

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1237th
PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 10 October 1963,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
<i>Speech by Mr. Auguste (Haiti)</i>	1
<i>Speech by Mr. Issa (Somalia)</i>	4
<i>Statement by the representative of Indonesia</i>	7
<i>Statement by the representative of Malaysia</i>	8
<i>Statement by the representative of Tanganyika</i>	11
<i>Statement by the representative of the United Kingdom</i>	11

President: Mr. Carlos SOSA RODRIGUEZ
(Venezuela).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. AUGUSTE (Haiti) (translated from French): Mr. President, the profound satisfaction felt by your friends from South America on your election to the Presidency of the General Assembly at its eighteenth session is explained and justified by the fund of experience you have acquired during five consecutive years of active participation in the work of the United Nations, in its Committees and other organs, and as Chairman of the Latin American group. I am convinced that you will bring to your new and highly responsible office the knowledge, wisdom, objectivity and impartiality, accompanied by courtesy and a rare distinction, which have so happily characterized your career as a diplomat.

2. The international scene, prior to the opening of this session, has been marked by events of many kinds. Following them on a map of the world, we can journey, as it were, at little cost, through almost every continent, merely by reading the enlightening comments which are provided daily by the Press of the free world. Whether we like it or not, these great events, no matter where they may break out or become apparent, cannot fail to affect us. The world is no longer what it used to be. The expressions "old continent" and "new continent", which used to indicate everything that separated the men of two civilizations, are obsolete formulas which have gone out of use.

3. The isolationism of the period of Monroe, Adams, Grant and Polk is now merely a page of ancient history which it may be useful to read again for spiritual satisfaction and enjoyment, but which the demands of science and politics with their implications and consequences, relegated long since to its rightful place in the great museums which form the treasure houses of this century and where the ancient divinities of a time long past also have their place.

4. The world now forms a single entity and, whatever may be our status in this great universe, we are but part of that same whole. As a result of the tremendous new developments which can put an end to man's existence yet symbolize his material power, peoples and continents now form but one great family. For that reason anything that disturbs or upsets anyone of us, or even merely alters our way of life, cannot be regarded by the others as an ordinary occurrence which can soon be forgotten as our lives go on.

5. It is therefore our duty to study such occurrences, to try to understand them and to sift the facts. I realize that it is not always an easy task to interpret, not the thoughts, but the feelings of others, for feelings are not unaffected by subtle remnants of hereditary and ancestral legacies which reflect the very depths of the human soul and the profound differences between races.

6. The great tragedy of human misunderstanding is that the achievement of greater mutual comprehension and knowledge remains the most difficult of human problems, notwithstanding the great mingling of peoples which is taking place at the United Nations. The philosopher's well-known saying "know thyself" is as valid as ever when we try to find an explanation for the evasions of some and the differences in the points of view of others.

7. Yet, sharing as we do in the great reforms which ideas are bringing to our way of life, we suffer or accept, as the case may be, the effects of a joint liability which, depending on circumstances, makes each one of us the servant, the defender or the grave-digger of this civilization.

8. For all these reasons, the momentous events on the international scene are just as significant for us as the everyday incidents which occur within our frontiers. If they are to be properly understood, however, they must be analysed in the light of the physical and human environment which shaped them. Such analysis, which is a particularly gratifying pursuit, enables us to follow the important developments on the screen of international life, not as dilettantes, but rather as scientists, driven by that curiosity which characterizes the human spirit.

9. Striking opportunities for such analysis were provided by the Nassau talks of December 1962, which were of such vital interest to us all; the creation of a multilateral force, which also gave rise to the legitimate but belated desire for a national deterrent; the differences caused by the closed-door policy of the European Economic Community; and, finally, that great European event, the Franco-German Treaty.^{1/}

10. In Africa, in the Middle East and in Asia, events of equal importance have been taking place.

^{1/} Franco-German Treaty of Reconciliation, signed at Paris on 22 January 1963.

11. In the case of Africa, apart from the changes being made in the structure of many Governments in order better to adapt them to human environmental conditions, I shall refer only to the most important international event, the signature of the association agreement linking eighteen French-speaking African States with the Common Market. The economic significance of that event cannot be over-emphasized. We wish that experiment every success, for it is our firm belief that the agreement carries within it a new seed of fruitful co-operation between industrial and agricultural countries, which we should like to see used as a model by other nations.

12. The most important event, however, which indicated a realization of the role which the black continent is called upon to play in international affairs, was the success of the Addis Ababa Conference,^{2/} which produced the Charter of the Organization of African Unity signed by thirty-two Heads of State of the black continent.

