charter? On the whole, we should say that they have not. And the resolution of which we have already spoken more than once, entitled "Uniting for peace", also concerned itself with that question by deciding to replace the Security Council by the General Assembly for the implementation of collective security. Clearly, the General Assembly was not satisfied with the working of the security system set up by the Charter. Nor can the Powers have placed their trust in it, since they fell back, to ensure their defence, on regional pacts. Yet that resolution emphasized that to ensure a lasting peace it was not enough to conclude collective security agreements

against breaches of international peace and acts of aggression. It should be remembered, too, that it was the poor functioning or the lack of a system of collective security under the League of Nations which led to the Second World War. It is somewhat disturbing to compare the two crops of regional pacts, one today, the other on the eve of the last war, concluded to compensate for the weaknesses and failures of collective defence. That concept of collective security, the result of centuries of experience, which aims at re-establishing peace in this world torn by dissension and grievous conflicts, is thus subjected to a new test, following that of the League of Nations, on the result of which the future of our Organization and that of humanity for many generations will depend.

50. If it is to be strong and respected, this institution, which is in spite of everything the best weapon of defence we have against aggression, must function whenever peace is threatened or broken. It has been in Korea. But, as we have pointed out, it is not in Korea alone that peace has been endangered. If the United Nations is to be strong in Korea or in any other place in which it may have to exercise its authority, it must not give the impression, true or false, that its action is based on any considerations other than those of reason and law.

51. This institution should also have been supplemented by an organ envisaged in the provisions of the Charter, namely, a strong standing army in the service of the United Nations and its objectives of peace. It is true, as I have already pointed out, that the setting up of an international army, which would be a symbol and organ of United Nations authority, is dependent on the military and moral disarmament of the Powers. Conversely, disarmament appears to be acceptable to certain Powers only if that army, the guarantee of their security, has first been set up. In this vicious circle in which the United Nations finds itself, the provisions of Article 43 *et seq.* of the Charter, remain a dead letter. Are we to assume that these provisions have never been, and in the present state of the world can never be, more than a Utopia, an impossible dream of the legislators of San Francisco?

52. It would appear to be due rather to the disappearance of the spirit of San Francisco, or even more of that of the atmosphere of Yalta. Why should that be, if not because the principles embodied in the Preamble to our Charter are not observed, or are not universally applicable? Although valid in one case, they appear not to be in another. That leads to the emergence of areas of strife and insecurity, to conflicts almost everywhere in the world: in Asia, in Africa and in Europe. For, whatever we may think of it, the world is everywhere divided, and I do not refer only to the great ideological division which separates it into two groups, but to divisions within these two groups.

53. Among the causes of the world's unrest, should we not include the economic cause? The Belgian representative, Mr. Van Zeeland, spoke [392 meeting] with great authority of the economic problems facing Europe. We should have liked economists of his standing to deal with the problems of other parts of the world.

54. Speaking of the division of the world into two great financial areas; the dollar area and the non-dollar

area, he emphasized that the position of a creditor implies duties and obligations as well as rights. For Europe, one consequence of that division was the Marshall plan. But that was for Europe alone. Nevertheless, it has been continually repeated that the countries of the world are all definitely interdependent from an economic point of view. It is in the interests of all to ponder that.

55. Allow me also to bring to the Assembly's attention another problem of world scope, which we may call economic justice. For there is an economic justice, which prescribes that free access for all peoples to the resources of the world should be facilitated and that all countries should be given an equal share in the production of the world to which they contribute.

56. There are countries, however, in particular the undeveloped countries, in respect of which a balance has not yet been achieved between the contribution they make and the profits they receive. Praiseworthy efforts have certainly been made on their behalf. The technical assistance given them by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, by the United Nations and by certain countries, led by the United States, with its generous contribution, deserves due recognition.

57. But there is a great difference between these different countries. The statistics of *per capita* national income are most informative in this regard. Thus, in the United States, the *per capita* national income is nearly \$1,500; in Europe, it varies between \$235 and \$850; and in Asia it is nowhere higher than \$125, except in Lebanon where, at \$140, it is slightly higher than in Brazil.

58. These figures speak for themselves. We have been told here that more than half the peoples of the world are under-nourished and many others on the verge of famine. Is not the vast difference in national productivity largely due to the fact that the natural resources of the under-developed countries and the raw materials they produce have not been sufficiently utilized for their profit? Most of these countries make a great contribution to the production of raw materials. Are they all equitably remunerated for it? That is the crux of the problem, the problem of the better distribution of wealth, which the United Nations must consider in order to find a solution which will safeguard the rights of all.

59. The clouds that are now darkening the horizon cannot hide from us this other aspect of the life of the international community. Economic problems, just as much as power politics, have been at the origin of the two great wars which have endangered civilization. Along with the safeguarding of peace, it is the promotion of well-being and economic justice which must, for the common good, remain the highest objective of the United Nations.

60. If, for the common good, we fervently dedicate ourselves to this objective, no one may apply Bergson's words to us and our Organization, whose benefits we wish to extend to the whole world: "In our overgrown bodies, the soul has remained too small".

61. Mr. JOOSTE (Union of South Africa): First of all, permit me to take this opportunity to associate the South African delegation with the tributes which

have been paid from this rostrum to those who were responsible for the planning and the construction of our permanent headquarters. To them, and to those under whose direction and guidance this gigantic task was performed, we owe a debt of gratitude—and I should like to place on record my Government's recognition of the efficiency with which that task was executed. We now are permanently housed. Our wanderings and temporary arrangements, since 1945, have often had unhappy consequences for our respective exchequers. They could not, also, but have had an unsettling effect on our Organization—and the mere fact that we have now moved into our permanent headquarters may, I believe, enable us to settle down and build solidly on the foundations which were so wisely laid at San Francisco.

62. If there is one thing that characterizes the development of the United Nations during the years since San Francisco, it is the gradual loss of faith by the many millions, the peoples of the United Nations, in the future of the Organization. During the years—the difficult years—since San Francisco, the hope and the faith, which was inspired by our founders, has gradually diminished, until today there is uncertainty—uncertainty on all sides—whether the United Nations can ever fulfil its early promise of creating the conditions and relationships which are essential if the world is to have peace, and mankind is to have that sense of security which is necessary for a full and fruitful life.

63. How could it be otherwise? For how could we expect that faith to continue unimpaired when we consider the facts which surround us, when we observe the continuous process of estrangement, so clearly reflected in our debates, the mounting tensions, due not only to major differences but also to the prosecution of minor feuds and rivalries? When we see all this, how can we expect the peoples of the world to continue believing—believing with unshaken faith—that on its present course the United Nations will ever achieve the high purposes for which it was created?

64. And yet, despite these doubts and fears which beset them, the peoples of the world continue to look to the United Nations as their best hope of achieving world peace and security. The Charter, as drafted at San Francisco, contains all the essential elements to permit of the full development of this Organization into an effective means of ensuring international harmony. The Charter contains the essential elements to enable us to become the most effective bulwark of peace and security.

65. It is therefore not so much the Charter which is at fault. It was framed in a spirit of goodwill and co-operation at San Francisco. It established obligations—and included certain safeguards—and the test of the failure or success of our Organization lies in the manner in which we live up to these obligations and respect these safeguards. It is for us, and especially for those who, in consequence of their larger experience and influence, have been entrusted with leadership, to ensure that we do not stray from that course charted by our founders, in search of other goals which will vitiate our efforts to achieve the primary objective of the Charter, and by so doing lead to certain failure and the inevitable ultimate disintegration of the United Nations.

66. The United Nations was created for the primary purpose of maintaining international peace and security. That system of collective security is the keystone in our Charter, and it is to the development of that system that we must apply ourselves assiduously, at all times eschewing anything and everything which can militate against success in achieving this all-important objective.

67. We can succeed—as indeed we must—if we are to keep faith with those who look to us for peace. This Organization has already given proof of what it can do. It has already shown that it can deal effectively with real threats to the peace. I need but refer to the assistance rendered by it in restoring peace in Greece and in terminating armed conflict in Palestine. I need also but refer to the action taken by the United Nations in repelling aggression in Korea, which is perhaps the best proof we have that this Organization, given the loyal support of its Members and firm leadership by those entrusted with initiative, can still become a real and effective guarantor of peace and security for the future.

68. In order that this may happen however, it is essential that that unity of purpose to which we pledged ourselves originally should be achieved. The present conflict in Korea demonstrates how sadly this unity of purpose is still lacking. Let me say at once that some of our Member States have, of course, been precluded by circumstances peculiar to their own cases from participating actively, and I have no wish to say anything which could be construed as implying criticism of them. But is it not true that there are Member States which have chosen to follow a singularly neutral course, as though the present struggle were one with which they were not directly concerned? In fact, have we not had to witness how some Member States have seen fit to obstruct this great task undertaken by the United Nations in order to fulfil its promise to combat aggression—wherever it might occur? Have we not seen how, in certain cases, they have even seen fit to heap calumny on those who are sacrificing their lives in order that the United Nations may be enabled to give effect to the solemn undertaking explicit in our Charter?

69. No one any longer doubts that had the United Nations refused to act in Korea as it did act, the system of collective security, which is basic in our existence, would have become meaningless and the Organization itself robbed of its main purpose and its real value.

70. I may perhaps explain that it was this consideration which led my Government to decide to make its contribution, a modest contribution in relation to that of certain other Member States, but a contribution as real and as effective as my country's limited resources would permit. It was because of this consideration that the Union of South Africa decided to participate actively in an area so distant and in which we could have no direct military responsibilities. It is also because of this consideration that the Union of South Africa has assumed extensive military commitments in other parts of the world—I refer, of course, to the Middle East and to Africa.

71. Let me repeat, therefore, that, given the widest support of its Members, the United Nations can become an effective instrument of collective security and

the best means of ensuring world peace. And it is the view of my Government that we should, under present world conditions, direct all our efforts to the attainment of this fundamental objective. If, by dissipating our energies in other, less profitable and sometimes dangerous, directions, we should lose sight of this objective, the United Nations would lose its real purpose and undoubtedly would run the danger of becoming, not the virile and all-important international organ which it was intended to be, but rather a propaganda forum for the prosecution, in the spotlight of world publicity, of the relatively unimportant feuds and rivalries to which I have already referred. It is against this danger, this danger of the Organization degenerating into a propaganda forum, that we have to guard.