13. The Conference held at San José, Costa Rica, in March 1963 was also one which was much talked about, but the veil of oblivion soon relegated it to the shadows when, to the great surprise of many, it was eclipsed shortly afterwards by sudden changes of Government and the grave events which threatened to spark the powder keg which some are seeking to make of the Caribbean.

14. In the United States of America the question of racial segregation has developed all the aspects of a thorny social problem, causing the United States leaders real concern. It must be recognized, however, that it is a problem which they are boldly seeking to remedy. In the country which the great Abraham Lincoln wished to present to the world as a model of liberty and equality for all, regardless of colour, the black American has shown, in his peaceful yet tenacious struggle to put an end to ancient and degrading prejudices, a sense of the great virtues of moderation and dignity which do credit to the human race.

15. The Middle East, too, has shown its vitality in the dynamic action of its worthy sons, seeking, with that faith which moves mountains, to realize their dream of building a united Arab world.

16. In Asia, family quarrels still leave the painful impression of an eternally disputed inheritance, aggravated by the existence of different political and social beliefs and recently made even more serious by new and deep divergencies which relate to a purely dogmatic controversy.

17. All these events led to intense diplomatic activity in the great political capitals, where official visits, conferences and meetings of the most important international personalities took place. More often than we would have wished, the Security Council, which is entrusted with the maintenance of peace, had to meet and consider, with all the firm authority delegated to it, the problems which were placed before it.

18. Dominating all these chapters in the history of the world of today, a disturbed and anxious world as these burning issues clearly show, a great figure of Christendom, His Holiness John XXIII, addressed to the world his encyclical *Pacem in Terris*, that great message of Christian faith carrying a warmth of human feeling that penetrated the conscience of all

mankind. On his bed of pain, he offered his life that a greater spirit of understanding and tolerance should reign among men. Then, one morning in June 1963, he made the great Journey, to take to the Almighty the message of supplication of men of goodwill that peace might finally reign on earth. Speaking as I am to men who carry within them that miraculous spiritual leaven of faith, I cannot ignore this strange coincidence or fail to associate the present great relaxation of international tension with the promise of the aged and illustrious Vatican leader that he would always be our advocate in the other world in pleading for peace to be made a reality here on earth.

19. In this Organization we have all been working for that for years, but, in all honesty, have we ever felt that our efforts have achieved anything? Have we ever been satisfied with all these summit and lower-level conferences? Of course, there have been times when the horizon seemed a little more serene, but alas, it was soon piled with the heavy clouds which are the fore-runners of a storm.

20. The Moscow Treaty^{3/} is certainly the outcome of the efforts made by our envoys in Geneva, but, because of the new spirit of understanding with which it is imbued, it is also the embodiment of something higher, which some find puzzling but which those who believe in spiritual values feel to be more strongly tinged with spirituality, an expression of the mystery surrounding everything which confounds our logic. Of course, at the diplomatic level and in the field of international law, the Moscow Treaty is just another instrument, as fragile and subject to the imponderables of life as any other. Nevertheless, it is permeated by a new spirit, which is shown, not by the eagerness with which nearly all States—a hundred already—have acceded to it, but by the encouraging changes we can see in the new political trend. The scepticism which is so often cherished in the hearts of men will for some time to come take the form of mistrust, expressed in catchwords about "responsibility" and "sovereignty", but that cannot blind us to the rapprochements which are taking place, for the light of human reason is prevailing more and more over vanity and pride.

21. As has been said before, the spirit of Moscow is the expression of a desire not to stop half-way, a desire to continue the dialogue so that a moral disarmament may finally induce men to repair their past errors. Never, since the San Francisco Conference, have we felt so strongly as now that the ship of mankind is sailing on an ocean with the barometer at "set fair". This is clear from the tone of the different speakers. Only recently we heard President Kennedy [1209th meeting], in a speech from this rostrum in which the purity and elegance of style were matched by the depth of thought, give quite an optimistic outline of his Government's views. Mr. Gromyko, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist republics, in his closely reasoned statement [1208th meeting], also spoke with the voice of lucidity and reason, rising above the old dissensions of other days.

22. How, then, can we doubt that the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development will open under happy auspices if we persevere on the right road of moral disarmament? It is high time to give the grave problems of international trade the serious attention they deserve. We have been hypnotized and disquieted

^{2/} Summit Conference of Independent African States, held from 22 to 25 May 1963.

^{3/} Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, signed on 5 August 1963.

for too long by the fearful destructive power of nuclear weapons which, together with radio-active fallout, have appeared to be our only major anxieties for the time being. Thus, we have failed to see that under-development kills nearly as many people as would a hurricane moving through the Caribbean, Central America, Latin America, Asia and Africa. This simple illustration, based on statistics, shows that two thirds of the world suffer from the most horrible disease there is, the cruellest that can trouble our consciences—poverty, with all its concomitant privations—in a world in which the standard of comfort has risen so high.

23. Poverty has its causes, of course, but when they are scrutinized under the microscope, they are seen to come to a surprising extent from outside and are the disastrous consequences of economic factors. That is why, paradoxically enough, the regions strongly affected by this frightful evil of our century comprise countries which, to use economic terms, are potentially rich in human and natural resources, possessing the principal factors which help to create wealth: nature and man.

24. It can be said that, to some extent, the primary factors which produce wealth have been distributed fairly equitably, on the basis of a division of labour, a sort of specialization based on the economic vocation of each country. In this order, laid down, as it were, by destiny, the countries of the world are divided into countries with an essentially agricultural vocation and countries with an essentially industrial vocation, but there are no grounds in assuming that one group is entitled to exploit the other. The role of international trade is to enable each country to develop and follow its economic vocation in an atmosphere of freedom and mutual aid by linking employment, production and consumption, with the certainty that their growth will mean more employment opportunities, the production of much more wealth, the availability of many more consumer goods. In reality, the world is suffering not so much from a lack of resources as from man's failure to make full use of his productive potential with the result that capital is only partly applied to the development of natural resources. The economic stagnation with which many countries are plagued, and which is the cause of the crisis, is nothing but the result of this lack of co-operation between the possessors of the different means and factors of production. Hence the economic system, whose organs must function normally if it is to be healthy, is also afflicted by disease, caused by the restrictions we have mentioned, which occur when moral principle gives way to selfishness. That is why some people maintain that man originally came into a world rich in potentialities—with slight differences of degree, of course—and that poverty and misery, which are often linked with the invisible and maleficent workings of economic factors, are the outcome of human actions, the real causes of which are external rather than internal.

25. All the restrictions imposed on international trade by the policy of the protectionists, who have used every weapon in their power, from dumping, through preferential tariffs, to exchange control and policy, have therefore helped to constrict the flow of trade. And so the whole system of price, profit and production has been thrown out of kilter. It is paradoxical that the depression in the agricultural sector is all the more striking in comparison with the soaring prices in the industrial sector. The price curve

gives the clear impression that constant expansion is imposed on industry by an inflationary economic policy, whereas agriculture is struggling in the grip of deflation. Industry seems to be functioning under the conditions of a war economy—with high salaries and high prices—and agriculture under the conditions of a peace economy—with diminishing or stationary incomes and prices. When trade is carried on in such circumstances, that is to say, buying at high prices and selling at low ones, it is almost inevitable that such an imbalance will result in a depletion of the foreign exchange reserves and a balance of payments deficit in the countries which are forced to buy their supplies at high prices.

26. From the point of view of pure economic theory, however, there should be no such paradox, if we recall the working of economic laws. Indeed, the depression in agriculture should normally affect the industrial sector also, and progressively drag it downwards. If one works for the other the shrinkage of demand in the agricultural sector, caused by the collapse of the prices of primary products, should stop expansion in the other.

27. Since, however, what is happening is the contrary, we are faced with a fact that apparently invalidates all the laws of economics. This paradox is explained by the fact that the sharp rise in prices in the industrial sector is partly and indirectly supported by the armaments race and its economic repercussions. As we all know, year in, year out, the world spends about \$120,000 million on keeping its arsenal of destruction weapons up to date. In this sector of industry, which is one of the most powerful, the prices are monopoly prices. There is no bargaining, partly because the State is always a most generous customer, but mainly because the question of the relation of the purchasing price to the selling price does not arise. In this field no one is seeking profit, no one is worried about expense; it will all come out of the taxes. In the industrial sector, therefore, it is the constantly heavy demand for raw materials and labour—a demand supported by the armaments race—that determines the prices on the market, and all those who buy from this source must follow these prices, because of the single-price system, which the trade unions have every reason to defend.

28. These are the reasons for this paradox in our economy which causes the collapse in the prices of coffee, cotton, sisal, citrus fruit and all primary products, while there is a steady and sharp rise in the prices of manufactured products. It is not surprising therefore, that when there is such a fundamental distortion of the problem, technical and financial assistance produces much less than the results expected of it. For what, we may ask, is the good of making an effort when it is not justly rewarded? And how can the producer be justly rewarded when prices are so low? In our system, no one is interested in production when there is no profit to be made. Where incomes are low, there can be no capital formation; as a result, there is little or no investment and no social progress, any population increase becomes an evil and the economy lapses into a deplorable state of stagnation.