72. It is essential, therefore, that we seek some early remedy against the present dangerous tendency of dealing in the United Nations with matters which cannot be solved here and which only serve to exacerbate feelings and so militate against the achievement of our primary common goal. If international co-operation for the purpose of rendering the world secure against aggression is to remain our objective, this tendency will have to be discouraged. And this we can do. We can do so by refusing to deal in the United Nations with matters which do not fall within the purview of the Organization. We can do so also by limiting, as far as possible, our agenda—which in any case is becoming increasingly unrealistic—to matters on which we can co-operate. This would, in the view of my Government, enable us to accustom ourselves to the idea and practice of working together, and thus to create a climate which would be more conducive to a sober approach to problems on which major differences exist and which require the aggregation of true diplomacy and statesmanship available to this Organization.

73. This is not the first occasion on which a South African representative has drawn attention to the danger of continuing, year after year, to place on our agenda matters which do not belong there and the discussion of which, apart from being improper, in certain instances, clearly threatens co-operation and healthy relations between Member States. We have done so often enough, for we are not without experience in this matter, having been the victims during every single session of this dangerous practice. Our domestic affairs, or rather a distorted version of them, have time and again been paraded in this Organization in a most improper manner at the instance of people who, by doing so, have not hesitated to sow the seeds of discord when it was their solemn duty under the Charter to seek harmony and co-operation. They have, of course, been aided in their efforts also by those who neglect no opportunity to exploit the problems of others in order to promote their own subversive policies.

74. This year again, South African issues figure largely on the agenda—in our view improperly so. I had not intended to allude to them today, but two days ago we heard a statement in this debate and from this rostrum in which the domestic affairs of South Africa were discussed in a manner which must have shocked many of those present. In that statement [393rd meeting], the representative of India sought to exploit certain events in the Union of South Africa, events which might never have occurred had it not been for the sustained intervention in our affairs by

the Indian Government. In fact, the representative of India went so far as to state in the most unmistakable terms that those who are deliberately breaking the laws of my country have the blessing of her country. This, of course, we have known all along, but to repeat that blessing from this rostrum was a most reckless disregard for the principles of the Charter and the purposes for which the United Nations was founded.

75. May I, in this connexion, refer the General Assembly to one paragraph of the resolution "Peace through deeds" [resolution 380 (V)] which it passed in 1950? That paragraph reads:

"The General Assembly...

"Solemnly reaffirms that, whatever the weapons used, any aggression, whether committed openly, or by fomenting civil strife in the interest of a foreign Power, or otherwise, is the gravest of all crimes against peace and security throughout the world".

If the delegation of India supported this resolution—as I believe it did—how does India reconcile that solemn affirmation which I have just read with its present action of inciting civil disobedience in my country?

76. In any case, I may perhaps just add that had it not been for the acrimonious discussions of our affairs in this Organization, the Union of South Africa and the other countries concerned might not have drifted so far apart as they are today.

77. And ours are by no means the most serious problems. There are problems with which it is correct for the United Nations to deal, and in fact with which it must deal, which constitute an infinitely greater threat to international co-operation, and in some cases even to world peace. It is with these problems, with these disputes and differences, that the United Nations must deal in order to carry out its primary task of promoting international harmony and of maintaining international peace. All other matters, in so far as this Organization is concerned, should be subordinated to those problems, and it is to render the atmosphere more conducive to their solution that we should avoid, at all times, the acrimonious discussion here of minor differences which could, in any case, be settled more readily outside the United Nations—even though in certain cases the United Nations is empowered by the Charter to deal with them.

78. It is true, of course, that these major problems to which I have referred are in the main the responsibility primarily of the great Powers, but when they are placed before the United Nations they become our common concern. It is then that the aggregate of wisdom, of diplomacy and of statesmanship in this Organization is invoked in order to seek solutions and settlements, in the absence of which international relations continue to be charged with dangerous tensions. And it is in order that this fundamental task may be rendered less impossible than it would appear to be today that we should guard against unhealthy practices, including the abuse of this rostrum for the purpose of making speeches designed not so much to seek solutions or to bridge differences as to derive benefits of a purely propaganda nature. It would be wrong, I think, to draw the analogy of the United Nations being the town meeting of the world too closely if by that we permit

the Organization to be exploited for purely partisan political ends.

79. When our founders met at San Francisco, they realized that this system of collective security could not be brought about by mere inscription in the Charter. They realized that, in order to bring it about, it would be necessary to rely upon a great partnership based upon a sincere desire to work together. They knew, however, that such a partnership would comprise many peoples, many races of different cultures and different traditions, and that these differences would continue to exist. They conceived it essential that, in order to enable it to perform its great task, this Organization should be created and should set about its work in such a manner as to reconcile natural differences as far as possible. In the Charter they therefore told us what we should aim at and they also told us what we should avoid and not do. History had shown that the interplay of cultural and other forces had almost invariably been accompanied by clashes of one sort or another. If we were to work together, we should have to respect the differences which were and are peculiar to the different groups, peoples and races which comprise the United Nations.

80. Therefore, in pursuing our great common goal of bringing peace and security to the world, we should at all times be aware of these things and ensure that these differences do not obtrude themselves on the performance of our common task.

81. I have not sought to make a long speech. I have merely desired to state simply and clearly the dangers inherent in the course upon which this Organization appears to have embarked, and to ask that we return to the Charter which was drafted at San Francisco, as well as to the spirit of mutual good will and co-operation which then existed. I have also desired to suggest that we seek to build on that Charter and in that spirit in order that we may achieve the high purpose for which the United Nations was primarily created.

Mr. Carias (Honduras), Vice-President, took the Chair.

89. Mr. EBAN (Israel): It is difficult to remember a time when the United Nations confronted greater dangers to itself and to the cause of universal peace than those which crowd in upon it at this grave hour. If we rise from our deliberations without an earnest effort to advance towards agreed settlements of international issues, we shall not have served our destiny or risen to the full level of our cherished trust. All delegations should be haunted by these perils and uplifted by the contrary prospect of salvation which would burst upon our anxious world if we were able to chart some course of reconciliation through the conflicts and rancours of our times. We shall find no easy formula. There is no way of relieving the general tension except by encouraging agreements on the specific issues of which it is composed. The Israel delegation will make its chief contribution to the work of the General Assembly by offering detailed lines of action to our Main Committees which are engaged in the discussion of specific political issues.

83. For these reasons, and for motives of restraint concerned with the tensions of our region, it was not

my purpose until a few hours ago to participate in this general discussion. Those who have listened to the speeches made here on behalf of Arab Governments will have observed with regret that this sense of restraint has not been reciprocated. We note with deep concern that these governments appear resolved to maintain the original atmosphere of the armed aggression which they launched against Israel five years ago. They refuse to give home or shelter to their own kinsmen whose plight they wantonly caused and now deliberately perpetuate. But to these familiar themes of intransigence, they have now, in five speeches—two in the general debate and three in committee—added another: the unwarranted intervention, beyond their right or legal competence, into the treaty recently concluded between the Government of Israel and the Federal Republic of Germany.

84. This treaty, signed within the past few weeks, constitutes one of the most remarkable episodes which has taken place this year in the international life of this, or indeed of any other, generation. Historians of the future will pause in wonder when their eyes alight upon that solemn and silent encounter which took place upon the friendly soil of the Duchy of Luxembourg between representatives of Israel and the Federal Republic of Germany.

85. It was a moment unique in the moral history of civilization. It evoked the fresh and poignant memory of the most fearful crimes ever committed in a ghastly revolt against man's essential humanity. Six million of our kinsmen, men, women and children, had been rounded up like cattle, crowded into trains, neatly and diabolically classified into categories and age groups—there were special trains of special design for children—and then in circumstances calculated to be most revolting to human dignity, were slaughtered, beheaded, asphyxiated in cold blood, and their remains devoted to satisfy the chemical deficiencies of an aggressive war machine. In the sequel of Allied victory and at the Nürnberg trials, an astonished humanity gasped in incredulity when the curtain went up upon this hideous scene. Along with the slaughter there had been an odious campaign of degradation. The fame, the pride and the repute of the Jewish people, the oldest family of the human race, had been foully attacked. Behind the smiling villages and the gleaming cities of Central Europe and Eastern Europe, ostensibly the symbols of an ordered and merciful civilization, there had opened up a dark abyss of perverted hatred into which millions of our people had been pulled to their doom.

86. These memories of anguish, this unlimited ocean of blood and tears, were the sombre background of the Luxembourg encounter. The guilt was too extreme for any human forgiveness. The sorrow was too vast for any expiation. Yet within those limitations, an alert human conscience would see much significance in that meeting and in that treaty. It marked the ultimate victory of justice over brute force, of weakness over strength and of responsibility over arbitrary and tyrannical impunity. For the first time in its bloodstained martyrdom, the Jewish people were able, as a result of Israel's renewed sovereignty, to receive the public penitence of its most savage foe acting under the dictates of a tormented conscience.

87. The Nürnberg trials had been hailed as a great advance towards universal law because they recognized and confirmed the responsibility of individuals who, as leaders of nations, embarked upon aggression and violated the universal peace. But the Luxembourg meeting extended the frontiers of that advance. It laid it down that the people, in whose name the initiative for launching war is taken, bear the collective responsibility for all that follows from that initiative and for all the sequence of blood and suffering inflicted by the aggressor in his attack and by the defender in his response. When the concepts of retribution and responsibility begin to attach to international crime as surely as they attach to individual crime within our separate societies, shall we not begin to see the portents of a new world order regulated by legal penalties and restraints? The conclusion, therefore, of the Luxembourg treaty naturally evoked a deep and unanimous echo of applause in all the free countries of the world. It was plain that the conclusion and implementation of this treaty constituted a deep and inescapable necessity, not merely for Germany and for Israel, but for the conscience of mankind.