29. Let me ask any man or woman among my listeners who has chosen the fine and noble profession of forming public opinion the following question: when the real causes of poverty are clearly stated like this, can we take it lightly, or should we not rather take it as an occasion for searching our souls? Let me put another

question to the great and powerful of this world, who have never been more conscious of their noble duty to help others or more anxious to fulfil it; will your help reflect just a passing impulse of sympathy, or will it rise to nobler heights and become an alliance for progress, designed to restore the dignity of man by restoring the value of his goods and services? We cannot develop and stabilize the economy any more than we can cure the social evil just by feeding a few more poor people; the only solution is to enable men to improve their lot by their own efforts and in a way which is consonant with human dignity, that is to say, by paying them a fair price for their goods and services, and thus ultimately ensuring the repayment of any credit facilities that may be extended to them.

30. The reason that I have devoted the major part of my statement to this question is that I have been thinking of all those who are facing these terrible problems. It is only natural that the picture of my own poor country, Haiti, which has been constantly before my eyes while I have been saying all this, has given me the voice of my countrymen, who are grieved at being so deeply misunderstood. While outlining all these difficulties and disappointments and unfulfilled expectations, I have had my finger on the pulse of the Haitian. I know of no misfortunes more moving than his; no one has greater courage in adversity; nor do I know of any people so dogged by misfortune, for now, on top of all their other bad luck, they have had a frightful disaster, which has destroyed their crops, devastated their towns and villages, ruined what was already a poor agricultural economy and spread sorrow and desolation throughout a country already beset with evils. From this rostrum, I should like, first of all, to thank U Thant, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and the many friendly delegations who in these painful circumstances have expressed their profound sympathy to the Haitian people and Government and to their representative to the United Nations.

31. This is for us—I cannot find strong enough words to express it—a terrible disaster and a new ordeal, but it will not prevent us from raising our voice in the United Nations whenever there is an injustice to be remedied or a principle to be defended. We shall therefore press more strongly than ever this year for an increase in the number of seats in the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, so as to enable the young States of Africa and Asia to take an active part in the discussion of the big political and economic problems. There is an atmosphere of great enthusiasm and if this is not entirely illusory we should be able to decide unanimously to review the Charter, with a view to meeting the legitimate desire of the African peoples for representation on both Councils.

32. The world is certainly on the right road now. We feel, too, that the questions of Portugal and of South Africa will be solved before long in accordance with the principles of self-determination and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

33. We have outlined the major problems facing the United Nations and we have greater confidence than ever in the Organization, as also in the man who is directing it with such a sure hand. Much has already been achieved under his administration, and I should be doing less than my duty if I did not mention, besides the crisis in the Caribbean, the question of the unity of the Congo, which bears the stamp of his wisdom and handiwork. He has done well, and he cannot escape the congratulations he deserves.

Mr. Tarazi (Syria), Vice-President, took the Chair.

34. Mr. ISSA (Somalia): Mr. President, I would like to associate the voice of my delegation with that of previous speakers in extending to you our congratulations on your unanimous election to the high office of President of the eighteenth session of the General Assembly. Your election to this office is indicative of your eminent qualifications, which I am sure will enable you to guide our work with wisdom and a high degree of competence. You have brought to your country a great honour. Indeed this honour extends to the whole of Latin America.

35. I also wish to extend my delegation's thanks and great appreciation to your predecessor, Mr. Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, for the dedicated way in which he discharged his duties and the valuable work he has rendered to this Organization during his tenure of office. I would also like to pay tribute to the Secretary-General, U Thant, who with his great efforts and determination has enhanced the authority of this Organization and successfully steered it out of a variety of difficult situations.

36. This session certainly opens with a favourable climate in the international sphere. The relaxation of international tension in recent months culminated, as you know, in the conclusion of the Moscow treaty for a limited nuclear test ban. My country was among the first to sign the treaty, and we did so in the earnest hope that this would lead to general and complete disarmament. The limited nuclear test-ban treaty is, no doubt, a step in the right direction, but it is far from being an answer to the problems that confront us. Underground testing still continues, and nuclear Powers still have a stockpile of nuclear weapons in addition to their huge stock of conventional arms. There are still other States which are set on being nuclear Powers and to this end they have speeded up their efforts. Furthermore, there are many other Powers which also maintain relatively large stocks of conventional arms. The balance of terror is still maintained, the armaments race continues. The tension between the nuclear Powers might be temporarily reduced, but the danger of war, nuclear or conventional, is still high.

37. We earnestly hope that the present limited test-ban treaty will open the way to a series of agreements that will lead to general and complete disarmament. Until we achieve this objective, which is our ultimate goal, the danger of war will always be hanging over our heads.

38. While welcoming the reduction in world tension, my delegation feels that the admission of the Chinese People's Republic to the United Nations not only will enhance the universal character of this Organization but also would go a long way towards reducing further world tension. We consider the admission of the Chinese People's Republic to the United Nations a vital necessity. Many issues which are being discussed here can have no real meaning if they do not take into account the views of several hundred million Chinese, who constitute a substantial proportion of the world population.

39. My Government is happy to have taken note of the significant improvement in the Congo situation and we are gratified by the assurance in the introduction to the Secretary-General's report [A/5501/Add.1] that external military interference in the Congo has ceased, that the territorial integrity of the country has been secured and that law and order have generally been

restored. This represents a great achievement for which the Secretary-General deserves our gratitude and tribute.

40. Three years ago the General Assembly adopted almost unanimously the resolution on the granting of independence to all colonial peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)]. It appears that no decisive result has been achieved so far, and that we are instead witnessing a desperate resistance on the part of the colonial Powers, which are trying to prolong their existence both in Africa and elsewhere.

41. The Government of Portugal is still allowed to persist in its ridiculous fiction that Portuguese colonies in Africa constitute an integral part of metropolitan Portugal, a proposition that does not deserve any serious discussion.

42. In defiance of the principles of the Charter and the various resolutions of the United Nations, the plight of our African brothers in Angola, Mozambique and the so-called Portuguese Guinea is regrettably still unaltered. This is particularly shown in the resolution of 4 April 1963 [A/5446/Rev.1, chapter II, para. 251] adopted by the Committee of Twenty-Four,⁴ wherein the attention of the Security Council was called to the grave situation in Portuguese colonies and wherein appropriate measures against Portugal were requested, to compel it to refrain from aggravating an already explosive situation.

43. Because the racist Portuguese Government is permitted to entertain its colonialistic theories, millions of Africans are flagrantly denied the right to self-determination and are subjected to the most unbearable brutalities.

44. The United Kingdom Government is likewise perpetuating its colonialistic policy in Southern Rhodesia by protecting the interest of a racially minded minority of Europeans who are strongly opposed to the aspirations of the African people. We cannot overstress the danger inherent in the present Constitution of Southern Rhodesia, which preaches the racial conception of white supremacy. Apart from being unacceptable to the majority of Africans, this Constitution may well be the source of conflicts which could endanger peace and stability in the rest of the African continent.

45. We are often accused of being emotional when requesting the early and equitable settlement of colonial problems, but we firmly believe that no real stability can be established unless these inhumane practices of the colonial Powers are brought to an end. It is for this reason that we call on the States Members of this Organization to take such action, diplomatic or otherwise, as would expedite the removal of the colonial yoke and speed up the march towards the liberation of the oppressed African people for whom we pledge our unconditional support.

46. As regards South Africa, my delegation feels that it is not enough for us to use mere words in condemnation of the policy of apartheid, which stands out as a classic violation of human rights, but that we must collectively take, both in this Organization and in its specialized agencies, concrete action to purge the world of the shame of apartheid and all other forms of racial discrimination once and for all.

47. I am in complete agreement with the speaker from Uganda that the minority white Government of South Africa is a diseased organ of the body politic and that the Organization has no alternative but to amputate this diseased part before the infection spreads to other parts adjacent to it. We should now seriously consider the expulsion of South Africa from this Organization and its specialized agencies, in so far as all other measures have failed to be effective and have met with that country's open disregard for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

48. The same strong measures may very well prove to be the only reasonable answer to the abominable policy of the fascist Government of Portugal.

49. In my delegation's previous speeches to this Assembly, we were compelled to draw attention to the unhappy and menacing situation that exists in the Horn of Africa which has its causes in the brutal partitioning of the Somali people and their land by the colonial Powers in their scramble for Africa in the nineteenth century. Such cruel partitioning of the Somali people in that area, sharing as they do a common religion, language, culture and creed, has created a serious situation which has culminated in some parts in actual fighting and the shedding of Somali blood for no other reason than that they are committed to the defence of their right to self-determination and unity.

50. None the less, I do not intend to go into detail over this matter and my delegation reserves the right to raise it at an appropriate time. However, in exercise of the right reserved by my delegation to reply to the statement of the United Kingdom delegation, I should like to say that the United Kingdom has tried to link Kenya's independence with the rupture of diplomatic relations between our two countries and claimed that we have undertaken this action because they have refused to dismember Kenya. My delegation cannot understand where the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom got his facts.