88. Into this bilateral treaty between the Governments of Israel and Germany, into a matter which is none of their business and none of their concern, into a situation in which they lack the remotest right or title to interfere, the Arab Governments have now intruded with prejudice to the sovereignty of the signatory governments and with an abuse of the United Nations forum in order to magnify the echoes of this intervention.

89. The Foreign Minister of Egypt, speaking at this rostrum [395th meeting], took it upon himself to assert that Germany and Israel had no right or title to conclude the agreement which they have concluded. If the territories of Israel and Germany were Egyptian colonial possessions, the Egyptian Foreign Minister could not have spoken with a more lordly and arbitrary decisiveness about what treaties they might or might not agree to sign.

90. But the speeches here do not exhaust the story. They are part of the pressure campaign conducted by the Arab League in Bonn in an effort to persuade the German authorities not to honour their signature, and thus to bring an indelible disgrace upon mankind in the issue which, more than any other, affects the moral health of our generation. The avowed object of this pressure is to cause a violation by Germany of its most compelling international obligation, to prevent any attempt at departing from the Nazi tradition which has afflicted the life of the German people, to perpetuate the atmosphere and sentiments of Nazism by opposing their voluntary expiation, and to do all this by arbitrary diplomatic intervention and by a threat of economic sanctions and political penalties.

91. The General Assembly will observe that Arab States, Members of the United Nations, have threatened to apply sanctions to the German Government if that Government does not violate its international obligations. Thus the Arab League stands ready to apply a new and mournful system of international morality: they will punish attempted virtue; they will reward the maintenance of an international crime. Within our separate States, the effort by any citizen to carry out

the kind of extortion which the Arab League now attempts at Bonn and elsewhere would surely be described by some such word as "blackmail" and be recognized as one of the most despicable of offences. Why then should that concept here be asserted and avowed in so sensitive a sphere of international relations?

92. The Government of Israel has reason and justification to expect the early and unconditional ratification of the Israel-German compensation treaty. We assume that the Government of Germany understands the paramount international importance of this treaty. This morning, *The New York Times* reported from Bonn:

"Chancellor Conrad Adenauer asserted tonight that West Germany would stand by its restitution agreement with Israel, and would not yield to the threats of an economic boycott advanced by the Arab League. 'I have signed the German-Israel agreement', Dr. Adenauer said in radio interview. 'I stick to my word.'"

93. The objection of the Egyptian representative, as exemplified by the action in Bonn and by allusions made in these debates, rests presumably upon the following assumption. Egypt, or the Arab States, are in a state of war with Israel; they are entitled to maintain a policy of boycott to serve that state of war; they are further entitled to induce other States within the United Nations and outside of it to identify themselves with the alleged Egyptian state of war and also with the blockade and boycott which flow from it. Therefore, the argument goes on, Israel's trade may legitimately be subject to pressures, controls and limitations imposed in deference to Egypt or other Arab States.

94. It is here that this question becomes of much closer concern to the United Nations. Let there be no mistake. It is an international offence for any State even to invoke these justifications of belligerency, let alone to base international policies upon them. The offence is not that other nations negotiate agreements with Israel; the offence is that the Arab States do not themselves negotiate such agreements with Israel. The international illegality rests in the maintenance by Egypt of its boycott and blockade, not in the refusal of other governments to be marked by the infection of that boycott and blockade. The Arab policy of blockade towards Israel is something to be changed in itself, not something to be communicated to other spheres of international relations.

95. I wonder whether all Members of the General Assembly and of the wider public are aware that this question whether any State is entitled to base its policies towards Israel upon the theory of belligerency has been the subject of international adjudication. The principal organ of international security has pronounced a verdict of which, incidentally, Egypt is still in defiance. The discussion arose in the context of Israel's complaints to the Security Council against Egyptian action in interfering with the passage of commerce and shipping on their way to Israel ports under alleged rights of blockade. In the course of condemning this Egyptian action and requiring its cessation, the Security Council made a clear and final definition of the wider political and juridical issues involved.

96. On 1 September 1951, at the 558th meeting, the Security Council examined Israel's complaint, and adopted a resolution without dissent. The resolution recalled that, in a previous resolution relating to the conclusion of armistice agreements between Israel and the neighbouring Arab States, the Council had drawn attention to the pledges in these agreements against any further acts of hostility between the parties; it recalled further its reminder to the States concerned that the armistice agreements to which they were parties contemplated the return of permanent peace, and therefore urged them and the other States in the area to take all such steps as would lead to the settlement of the issues between them. The Security Council went on to affirm that since the armistice régime, which had been in existence for nearly two and a half years, was of a permanent character, neither party could reasonably assert that it was actively a belligerent or required to exercise the right of visit, search and seizure for any legitimate purpose of self-defence. Therefore the Security Council found that the maintenance of these blockade practices was inconsistent with the objectives of a peaceful settlement between the parties, that such practice was in abuse of the exercise of the right of visit, search and seizure, and that these practices could not in the prevailing circumstances be justified on the ground that they were necessary for self-defence. The Security Council called upon Egypt to terminate all these restrictions on the passage of international commerce and goods wherever bound and to cease all interference with shipping and with the free passage of goods.

97. Israel will, of course, utilize its specific rights under that resolution. Here I am more concerned with its broad political and juridical effects. I am aware that many governments represented here are under constant pressure by Arab States to adapt their own policies towards Israel so as to conform with the objectives of the Arab boycott and blockade. I am confident that all those governments will understand, from a reading of this resolution, and indeed of the Charter of the United Nations itself, that they would here be invited to participate in hostile and aggressive actions.

98. I suggest in seriousness that it is not for other governments within the United Nations, or outside it, to model their attitude in this question on that of the Arab States. On the contrary, it is the right and bounden duty of the United Nations to require most insistently that the Arab States shall bring their relations with Israel into accord with those practised by the international community as a whole, both by the United Nations and by all Member States that maintain the decencies of international intercourse.

99. My delegation will return to this subject in the proper committee at the proper time. Here I would merely stress that the basic duty of the States of the Near East is not to maintain boycotts or intrude into each other's treaty relationships with third parties, but to negotiate directly for a settlement of their outstanding differences. Those who refuse to seek a settlement by direct negotiation have no moral right to complain before world tribunals because those problems are not solved. When has any problem ever been solved in the history of international relations except by those who agree to meet for a negotiated settlement? Is there any other government represented here which would receive

or entertain claims or complaints persistently lodged against it by other governments which refuse to acknowledge its statehood and sovereignty and to seek agreed settlements in accordance with the basic purposes and principles of the Charter?

100. The General Assembly of the United Nations, whose purpose is to reconcile differences and encourage agreements, should not be used as a melancholy substitute for normal international relations, as an alibi and evasion for States which will not carry out the most elementary of their international duties, namely, the establishment of normal relations with their neighbours and the regulation of all conflicts and differences within the framework of those normal relations.

101. My delegation deeply regrets that the representative of Syria, having also told the Governments of Israel and Germany what treaties they might or might not sign between them, then went on to question [396th meeting] the existence of our statehood and even resorted to expressions such as "alleged Israel State", Israel "authorities" and "community".

102. The emergence of Israel as a sovereign State has on many due occasions, and especially within recent days, received sufficient testimony of universal applause and approval to enable us to maintain belief in our statehood despite the strictures of the Syrian spokesman. The only government in its area in which the ideals and practices of democracy are held up; almost the only country in the area in which individual freedom is not restricted by despotic monarchy or military dictatorship; the only State which, above all others in the area, devotes its political freedom consistently and earnestly to the purpose of social and economic progress; the only State in the area in which all adult men and women have freedom to vote; the only government in the area which is prepared without condition to enter into full and normal relations with all other governments in the area; the only government in the region which by sacrifice close to the very point of exhaustion has given shelter and home to 750,000 of its kinsmen, while the Arab governments of that same area voluntarily withhold permanent home and shelter and employment from their own flesh and blood, whose flight and panic those governments caused and whose rehabilitation they have the full capacity to effect; the only government in the area which, despite all attack, refuses to abandon or renounce the ultimate prospect of Israel-Arab peace. Such a people does not depend for the credentials of its statehood upon the authority or sanction of the Syrian representative.

103. I speak with some detail on these affairs, because the agenda of this session is rather full of Arab complaints against the world. Sometimes individual governments are denounced for not reaching standards satisfactory to the Arab States in their political, social and national progress, in their attachment to national liberty, equality and fraternity, in their habit of signing treaties without Arab permission, or in their efforts to solve the problem of minorities and civil rights. Sometimes the United Nations as a whole is abused as being responsible for all international difficulties because it does not always conform to the particular objectives of the Arab world.

104. Here we are, some fifty-four nations full of imperfections and sin, in a world in which the Arab

States stand out in solitary and immaculate virtue, full of righteous indignation at our shortcomings. Such is the picture presented by this most extraordinary agenda which the Arab States have prepared for our political committees at this session. I have felt a deep undercurrent of desire amongst many delegations to see some balance of humility restored in the spirit and tone of these debates. For this attitude of grievance and denunciation is not justified by any objective reference to facts.

105. Has history in its broadest sweep, history in its general line of movement, dealt harshly with the Arab world? Look at that vast expanse of sovereign opportunity extending throughout eight Arab States, covering a million and a half square miles, teeming with natural and mineral resources, full of latent and potential wealth; a great region in which the wonderful developments of the American continent in recent centuries could well be inaugurated by the united and devoted efforts of its people, if they were all dedicated to a vision of the future and not to rancours of the past.

106. Most of these sovereignties were recently established. There was not a single independent Arab State upon the surface of the inhabited globe thirty-five years ago. Rarely in history has any people attained a greater measure of its national aspirations in so short a time. The world rightly congratulates them upon that progress and wishes them well in the development of that opportunity.