51. The United Kingdom stands today on this rostrum and pretends to champion the cause of Kenya's independence, yet only recently it perpetrated the worst form of cruelty against the African people of Kenya simply because they were demanding their freedom. The present Prime Minister of Kenya, Mr. Jomo Kenyatta, himself languished in a British prison for over ten years for the same reason; not long ago the last British Governor described Mr. Kenyatta as a leader of darkness and death. Indeed the majority of African leaders in Kenya have suffered a similar fate. It is a matter of surprise to us, and, if I may venture to say so, to all ex-colonial countries, that Britain should be the spokesman for the interest of a dependent nation when its history in its colonies proves that it is exactly the opposite.

52. We have no quarrel with the assertion of the United Kingdom that it supports the will of the majority, but what we cannot accept is that the territory of any nation should be detached from its parent body and incorporated into another territory by an imperial edict dictated by the interests of the United Kingdom without the consent of either people and in complete disregard of the facts, history and ethnic alliance of these peoples. In this situation we can never accept the argument that a territory annexed to another under duress should some years later constitute a part of that territory to which it has been forcibly annexed.

⁴ Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

53. To illustrate my point, it is appropriate that I should quote here what Sir Charles Elliot, the then British Commissioner of the East Africa Province—as the East African countries of Uganda, Kenya and Zanzibar were then known—said in the early part of the century:

"If it were possible to detach the districts inhabited by Somalis, it would be an excellent thing to form them into a separate government, as they are different in population, economic and physical conditions from the other Provinces; but unfortunately, they are too small to form a separate administration, and the adjoining Somali territories are not British."

The adjoining Somali territories referred to were under Italian domination at the time but today they constitute the sovereign State of the Somali Republic.

54. Britain's lofty pronouncements that it supports the will of the majority cannot absolve it of its history of duplicity and double-dealing wherever the British have been, as is evidenced by the situation they have left in many countries, including our own, with regard to the secession of several of our territories and their annexation to a foreign country. Is there a nation in the world that did not attain its independence from the United Kingdom, or, for that matter, other colonial Powers, without great sacrifices and, indeed, without bloodshed? Where were these honourable sentiments of the United Kingdom Government when it dismembered the Somali nation time and again without the consent of the majority of the Somali people? Why has the United Kingdom acted in contravention of the established principle of the right of self-determination?

Mr. Sosa Rodríguez (Venezuela) resumed the Chair.

55. The only possible conclusions are: the selfish interests of the United Kingdom Government have led to a wilful suppression of all rights which might appear to conflict with those interests; the United Kingdom Government has come to the conclusion that its interests are better served by the existence of a state of tension and conflict in the Horn of Africa; in support of this policy the United Kingdom Government is determined to avoid any odium which might attach to it in East Africa whilst it attempts to clean up the mess for which it is largely responsible.

56. In spite of what the United Kingdom is trying to provoke between us and our Kenya brothers, we affirm here, as we have always affirmed, our unqualified support for Kenya's independence, and we rejoice at the fact that it will attain its independence in December of this year.

57. It is therefore quite clear that the United Kingdom policy is directed at creating a state of conflict and dissension between us and the new African Government of Kenya, as it has already done between us and another neighbouring African country. As a result of this deplorable tactic, the situation in the Horn of Africa today is, to say the least, highly explosive. In fact, there are alarmingly persistent reports of armed clashes involving considerable losses of Somali lives and property in the area. We sincerely hope that our African brothers and neighbours will be watchful of these imperialistic manoeuvres as, in like manner, we hope that they will appreciate the natural desire of the Somali people to unite in exercise of their right to self-determination.

58. There is yet another Somali territory under foreign domination. French Somaliland is the only such

French possession in Africa. For some curious reason, that territory is almost denied any further constitutional advance and the French Government appears to be even less inclined to hold out any hope for an early constitutional change. Not content with denying the people of that territory their right to independence, the French local administrators have mounted a campaign of terror and intimidation against the Somali people in their attempt to silence any claim of the people to independence and unity with their fellow Somalis across the border.

59. What is extremely shocking is the attempts of the French colonial administration to reduce the Somali representation in the Legislative Assembly to that of an insignificant minority group when it is well known that not only are the Somalis, as the indigenous population of the area, the overwhelming majority, but the country is indisputably theirs.