107. The United Nations and the victorious coalitions of two world wars have contributed much by their blood and sacrifice to this great Arab bounty. International opinion throughout the United Nations has helped to liberate many of these Near Eastern countries from foreign occupation. In one case, that of Libya, the United Nations has itself established Arab sovereignty in a new and great area—an act to which the Government of Israel, notwithstanding the general climate of our relations, gave wholehearted assistance through the exercise of what proved to be its decisive vote. From a people thus endowed with such a wealth of political good fortune and national opportunity, the United Nations may perhaps rightly expect a modification of these harsh attitudes and these vengeful demeanours.

108. Indeed, it was this huge expanse of Arab sovereignty which stood before the eyes of the United Nations when the question of Israel's right to statehood came before it. The nations of the world pronounced a simple truth. They said, "If it is right for the Arab peoples to possess their vast continent, it cannot be wrong for the Jewish people to enjoy the peaceful possession of its more modest but precious home". It was plain to every balanced conscience that there is no value whatever in an international philosophy which would withhold from Israel in its infinitely smaller domain the privileges and opportunities with which the Arab people is so lavishly endowed.

109. The Arab States now aspire to expand further in other large areas. These problems are complex, and my delegation will express its views upon them on due occasion, but is there not some contradiction in the attitude of a national movement which begrudges to its own neighbour, in the most modest measure, those very rights and privileges which it claims for itself on

so unlimited a scale? Is Arab nationalism the only interest which has to be satisfied in the affairs of this region? Is national freedom the prerogative of all peoples in our area or the monopoly of one?

110. We listened carefully and sympathetically when the representative of Egypt outlined the achievements of the new Egyptian régime in passing a law of agrarian reform for the fair allocation of land. The leaders of my Government in Parliament did not hesitate to make public the expression of their profound sympathy with all efforts to cure the conditions of social and economic oppressions which have prevailed in the neighbouring Near East for time immemorial. I am certain that all liberal nations which heard about it welcomed the adoption of that law and will react with sympathetic enthusiasm if it is implemented.

111. But they consistently argue for the limitation of vast estates, for an equitable distribution of land and property, within a national community, and fail to apply to international relations the identical concept, namely, that each people has a right to its own corner, however small, of this vast globe, in which its life and spirit can develop in complete freedom and independence. If you look at the map, you will see that the Arab governments are the vast estate owners of the Middle East, objecting, unfortunately, to the most minimal concept of equal distribution of sovereign rights.

112. What an enormous patrimony is theirs! Surely their true destiny is to develop and fructify the vast inheritance which they possess, under the impulse of their venerable and magnificent culture, and not to brood in sterile vengeance over the tiny corner in which Israel was born and now lives again. Surely a nationalism which proclaims freedom for itself and denies it to others will lose much of the moral credit which would otherwise adhere to its cause.

113. Despite all disappointments and denunciations, and notwithstanding our resentment at being provoked into this superfluous exchange, the Government of Israel continues to believe in the ultimate vision of Arab-Israel reconciliation. All other nations, individually and collectively, can help in that task to the degree that they actively sponsor and encourage direct settlements between the Arab States and Israel, and indeed among all governments and movements in that area of the Middle East and central Mediterranean, whose interests appear to conflict. The Hebrew tradition now embodied in a free Israel preceded and indeed gave birth to all the other great spiritual movements which have given the Middle East its eternal renown. We do not now doubt that these two kindred peoples—the Arab States and Israel—can unite their strength to build upon the shores of the eastern Mediterranean a civilization worthy of their ancient and medieval past. Thus, while we defend our honour and interests in these debates no less vigorously than we defended our frontiers against equally unprovoked attack, it is upon that paramount vision of fraternity that we would rather set our eyes and consecrate our effort.

114. Mr. FARRAG (Egypt) (*from the floor*): I wish to raise a point of order. My delegation wants to reserve the right to reply to the many points which were raised by the representative of Israel.

115. The PRESIDENT: We closed the list of speakers yesterday at 5 p. m. o'clock. In accordance with

rule 74 of the rules of procedure, the representative of Egypt has the right of reply, but I shall call on him at the end of the general debate.

116. Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) (*translated from French*): Before beginning my speech, I should like to express the complete surprise and sorrow with which my delegation learned of the unexpected decision of the Secretary-General, Mr. Trygve Lie. I sincerely share the regret expressed here by the speakers before me and join in the tributes paid to him. My collaboration with Mr. Trygve Lie extends over a period of five years, and during the fourteen months of my presidency of the General Assembly it was most cordial. Accordingly, I know his high qualities better than anyone and it is my fond hope that his decision is not irrevocable and that the General Assembly will succeed in persuading him to withdraw his resignation.

117. The annual session of the General Assembly, which is the most important and most representative of United Nations organs, provides an opportunity for all Members of the Organization, large or small, to review the work accomplished during the year. Everyone tries, in the course of that review, to express his hopes as well as his criticisms, so that the United Nations may avoid the errors of the past and go on to ever greater perfection. The general debate gives us an opportunity to put forward the views of our governments on the various problems on the agenda and to explain the policy they have followed in the fulfilment of their duties as faithful Members of this eminent international community.

118. For my part, I shall confine myself to some brief general remarks. I shall only enlarge towards the end of my speech on a problem of particular interest to my country, a problem which, as the Secretary-General puts it in his annual report, is critical, and which, in spite of all our efforts, has not so far been solved.² I have in mind, as you have doubtless guessed, the problem of Iranian oil.

119. It would be wrong if we contented ourselves with heaping undeserved praise on our Organization while denying the grave tension which is of concern to all peace-loving nations. On the other hand, it would not be right to give free rein to our anxieties and disappointments with no recognition of the services rendered by the United Nations.

120. The basic cause of international tension lies in the fact that the great Powers have not fulfilled the hopes that we had placed in them. In San Francisco, we accepted the idea or, to be more precise perhaps, we had conceived the hope, that co-operation among the permanent members of the Security Council would provide a solid foundation for the building of peace. Unhappily, incessant disputes among the great Powers have shattered that hope. Having to belong to one group or the other is not conducive to the maintenance of world peace. My country, like most small nations, fervently hopes that the great Powers will find a way to agree and settle among themselves the disputes which are propelling the world in such tragic fashion towards the danger of a third world war. To see such agreement come into being is our common ideal. Yet we

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 1A*, p. 2.

should not like to have agreement among the great Powers at the expense of the small countries. What we want is an agreement resting on equity and justice, that is, on respect for the fundamental principles of the Charter, without which a just and lasting peace would be wholly inconceivable.

121. In the present circumstances, a number of questions call for our special attention.

122. The first is the war in Korea and the need to put an end to it. We regret that the armistice negotiations have not yet led to a successful outcome, and it is our most ardent wish that the near future will see the conclusion of an honourable and equitable truce, for there is no doubt that the present international tension cannot be dissipated until there is an armistice in Korea.

123. The second matter of concern to us is the armaments race. While understanding the just and legitimate responsibility of each State to make preparations for its national defence, we trust that it will be possible to reconcile the two propositions: prohibition of weapons of mass destruction and effective international control of the production of armaments. It is distressing to note that, after six years of effort, not only has no real progress been achieved in the matter of the control and regulation of armaments but that, on the contrary, the diabolical race is gaining speed and is drawing off the greater part of the world's material resources to the bottomless pit of ambitious rearmament plans.

124. The third matter which, in my Government's view, is at the root of present troubles, is that the colonial Powers have not been willing to recognize the national aspirations of the non-self-governing peoples. Iran is ready to give very warm support to those peoples' claims, and we are grateful to the majority of Member States which voted for inclusion of the questions of Tunisia and Morocco in the Assembly's agenda. We ardently hope that wise and practical solutions will emerge from our discussions and we are convinced that the noble French nation, true to its democratic traditions and to the principle of the freedom of peoples which it was the first to proclaim in its immortal Declaration of the Rights of Man in 1789—for which history honours it—will once again demonstrate its liberal ideas and spirit of understanding. The signs of the times cannot be ignored; the world will no longer tolerate colonial methods, with all that they entail in the way of encroachment on the rights and freedoms of the subject peoples. The time has come for the oppressed peoples at last to regain freedom so as to take their place in the concert of nations.

125. The fourth matter which is a source of perpetual trouble is the poverty in which more than two-thirds of the peoples of the world live. It is impossible to envisage a truly lasting peace so long as millions of human beings are deprived of everything and forced to live in ignorance, poverty and disease, for certainly those suffering from such ills and social injustice may easily lose confidence and be driven to revolt, even though they enjoy political freedom. I feel some optimism as I refer to this point, since I recognize the services which the United Nations and the specialized agencies have rendered, despite limited resources, in helping certain countries to raise the standards of living of their peoples.

126. The technical assistance activities of the United Nations have proved quite effective, and I should not care to miss the chance of paying a tribute to the work of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies in this respect. May I also add a word in expression of my country's gratitude for the help extended to us. We nevertheless believe that technical assistance can be effective only when accompanied by financial aid. It has not been possible to secure such financial aid for the development of the under-developed countries, chiefly because private capitalists have shown no desire to invest their funds in the under-developed countries.

127. We consider that the establishment of a finance corporation on the lines envisaged by the Economic and Social Council would have the advantage, by establishing confidence, of encouraging foreign capitalists to invest their capital in the under-developed countries.

128. In that connexion, I should like to add that any foreign capitalist desiring to invest money in Iran on the basis of regular commercial contracts would be very favourably received.

129. We consider that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has not so far been able entirely to fulfil the task laid upon it. The amount of the loans it has granted each year is far below that required by the under-developed countries; according to United Nations experts, it should aim at granting loans of up to \$1,000 million a year to these countries. It is notable that only \$129 million out of the \$1,500 million so far granted in loans by the Bank have been granted to under-developed countries, a sum which bears no relation to their needs for purposes of economic development. It is desirable that, in the light of the need to expedite the development of these countries, the Bank should make an effort to increase the requisite loans.

130. We further consider that the creation of a special fund for the purpose of financing non-self-liquidating projects is highly desirable. We therefore trust that the Economic and Social Council will be able to complete the study of the establishment of such a fund at an early date and report to the General Assembly upon it.

131. I should like to add that Iran has not so far succeeded in securing the smallest of loans from the Bank. Could it be that political considerations have dictated the attitude of this international agency towards my country? That is the question we are asking ourselves.