60. My Government is aware of the attempts that are being made by the French colonial authorities in the territory to change the name of the area from "French Somaliland" to some other name. We hope, however, that good counsel will prevail and that the French Government will recognize the inalienable right of the people of French Somaliland to self-determination and independence, as they have done with the rest of their possessions throughout the African continent.

61. In short, my Government desires no more than to see the right of self-determination granted to all the Somali people under foreign rule. In our complete adherence to the principle of self-determination not only are we committed to see this right properly accorded to the Somali people, but we firmly support the unity of all artificially divided countries if they so desire. Being one of these artificially divided nations, the German people have, unsuccessfully but relentlessly, sought the reunification of their country since the imposition on them of the present artificial political boundaries at the end of the Second World War. Once more we reaffirm our sympathy for the German people in their efforts to achieve national unity and assure them of our whole-hearted support for their right to self-determination and unity.

62. Finally, allow me to turn briefly to another problem—that is, the problem of economic and social development. Many of the countries in Africa and Asia that have recently acquired their political independence are facing a considerable measure of economic strain, and their need for assistance from the more prosperous countries is more acute at this stage of their development than at any other time. One of the essential tasks facing a developing country is the urgent need to raise the standard of living of its people and to improve their social condition. The need of these countries is not for financial assistance alone, but embraces several other factors, particularly the need to make available to them markets for their raw materials and other products, with a corresponding right to be paid a fair compensation for their goods. At present the developing countries are not receiving adequate compensation for their products, agricultural or otherwise, in the international market. These countries are facing insurmountable difficulties. Every year they are receiving less for their exports while paying more for their imports. The developing countries may increase their production and, subsequently, their exports, but their total revenue does not necessarily increase, thanks to the deterioration of the terms of trade. The present structure of international trade is such that the under-

privileged countries are providing greater advantage to the economically more fortunate ones. This may seem paradoxical, but it is a reality. Thus the developing countries will not benefit from an increase in production, along the present lines, proportionally in terms of foreign exchange. The problem here is that the developing countries are required to pay more for their imports at a crucial moment when their demand for capital goods is at an all-time high. We hope that the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Trade and Development will find a satisfactory way to deal with this very important problem.

63. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The list of speakers in the general debate this afternoon is now exhausted. I shall give the floor to those representatives who have asked to speak in exercise of their right of reply, in the order in which they made the request.

64. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia): I must apologize for asking for the floor again in exercise of my right of reply; but I have no choice.

65. While the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom, Mr. Thomas, had only sweet words for the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines in answer to Mr. López's penetrating criticism—which, incidentally, made good use of the devastating exposé of British neo-colonialism to be found in the Pakistani newspaper Dawn of 17 September 1963—he directed his main attack against Indonesia. Evidently, in pursuing to the utmost its neo-colonialist policy in South-East Asia, the United Kingdom is now relying on its old trusted method of "Divide and rule" which has always served it so well in the past. Having now succeeded in crippling Maphilindo, its next target is Philindo. And my answer to that is: the United Kingdom tried to destroy Maphilindo, but only crippled it, not crushed it; now it is trying to destroy Philindo, but again it will not succeed—and it will no doubt regret that it ever made the attempt.

66. I should like to deal now with the explanation which Mr. Thomas gave as the reason why the Philippine and Indonesian observers were kept out of Sabah and Sarawak for more than two-thirds of the time they should have been there. I will begin by comparing what the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Lord Home, said on this subject here on 27 September [1219th meeting] with what Mr. Thomas said to us on 8 October [1234th meeting]. In trying to invalidate my complaint that there were too few observers, Lord Home declared that in fact it did not make any difference so far as their task was concerned whether there were ten or ninety or no observers. The Minister of State, on the other hand, gave us a detailed account of the great lengths to which the United Kingdom Government went in order to restrict the number of observers to as few as possible. In doing so, Mr. Thomas—to our surprise, I must confess—apparently felt free to divulge certain parts of the private consultations that had been required to obtain the United Kingdom's permission for the Indonesian and Philippine observers to enter Sabah and Sarawak. Should I now, in order to set the record straight, do likewise and also discuss these private consultations in this forum? It would certainly produce a much needed clarification of the whole business. But would it be fair to the Secretary-General, who had the burden of conducting these delicate consultations so as to facilitate the carrying out of the Manila agreement? I shall, therefore, resist the temptation to follow the example set by the Minister of

State of the United Kingdom, and shall continue to observe the rules of what the British call "fair play".