132. The Bank's chief function is to place the necessary capital at the disposal of the under-developed countries so that such capital—in conjunction with United Nations technical assistance—will help them raise the standards of living of their peoples. Unfortunately, the Bank has disregarded that duty and has not paid enough attention to the countries of the Near East, more especially Iran, thus demonstrating a lack of impartiality. The loans granted to Near Eastern countries are very small in comparison with those received by the countries of Western Europe.

133. In the case of Iran, the Bank, although recognizing that our economic programmes were worthy of

interest, refrained from granting the loans for which we had applied on the pretext that Iran, having lost the oil revenues, would be unable to repay its debts. This pretext was invoked despite the repeated statements of the Iranian representatives in various international gatherings that the oil revenues were only an insignificant part of our national income and that our economic position was strong enough to enable us to honour our debts. In any case, what connexion is there between an application to the Bank for a loan and the problem of oil?

134. Happily, Iran is one of the few countries which has not contracted any external debt and, although my Government's Treasury has received no revenues from oil for almost two years, we have succeeded in maintaining our economic independence and meeting our financial needs in spite of external pressure on our economy.

135. Should we feel called upon to press curiosity further, we might be tempted to ask ourselves whether the Bank's refusal to grant loans to Iran is not really part of the system of economic pressure devised with a view to compelling my country to give way. Indeed, we see no other reason why the Bank should have gone so far as to disregard the very purpose for which it was created.

136. While we are still on the subject of technical assistance, I should like to repeat here what I have had occasion to say in previous speeches. I stated—and I still believe—that if the meaning of technical assistance and economic aid to under-developed countries were to be explained, it would have to be said that States have realized that it is henceforward no longer possible for some to base their happiness and prosperity on the misfortune and misery of others. If this is the true goal—that is, if all governments intend to co-operate sincerely and loyally to improve the economic situation and raise the standard of living of all peoples—how can the policy followed by some States be explained, States which are seeking by every possible means to deprive other nations of the possibility of profiting from the resources and wealth bestowed upon them by nature? Iran finds it somewhat hard to reconcile, on the one hand, the persistent declaration that the economic advancement of the under-developed countries is the prerequisite to economic stability and the maintenance of peace, and, on the other hand, the lack of any attempt to understand the Iranian Government's action in nationalizing its oil industry as a decisive step not only towards its political emancipation but also towards the achievement of its economic development.

137. That remark leads me to recall the difficulties we are encountering in attempting to benefit by our principal natural resource, oil. At the sixth session [344th meeting], I had occasion to give you a picture of the situation and to explain our reasons for nationalizing the Iranian oil industry. At the same time, I explained the difficulties created for us by the old company operating under the protection of the United Kingdom Government. A whole year has gone by without any improvement in our situation, and the suffering inflicted on our nation has progressively increased.

138. It will be recalled that the United Kingdom Government first turned to the International Court of Justice—despite the fact that the Court was not

competent in the matter—and, later, to the Security Council [S/2357], in order to bring pressure against my Government and to impose unacceptable conditions. At the same time, it continued to resort to intimidation, among other things by demonstrations of armed strength close to Iran's borders and by an economic blockade intended to weaken the resistance of our people, who are defending their economic independence. The United Kingdom Government itself recognized those facts in the message it sent, jointly with the President of the United States, to the Prime Minister of Iran on 30 August 1952. Paragraph 3 (b) of that message reads as follows:

“Her Majesty's Government would relax restrictions on exports to Iran and on Iran's use of sterling.”

139. All those measures were taken against an under-developed country whose people have a very low standard of living, in order to protect the interests of a company which has more than amply recovered the capital it invested and whose activity was not confined to industrial and commercial exploitation.

104. That is how a great Power, a Member of the United Nations, which has subscribed to the resolutions adopted by this Assembly to promote the economic development of under-developed countries, is hampering the legitimate efforts of my country to maintain its political and economic control over the Iranian oil industry.

141. The United Kingdom Government is one of the three signatories of the Teheran Declaration of 1 December 1943, in which the valuable contribution of Iran to the common victory was recognized. In that declaration, the United Kingdom Government, together with the other two signatories, unequivocally committed itself to help Iran, when hostilities had ceased, to overcome the economic difficulties created by the war. I should like to read, for your benefit, the text of the Teheran Declaration:

“The President of the United States, the Premier of the USSR, and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, having consulted with each other and with the Prime Minister of Iran, desire to declare the mutual agreement of their three Governments regarding their relations with Iran.

“The Governments of the United States, the USSR and the United Kingdom recognize the assistance which Iran has given in the prosecution of the war against the common enemy, particularly by facilitating the transportation of supplies from overseas to the Soviet Union.

“The three Governments realize that war has caused special economic difficulties for Iran, and they are agreed that they will continue to make available to the Government of Iran such economic assistance as may be possible, having regard to the heavy demands made upon them by their world-wide military operations and to the world-wide shortage of transport, raw materials, and supplies for civilian consumption.

“With respect to the post-war period, the Governments of the United States, the USSR and the United Kingdom are in accord with the Government of Iran that any economic problems confronting Iran

at the close of hostilities should receive full consideration, along with those of other Members of the United Nations, by conferences or international agencies held or created to deal with international economic matters.

"The Governments of the United States, the USSR and the United Kingdom are at one with the Government of Iran in their desire for the maintenance of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iran. They count upon the participation of Iran, together with all other peace-loving nations, in the establishment of international peace, security and prosperity after the war, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, to which all four Governments have subscribed.

"(Signed) Winston CHURCHILL
"J. V. STALIN
"Franklin D. ROOSEVELT"

149. On the basis of that declaration, my country was entitled to expect economic assistance from the United Kingdom Government; instead, it finds itself today the victim of economic pressure by that Government. It is interesting to recall the view expressed on several occasions by Mr. Eden, the present Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, on the services rendered by Iran to the common cause during the last war. I shall not mention similar views expressed by other British and Allied statesmen. I am sorry that Mr. Eden is not here, because it is always pleasant to hear the statements one has made quoted.

143. On 17 October 1941, at a banquet in his honour in the Palace of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs at Teheran, Mr. Eden said that the United Kingdom felt that it owed a debt of gratitude to Iran for the valuable contribution that country had made to the common victory. The United Kingdom, he said, also paid tribute to Iran's contribution, throughout the centuries, to civilization, to artistic and literary accomplishments and to the evolution of human thought. Mr. Eden was glad to express his heartiest good wishes for the happiness, prosperity and greatness of Iran and to assure it that the United Kingdom Government would give it all possible aid in the future.

144. Two years later, on 22 August 1943 to be exact, Mr. Eden said in the House of Commons that "Iran has faithfully kept its pledges to us and to the Soviet Union. Our sole interest in Iran", he said, "is to see that country happy, united and powerful. And we should not at any cost like to see a reversion to the spheres-of-influence policy and other similar procedures which made us unpopular in Iran for twenty years or more".

145. On 22 November 1945, Mr. Eden said in the House of Commons:

"In the Treaty signed with Iran, we have made it plain that we wished to interfere as little as we could with Persian sovereignty and in no way with its administration and security forces. We have given our word not to jeopardize in any way the independence of Iran and not to disturb the economic life of the country, the application of Iranian laws, the freedom of movement of the population and the operation of its police force. It is not by accident that those words appear in the Treaty signed with Iran. We weighed and chose them carefully and we

put them in the Treaty for a very specific purpose. We wanted and we still want to preserve the independence of Iran, to spare it any return to the painful and hateful memory of the spheres-of-influence policy. In short, we wanted to allow that old nation to live in peace."

146. What we ask of the United Kingdom Government is that it should abide by the statements of Mr. Eden, its present Foreign Secretary, and not permit any disturbance of our country's independence and economic life and of the freedom of action of its citizens. In a word, to quote Mr. Eden himself, for that old nation to be allowed to live in peace.

147. I now come to the action taken in international agencies. Unable to persuade the Security Council to condemn us, the United Kingdom Government brought the matter before the International Court of Justice. In its decision of 22 July 1952^a, the Court not only acknowledged that it was not competent; it made a definitive decision on a point of law which had been challenged by the United Kingdom Government. That Government was maintaining that the alleged concession of 1933 had been in the nature of a treaty and that Iran had violated an international commitment by nationalizing its oil industry. The International Court of Justice, in its decision, expressly stated that it could not agree that the contract signed between the Iranian Government and the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company could be regarded as an international treaty.

148. May I be permitted, on behalf of the Iranian nation, to express our deep appreciation to the Security Council and to pay a solemn tribute to the International Court of Justice which, having recognized the justice of our cause, has courageously taken its stand on the side of law and not on that of force.

149. Following the Court's decision, Iran felt entitled to regard the matter as settled, and, in order to prove our goodwill, on 7 August 1952 we sent a note to the United Kingdom Government stating that we intended to resume negotiations with the former company. We had hoped that the United Kingdom Government would be ready to change its unbending policy and recommend that the former company should apply to the Iranian Government for the settlement of its claims.

150. On 30 August 1952, my Government received a message from the President of the United States and from the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. To this were attached certain proposals which, by their very nature, were unacceptable to my Government. The part of these proposals relating to compensation was very ambiguous and was subject to the proviso that the legal position of the parties concerned, with regard to the submission of the case to the International Court of Justice, should be that existing before the nationalization.

151. In order to make myself perfectly clear, I should like to quote the actual text of article 1 of the proposal attached to the message: "There shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice the question of compensation to be paid in respect to the nationalization of the enterprise of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company in Iran, having regard to the legal position of the

^a See *Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. case (jurisdiction)*, Judgment of July 22nd, 1952: I.C.J. Reports 1952, p. 93.

parties existing immediately prior to nationalization and to all claims and counter-claims of both parties." You will realize that by the use of the words "the legal position of the parties existing immediately prior to nationalization", an attempt was being made to revive the contract imposed in 1933. That can, moreover, be clearly inferred from the last letter sent by Mr. Eden, the United Kingdom Foreign Secretary, to the Prime Minister of Iran.

152. My country, which had declared in good faith that it was prepared to resume negotiations, expected that, out of respect for international law and principles and in order to ensure peace, the United Kingdom Government would change its attitude as a result of the decision of the International Court of Justice. Unhappily, the last message showed that the leading statesmen of the United Kingdom were pursuing the same goal as before, although they expressed themselves in new ways, and were disregarding the feelings of the people and the changes which had taken place in Iran and other countries. In addition, they did not seem to be giving international events all the attention they warranted.

153. In spite of all this, the Iranian Government, in order to show the maximum goodwill and a spirit of compromise, replied on 24 September 1952 to the joint message from President Truman and Mr. Churchill and made counter-proposals which must certainly be acknowledged as very fair and practical. For example, my Government suggested that, as regards compensation for assets which the former company owned in Iran immediately before nationalization, the amount to be paid and the method of payment should be fixed on the basis of any law passed in any country for the nationalization of any industry which the former company considered favourable and would accept.

154. My Government even went further—although competence in the matter of compensation comes within the province of the Iranian courts alone—my Government, in order to prove its goodwill and its desire to reach a solution, stated that it was prepared to accept the arbitration of the International Court of Justice on the amount of compensation to be paid for the assets owned by the former company, as well as on the Iranian Government's claims against the company. Unfortunately, in its reply of 5 October 1952 to the Iranian Government's letter, the United Kingdom Government made no reference to this point and completely ignored these proposals, which clearly pointed to a practical way of reaching an equitable solution.

155. Despite that, and in the belief that Mr. Eden's message held a faint ray of hope which should in any case be explored, the Iranian Government, in order to avert a break in diplomatic relations, sent another communication to Mr. Eden on 7 October 1952, emphasizing that its intention in submitting counter-proposals was to avoid loss of time and to indicate the practical and fair way to consider the claims and counter-claims of the former company and the Iranian Government. Once again, my Government expressed its readiness to enter into conversations and, with a view to reaching a final settlement as rapidly as possible, invited the authorized representatives of the company to Teheran to initiate negotiations within the limits of the Iranian counter-proposals.

156. Moreover, the Iranian Government, which was in urgent need of funds, asked the company, before sending its representatives, to make available to the Iranian Ministry of Finance a sum of £20 million sterling, convertible into dollars, in partial payment of the £49 million which it owes us. That sum of £20 million corresponds to the Iranian Government's share in the general reserves of the company, as shown in the balance sheet for 1951 and based on the 1933 agreement. It bears no relation to the project known as the Gussa-Golshayan agreement. According to the 1951 statement, the company's general reserves amounted to £110,500,000 sterling. Of that sum, £81 million are included under the heading of general reserves and the remainder, that is, £29,500,000, are included in the figure of £49,900,000 that the company owes the Iranian Government. Iran's share in the general reserves, on the basis of the 1933 contract, is 20 per cent. As the sum under that heading amounts to £110,500,000, Iran's share comes to £22,100,000, which should be reimbursed promptly to the Iranian Government now that the oil industry in Iran has been nationalized. It is on that basis that the former company was asked for the sum of £20 million as a down-payment.

157. The United Kingdom Government sent its reply to the most recent proposals of the Iranian Government on 24 October 1952. In the reply, it revealed what had always been its objectives and intentions, hitherto couched in vague terms. The letter clearly proves that my Government's anxiety did not, as contended in previous communications from the United Kingdom Government, arise from unfounded misunderstandings, but rather was based on the real intentions of the United Kingdom Government, which the Iranian Government had succeeded in uncovering after much effort and care.

158. In the letter, the United Kingdom Government clearly indicated that, when the matter was brought before the International Court of Justice, it would ask the Court, on behalf of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, to fix the amount of compensation to be paid not only to cover the loss of the company's installations in Iran, but also on the basis of the unilateral denunciation of the 1933 concession. Is there a single precedent in countries which have nationalized their industries where compensation was paid to cover profits the company had to forego owing to the breach of a contract, even a private contract signed in good and due form and perfectly valid?

159. The United Kingdom Government was asking the people of Iran to pay damages for the unilateral denunciation of a contract entered into in circumstances fully described, with supporting evidence, in the Security Council by Mr. Mossadegh, the Iranian Prime Minister. The United Kingdom Government claims that Iran must compensate the former company not only for the loss of its assets in Iran, but also for the profits it had to forego. That is obviously unacceptable.

160. The 1933 concession has been vitiated; it is null and void. But even if it was valid at first, it can no longer have any value or legal force since the nationalization of the oil industry, because it would then be contrary to the purpose of nationalization which is, essentially, to put an end to private profits.

161. We have not accepted the United Kingdom proposals, because they would mean that Iran would have to consent to submit to the Court the question of compensation, not on the basis of the value of the company's assets at the time of nationalization, to which we had no objection, but on the basis of the so-called 1933 concession. In other words, we were being asked to pay, not only the value of the company's assets, but also the profits which the company might derive from Iran's resources if the 1933 concession were to remain in force until 1993.

162. It is plain that the Iranian Government could not, in the circumstances, consent to bring such a dispute before the International Court of Justice. We had said, however, that we were ready to refer the matter to the Court if the former company was claiming compensation on the basis of the value of its assets. The reason is simple enough: if the former company had wanted to submit its claims to Iranian courts, it could have done so and the courts would not have had to place any limitation on its claims. But, as it wanted us to waive the jurisdiction of our natural judges and to bring the matter to the International Court of Justice for arbitration, that could not be done unless the nature and scope of the compensation to be claimed had been determined beforehand.

163. But what was our surprise to find that our generous offer was rejected as unacceptable, unfair and unreasonable! The United Kingdom Government, which, as I have just pointed out, had exerted all kinds of economic pressure in the past year, chose to continue in that course, maintaining its embargo on British goods for Iran, continuing the economic blockade and tracking down any oil tanker carrying Iranian oil—the confiscation of the tanker *Rose-Marie* is only one example.

164. Diplomatic relations are established between governments to maintain friendship and promote mutual understanding and co-operation among nations. What would be the use of those relations if they were prevented from attaining their objectives by a lack of goodwill?

165. In view of the obstinacy with which the United Kingdom persisted in that unfriendly attitude, my Government was compelled, to its great regret, to break off diplomatic relations with the United Kingdom Government.

166. It might be well to recall that the Prime Minister of Iran said in his message to Parliament: "There is no question of breaking off relations between our peoples; it is only diplomatic relations that are broken". For we are convinced that there are hundreds of thousands of people in the United Kingdom who recognize that our cause is just and who, like all the people of Iran, want to maintain friendly relations.

167. We know that the United Kingdom Government will try in every way to distort the truth in the eyes of the world and present the case in a tendentious manner. But I am sure the world will not be deceived by that propaganda and will remember that Iran decided to break off diplomatic relations only after the United Kingdom Government had resorted to such inadmissible methods as intimidation by force, embargo, blockade and the freezing of Iranian funds and assets in British banks.

168. A great Power which uses such methods can have no other purpose than to crush a peace-loving people struggling with all its might to improve its economic condition. Let those who would sacrifice the welfare of a people to the commercial profits of a greedy company know that they must answer to posterity for their actions.

169. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq): I had no intention of coming to the rostrum for a second time. But then the important and serious speech made by Mr. Schuman [392nd meeting], the leader of the French delegation, moved me to ask for permission to speak again. This afternoon, less than an hour ago, there was another speaker who moved me to say a few words, namely, the representative of Israel. I shall begin by answering the latter first.

170. We are used to hearing attacks on the Arabs. It is the Arabs who took Jewish lands in Palestine. It is they who occupied Jewish property and Jewish homes. It is they who made one million Jews homeless. That is why the Arabs are the aggressors. This is the tone and the language which we are accustomed to hearing from Mr. Eban.

171. Plato has a very fine description of the unjust and of the most unjust. The unjust, of course, is he who does not do justice; but the most unjust is he who, although he is most unjust, nevertheless appears as if he were the most just. Such is the picture which we see in Mr. Eban's speeches and in his attacks on the Arab world.

172. Mr. Eban expects the situation and the attitude of the Arab delegations to change. How can the Arab attitude change? Has the other party done anything to make the attitude of the Arab delegations change? Has it recognized Arab rights? No, the Arab attitude cannot change, and Arab claims to their rights will persist as long as the Jews do not recognize those Arab rights in Palestine.

173. Mr. Eban asked why the Arab States did not settle the refugees in their own homes. Why should we settle them when they have their homes in Palestine? They have homes there which they are not prepared to give up and to abandon, no matter how much money you give them and no matter what you do for them. Their spiritual attachment to their homes is something beyond the will of Mr. Eban or the wishes of anyone in the world.

174. Yet we are the aggressors. We use harsh language? We have not used harsh language. Our language is always the language of justice. We ask for our rights and the rights of those people who have been homeless.

175. As to the treaty between Israel and Western Germany, the Arab point of view could be simply stated in a few sentences.

176. To begin with, we believe that the harm done by Hitler ultimately fell to the Arabs. It was the Arabs who were the ultimate victims. Yes, the Jews did suffer, but the Jews were thrown on the Arabs in Palestine which made the Arabs homeless. Were it not for Hitler, the Arabs of Palestine would have been in their homes. Therefore, if there is any human justice, it is the Arabs of Palestine who must get restitution.

177. In the second place, we believe that, so long as the Jews in Palestine do not recognize Arab rights, and continue to be the cause of the misery of one million refugees living in a state of destitution—no shelter, inadequate food, ill-health—and suffering from disease and degradation, the Jews forfeit their claims upon mankind for any suffering they have had until and unless they recognize the rights of these wretched Arab refugees.

178. In the third place, we believe that Israel is not the legal heir to the Jews of Germany. That is a precedent in international law which we cannot admit. No Christian State in the world can claim to be the heir of all the Christians of the world, and no Moslem State can claim to be the heir of all the Moslems of the world. This departure in international practice we cannot admit.

179. In the fourth place, we believe that any material help to the aggressive State of Israel—and it is aggressive so long as it does not yield to Arab rights and so long as it does not yield to United Nations resolutions—should be opposed by us. We oppose helping and strengthening a State which is aggressive to our rights and our privileges. It is for this reason that we believe that we are entitled and free to negotiate with any country to defend our rights. Just as Israel is free to negotiate with Western Germany, we are also free to undo the negotiations, if we can. We are all free in our international relations, and Mr. Eban cannot dictate to the Arab States their right not to counteract what they do to harm the Arabs.

180. They complain of the blockade and of the economic boycott; all these will continue until Arab rights are recognized. They have no right to ask the world for sympathy. They have no right to accuse the Arabs so long as they keep usurping Arab rights. They have no right to say that the Arabs have vast lands and, therefore, must give up their right to Palestine. It is none of their business. They have no right to say that the Arabs have plenty of riches and for that reason, must give up Palestine. This is a very dangerous precedent. If you do the same to other countries, I am sure that no national government or State in the world could accept such logic.

181. The Arabs, therefore, stand on their rights. They are not aggressors. They do not want to hurt anybody. All they want to do is to remove the harm done to them.

182. No matter how much propaganda is spread and no matter how eloquent the speeches are, it will not change the attitude of the Arabs, and the fact of the matter is that there is potential danger in the Middle East until Arab rights are recognized. It is time that the world knew these facts, and Zionist propaganda should not blind the eyes and mind of the world to this truth.

183. In conclusion, I wish to submit two points from this rostrum to the representative of Israel. If he accuses the Arabs of injustice, is he willing to recognize Arab rights to Palestine? The second question is: does he respect, and does his State intend to respect, the United Nations resolutions as they stand today? If the answer is in the affirmative, then he can accuse us; he can come to talk to us. If the answer is in the

negative, he has no right to speak of peace, he has no right to speak of a boycott and he has no right to speak of Arabs being aggressors. The Arabs are only on the defensive, and they will continue to be on the defensive. So much with respect to the statement by the representative of Israel.

184. I now wish to address myself to the Chairman of the French delegation. We believe that Mr. Schuman rendered the cause of Tunisia and Morocco a great service by fully and frankly exposing the stand of France before the world from the rostrum of the United Nations General Assembly. His statement certainly presents the basic difficulty in North Africa emanating from an authoritarian and absolutist domination of one people over another without due regard to their wishes and national aspirations. We wish, however, to make the following comments on some of the points made by Mr. Schuman in his statement last Monday.

185. Mr. Schuman is not right in thinking that those nations which asked that the items on Tunisia and Morocco should be put on the agenda have any intention to cause injustice to France or to inflict any insult upon it. On the contrary, I can speak for my country in saying that we have no evil intentions towards France, whose friendship we cherish and whose culture and ideals we admire. We do not believe that by asking that these items should be put on the agenda we are undermining French prestige or this United Nations Organization. Instead, we believe that by a friendly treatment of the subject in the United Nations, which might lead to the independence of Tunisia and Morocco, France will be so much the greater and this United Nations so much the stronger. We agree with Mr. Schuman that the purpose of this Organization is to develop friendly relations and co-operation among nations; but friendship among nations can be achieved only on the basis of human equality and justice for all nations.

186. The principle of self-determination of peoples is certainly basic for any international friendship and co-operation. Friendship, if it is to be of any value, should be based on the principle of mutual recognition and mutual respect of the freedom of all those who are nationally conscious and who desire their political freedom.

187. We wish to assure Mr. Schuman that we consider the cause of freedom the most sacred in human life, and when we ask for the political freedom and equality of our brethren in Tunisia and Morocco we are not discriminating against France. We stood for the freedom and independence of Indonesia. We stood for the freedom and independence of Libya. We stood for the independence of Somaliland and Eritrea. And we shall continue to defend and stand for the cause of freedom everywhere in the world, irrespective of the power dominating or the people dominated. Why did the world plunge into two world wars? Was it not for the sake of freedom? Did not the patriotic people of France actually organize underground forces to fight for their liberation from Hitler's yoke? We believe that the leader of the French delegation, who represents a country of high ideals of freedom and equality, is not justified in attributing discrimination against France to those nations which asked that these items should

be put on the agenda. On the contrary, these nations have the welfare of France as well as of the people of Morocco and Tunisia in mind when they ask for an amicable settlement which will lead the people of Tunisia and Morocco to their national goals.

188. The leader of the French delegation flatly contradicts himself when he speaks of the non-competence of the United Nations to deal with the subject, as being a matter of domestic jurisdiction for France, while at the same time he recognizes that the relations between France and these two countries are governed by treaties between France and two sovereign States, treaties signed in 1883 between France and Tunisia and in 1912 between France and Morocco. Since he recognizes the basic sovereignty of these States, we cannot see how Franco-Tunisian and Franco-Moroccan relations could be matters for internal jurisdiction.

189. Had France settled its affairs with these two States amicably, responding to their legitimate national aspirations, we should have had no question of Tunisia and Morocco before us today. But since France turned its back on the nationalists and ignored nationalist aspirations, there are only two alternatives.

190. The one is to let the nationalist struggle continue between the weak and unarmed people of Tunisia and Morocco on the one hand, and a strong, powerful, mechanized nation on the other. This leads to much human suffering and ruthless destruction of life and property and ultimately disturbs friendly relations between France and those nations that are tied to the people of North Africa by the ties of race, culture and language, and those that are tied to them by ties of humanity and love of freedom. The other alternative is to use the good offices of the United Nations to bring about a friendly settlement between France and the people of North Africa whereby they can be assured of the attainment of their national aspirations in accordance with the principles of the Charter, while maintaining friendly relations with France.

191. We certainly believe it to be a basic function of the United Nations to handle this matter in such a way as to remove international tension and to put into effect the principle of self-determination of peoples. This is especially urgent in the case of the people of North Africa, who inherit a high civilization and culture and whose contributions to learning in the past can never be denied.

192. To speak of the non-competence of the United Nations to deal with the question of Tunisia and Morocco is certainly contrary to the letter of the Charter and the practice of the United Nations. As for the letter of the Charter, one should only read Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter, which includes as one of the purposes of the United Nations:

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace."

193. Thus, in the issues of Tunisia and Morocco, the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples is directly involved; friendly relations among nations will certainly follow acceptance of that principle. To consider the questions of Tunisia and Morocco as matters of domestic jurisdiction, while recog-

nizing their basic sovereignty, is a contradiction in terms. For Tunisia and Morocco are not parts of France. They are sovereign States, and the United Nations General Assembly certainly can, under Article 10 of the Charter, deal with their problem.

194. So much for the letter of the Charter. As for the practice, this Organization has to its credit side that it has made its contribution to the independence of dependent peoples. Indonesia and Libya both profited from the intervention of this Organization. Eritrea followed. Somaliland is yet to follow as an independent State. It is not undermining or weakening this Organization to look to it for help in achieving freedom and independence. This Organization need not be cautioned or warned for its handling of the questions of Tunisia and Morocco. On the contrary, it should be cautioned and warned if it does not handle these topics and handle them properly, so as to achieve freedom and independence for both Tunisia and Morocco on the one hand and friendship and good relations between France and those countries on the other.

195. We sincerely hope, with the representative of France, that this Organization will do its duty and will keep within the limits of its mission before history when it tackles with wisdom and vision, guided by the principles of the Charter, the questions of Tunisia and Morocco.

196. Mr. Schuman often referred to the treaties between France and the States of Tunisia and Morocco. We submit that these treaties are valid only in so far as they represent the free will of the two parties concerned, and that they cannot be eternal. Treaties which are imposed and treaties between unequal parties cannot be held morally binding on any people. If the civilized world has reached a stage of abolishing individual slavery, it certainly should abolish national slavery. The treaties between France and Tunisia and Morocco, as described by Mr. Schuman, take the form of complete subjugation of the will of the peoples of Tunisia and Morocco to the will of France. We infer from Mr. Schuman's statement that France is the master of the destiny of these peoples and that they can have no say against what France decides; nor do they have the right of appeal against France. If this is not national enslavement, we do not know the meaning and definition of the word "enslavement". We wonder if this state of affairs is consonant with the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to both of which we should all be faithful adherents. Mr. Schuman asks: "In the present disturbed situation, too often systematically fostered by vehement propaganda, is it reasonable or desirable for the United Nations to interfere in affairs which ordinarily can and should be settled by the countries themselves?" [392nd meeting, para. 101].

197. Our answer is twofold. In the first place, it is because a state of ferment exists, of tension and bloodshed, that the United Nations must intervene. In the second place, it is France, and France alone, which is responsible for this state of ferment by its non-recognition of the claims of the nationalists.

198. Instead of continuing negotiations and finding friendly solutions, suppression, deportation and brutal handling of the population—men, women and children—became the rule of the day. Mr. Schuman speaks of

violence and terrorism in Tunisia. The Tunisian people are not terrorists. They are amongst the most peaceful and best organized peoples of the world. They have been subjected to repressive measures by the French authorities. It is against these repressive colonial measures that they have arisen to defend themselves. The government of Mr. Chenik, which truly represented the will of the people of Tunisia and which still enjoys the confidence of His Majesty the Bey of Tunis, was forcefully ejected by the French authorities and its members deported and imprisoned on 26 March 1952. This, coupled with the deportation and internment of other nationalists and labour leaders, provoked the masses, who were ruthlessly handled by the French military authorities, killing innocent men, women and children.

199. Speaking of violence and terrorism, we have been informed that at the very moment when Mr. Schuman was speaking from this rostrum about the alleged liberal policy and freedom of expression in Morocco, the French authorities were carrying out a wave of provocative measures against the peaceful population of Morocco.

200. Should France meet nationalist aspirations with sympathy and understanding, or should it meet them with ruthless suppression? It is for France to decide its own course of action. But the world cannot remain indifferent. It is needless to say that all those victims in the struggle for national liberation are considered as national heroes by their fellow citizens, just as those Frenchmen of the "underground" who fought for the freedom of France are national heroes today. This is a truism in the history of modern nationalism which Mr. Schuman cannot and should not ignore. It is for this reason that we appeal to that great nation, France, from this rostrum of the United Nations General Assembly, to stop suppressing the nationalists of Tunisia and Morocco, to come to terms with them and to have sympathy for their aims and ideals.

201. Mr. Schuman speaks at length of the contribution which France has made in the development of Tunisia and Morocco. We do not wish, at this stage, to question his claims concerning all that France has done for the peoples of Tunisia and Morocco; we wish, however to make the following observations:

202. If France has made such a great contribution to the development of these two countries in the realms of public health, administration, economics and education for the last seventy years in Tunisia and forty years in Morocco, as Mr. Schuman claims, is it not time that it should let them be politically free and independent today? It is certainly a well-known fact that the people of Tunisia and Morocco are amongst the well-advanced peoples of the world. Their contributions to culture and civilization in the past are well known. The fact that they have provided professors for some French universities today makes them no less entitled to independence than many of us in this Assembly. Then should the French argument for France's contribution to their development be one for or against their attainment of independence? It is certainly in favour of their attainment of independence.

203. We do not believe that the stage of economic and social development of any people, and specially peoples of advanced cultures like the North Africans,

should be a measure for their attainment of independence. We believe that political freedom should be recognized for any people who have developed political consciousness, irrespective of their riches or technical achievements. How would most of us here feel, and how would France itself feel, if a technically superior Power, much richer in resources and very highly developed, came to dominate us? Shall we acquiesce and accept the fact that because we are technically inferior we must accept to be ruled by that Power?

204. Mr. Schuman spoke of French sacrifices and expenditure in North Africa as though this was a justification for its continued domination therein. Did not the United Kingdom have similar claims over the territories which it used to rule and which have achieved their independence today? Is not the United Kingdom greater today, after the independence of India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, etc., than when it was a great colonial empire? We certainly believe it is. And we sincerely hope that France will be no less great in following the lead of the United Kingdom in this respect.

205. Mr. Schuman spoke at length of the contribution of France to the peoples of Tunisia and Morocco, but he mentioned nothing about the great sacrifices of the peoples of these countries to the defence and liberation of France. Thousands of men from Tunisia and Morocco gave their lives in defence of France and the free world in two world wars. They were promised, during the war, that their national aspirations would be realized after the war. Should not this in itself be a reason for their attaining their national aspirations? In other words, we wish to say that the contributions of the people of Morocco and Tunisia to France have certainly been no less than those of France to these territories, and that therefore there is no justification for retarding their attainment of political independence.

206. Mr. Schuman evaded the issue of the independence of Tunisia and Morocco by two assumptions. The first is that it is France alone which can determine the maturity of the peoples of Tunisia and Morocco, implying that the peoples themselves have no say in the matter, even if they are mature. The second assumption is that there is no need for national independence, since the world today is moving towards supra-national entities and that the day for independent nations is gone.

207. We submit that both these assumptions are unacceptable when examined in the light of the Charter. In the first place, France cannot claim to be the sole authority and judge qualified to decide as to the freedom and independence of Tunisia and Morocco. This violates the very principle of self-determination of peoples. If there were to be any standards for judging the fitness of a people for independence, they should be of a universal nature, and not dictated by France alone. In the second place, we live in a world of nations. No international co-operation is possible before the nations are formed. If France wishes to co-operate with Tunisia and Morocco in a supra-national organization, it is for the independent and free nations of Tunisia and Morocco to decide and to agree on this co-operation, and it should be entered into freely, in a spirit of independence, equality and friendship.

208. We emphasize again that France cannot be the master of the destiny of freedom-loving people like the people of Tunisia and Morocco. We believe that the people of Tunisia and Morocco are mature. They can become the masters of their own destiny. They must achieve independence.

209. In short, we believe that the march of the times and the spirit of the Charter demand a new outlook and a new approach by France towards the problems of Tunisia and Morocco. We appeal to Mr. Schuman that France should continue its tradition of defending the cause of the oppressed, as he puts it, and should prove again its devotion to the freedom and dignity of individuals and nations. We hope that it will prove in the case of Tunisia and Morocco that it respects the national ideal which France itself is proud to have served in every circumstance, as he puts it. And we wish to assure him that nationalism need not be blind or criminal fanaticism. With the right approach to the problems of Tunisia and Morocco, nationalism will prove to be a force for international co-operation and friendship, and will release pent-up energies for human and constructive endeavours.

210. We wish that France had itself satisfied the national aspirations of Tunisia and Morocco. France having reached a deadlock with the nationalists, we only hope that the United Nations may use its good offices to bring about a happy settlement of these two problems, a settlement leading to the independence of the peoples of these areas as well as to their good relations with France.

211. Achievements of national liberation could be made protracted, sanguinary, and bitter. Such was the process before the United Nations. Today, in the era of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is it too much to appeal to France to make the national liberation of Tunisia and Morocco quick, peaceful and friendly? This is the spirit of the Charter and this is the way of the United Nations.

212. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We have now completed our list of speakers. In accordance with our agreement of yesterday to close the list of speakers at 5 p.m., I declare the general debate closed. However, before adjourning the meeting, I call on the representative of Syria to speak in reply to a statement, in accordance with the terms of rule 74 of the rules of procedure.

213. Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): I realize that my right is limited to a reply, and that the hour is very late. I therefore do not like at all to enter into the discussion of what the Israelite representative stated this afternoon. However, he mustered his great skill and ability in order to make an impression on this Assembly, an impression which surely needs to be corrected. In fact, I confidently believe that his statement does not hold water. Allow me to state some basic truths in order to bring some light to our debate and to try to dissipate the clouds of confusion which are being advanced to destroy the Arabs of Palestine.

214. First, no matter how controversial some of the aspects of the Palestine problem are made to appear, there is one basic, fundamental, over-all fact: the Arabs of Palestine, living peacefully and calmly in their home-land, were subjected, for thirty years, to a

movement of intrusion, to an aggressive expansion which has continued to the present day. The Arabs did not create the Palestine problem; they are its victims. This aggression is continuing and it must be stopped. It is not the Arabs that have committed any aggression. We did not seek the land of any other people. We did not adopt principles and theories that would lead to strife. We have been the victims of all that, and as victims, we have come before the United Nations.

215. This expansion, which is continuing, is not based on a philosophy of nationalism such as the Arabs have, which, unfortunately, the Israelite representative tried to misrepresent. The philosophy of Zionist expansion is based upon a distinction of race and religion between Jews and Gentiles, it is based on a discrimination as to race and religion which we strongly oppose, whether it takes a Zionist or an anti-semitic aspect.

216. Were it not for such distinction, why should the Jews in different lands, where they enjoyed full rights of citizenship, have considered themselves to be exiled and attempted to enter Palestine? Why should their loyalty to the countries in which they live as citizens be shared by a loyalty to the Zionist movement, which is bent upon the destruction of the Arabs?

217. As regards the strategy of this expansion, it is very well known and it is clear. The facts speak eloquently. The strategy is based upon bringing Jews into Palestine from foreign lands—it is immigration for political reasons and not for humanitarian reasons. It is for the political reason of founding a State, the result of which is the discarding of the Arabs. The result has been what we all know: not the allegations or truths about the Hitlerite régime, but the very facts in front of us, namely, a Palestinian nation of refugees. That is the strategy of the Zionist expansion and that is the truth, basic, clear and obvious. It cannot by any means be made unclear or confused.

218. It is very awkward indeed for us in the United Nations to speak about the forcible repatriation of prisoners of war in Korea—not of refugees, but of prisoners of war, while the refugees of Palestine, whose rights the United Nations has recognized—their right to return to their homes—are forcibly prevented from returning to their homes by the very authorities which the able representative this afternoon has tried to defend. This is a fact; this is not confusion.

219. Speaking of reparations from Germany, I firmly believe that the Israel authorities have forfeited all rights to any moral claim of any kind by their very action in Palestine. We Arabs are not opposed to the restitution by Germany of rights to individuals. Such rights should be returned to their proper owners. It is exactly this that we claim for the refugees of Palestine: a restitution of rights and a compensation for losses to the individual.

220. However, the treaty of reparations with Germany is another thing; it is a completely different issue. It is not a restitution of individual rights, which should be made, but it is a kind of reparation, a so-called penitence by Germany, an occupied Germany. This moral obligation does not really exist.

221. Of course, we might find reasons here and there where some persecution was committed, but I cannot see how, out of that persecution, a robe of innocence

is being made with which Israel is to be clad. I do not see how we can try to cover actions with a cloak of legality when the actions themselves are essentially illegal.

222. The third fact that I should like to put before the Assembly is the following. Is it not true, as every delegation knows, that of all the resolutions passed by the organs of the United Nations, Israel has not agreed to put into effect any one of them?

223. Here are the refugees, there are the boundaries, and there is Jerusalem. All those things demonstrate that a sense of international responsibility is lacking, and any community which lacks a sense of international responsibility should not continue to enjoy the support of any delegation which is really peace-loving and which would like to see the Charter applied.

224. We are faced by a movement which seeks at this session to take the Palestine problem from the United Nations and put it beyond the international orbit.

225. Of course, Zionism and imperialism are entwined. Zionism has ridden the crest of the tide of imperialism and thrown its forces on Palestine. Of course, we Arabs have demonstrated our dislike for that imperialism by our national liberation movement,

which is disliked by the representative of the Israelite authorities. By our national liberation movement, we try to oppose imperialism and build liberty in its place. Our national movement is one which seeks at the same time national liberation and liberation from those forces which made it possible for domination to take place. The future of the Arab nations is one which should give the Israelite authorities much thought. It is true that about thirty years ago most of the Arab countries were under foreign domination. It is equally true that today a large part of the Arab countries are free, something which has taken place during the last thirty years. So much in thirty years, how much for the future! The future is definitely in favour of liberty and liberation movements such as the Arab movement.

226. Finally, it should be recalled that the Arab national movement is one which we should like to see firmly replace foreign domination; we should like to see foreign domination replaced by international co-operation that we can build and which will be genuine, real and true.

227. The PRESIDENT: I understand that the representative of Egypt is not prepared today to exercise his right of reply. There are no more speakers on my list.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.