67. Mr. Thomas was at pains to convince Mr. López that the Philippines was shabbily treated by the United Kingdom Government solely because the trust which it was prepared to place in the Government of the Philippines could not be extended to Indonesia. He went on to say that this was a risk that the United Kingdom was not prepared to take. Well, the lack of trust is obviously mutual. We on our side do not trust the desire of the United Kingdom to preserve Pax Britannica in Indonesian territory. To borrow Mr. Thomas's own words, this is a risk Indonesia is not prepared to take. The terrible record of Pax Britannica during its long colonial history is a reason why free Asia and free Africa also reject or are trying to get rid of it.

68. To return to the question of the observers: what risk was it precisely which the United Kingdom did not want to take in this respect? Mr. Thomas gave us the answer in his "exposé" on 8 October. It boils down to the risk that it expected would arise from the presence of the four Indonesian assistant observers in Sabah and Sarawak—for, as we now know, the four Philippine assistant observers had the full confidence of the United Kingdom. In order to minimize the risks attached to the presence of the four distrusted Indonesian assistant observers, therefore, the United Kingdom insisted that they be juniors and that their work be of a clerical nature. The presence in Sabah and Sarawak of the four assistant observers whom we chose to do the work was obviously too dangerous. Apparently the situation there was not stable enough, was too precarious politically, to withstand the risk of a ten-day visit of these four dangerous men. Since these four men would have been known to the colonial authorities and were to be continually under the control and supervision of these authorities as they went about their task of assisting in the witnessing of the ascertainment of the wishes of the people, one wonders what possible kind of risk they could have represented? Even if it were true that two of them had been intelligence officers, as alleged by Mr. Thomas, the continuous presence of the colonial authorities would certainly have prevented them from in any way endangering the situation in Sabah and Sarawak—unless, of course, the authorities did not have sufficient confidence in the real sentiments and political wishes of the people there. Honestly, I cannot think of any other possible reason. Indeed, it seems to us that this great distrust of four men, whose activities could be controlled day and night, in itself constitutes good enough grounds for our proclaiming the necessity for a fresh approach in the ascertainment of the wishes of the people.

69. Doubt about the genuine political sentiments of the people of Sabah and Sarawak can be the only logical explanation for the United Kingdom's insistence on keeping the Indonesian and Philippine observer teams as small as possible and for its ridiculous demand that the assistant observers should be juniors of clerical rank. It was this intolerable meddling in the way in which we wanted to compose our own teams which cause them to work for less than one-third of the time of the total ascertainment; and it was this successful British manoeuvring which torpedoed the ascertainment as agreed upon in Manila by Malaya, the Philippines and Indonesia. Small wonder, then, that the Foreign Minister of the Philippines felt compelled to say in his statement of 8 October:

"The ridiculous dispute about our observers would seem to justify the suspicion that a trap had been deliberately set for Indonesia and the Philippines so that they would be compelled to question the findings of the United Nations teams and thus put our two countries at odds with the United Nations as well as with Malaysia." [1233rd meeting, para. 51.]

Is there any stronger criticism possible?

70. The representative of the United Kingdom seemed surprised that the initial British demand for only two observers was countered by the Philippine and Indonesian wish to send twenty observers plus ten secretarial staff. Lord Home, I should like to remind him, though that it would not make much difference if we had sent ninety. But Mr. Thomas should not have been surprised. I have already made it clear in my earlier statements that the job of our observers was to witness the ascertainment. As I have said several times, what we primarily wanted to witness was not the activities of the United Nations teams so much as the activities of the colonial authorities, who we expected would influence the proceedings of the ascertainment and who—as it turned out, according to our observers—did in fact influence those proceedings. For the task of adequately watching the activities of the colonial authorities, not even ninety observers, as suggested by Lord Home, would have been sufficient.

71. In conclusion, I would like to say something about the political situation in the Borneo territories. What Mr. Thomas described as armed incursions into these territories are but a symptom of the general situation. Before the creation of Malaysia, Sarawak, Brunei, and Sabah were British colonies. Brunei was a protectorate. It was only natural to expect that the current African-Asian nationalism would find its expression in these territories as well. However, it was only as recently as about two or three years ago that it became clear how strong the freedom movement really was in the area. A revolution for independence from British colonialism broke out in December 1962. In Brunei, where the political party representing the people had already won all the available seats in Parliament, the revolution was a genuine people's revolution and it succeeded in overthrowing the British protected government of the Sultan. Had this revolution taken place in a free country, a government of the people would have taken over from the government of the Sultan as a matter of course; and, moreover, it would have been hailed everywhere as a progressive development. But the Sultan ruled under the umbrella of *Pax Britannica* and was therefore entitled to British armed protection. Britain sent troops, planes and everything needed to suppress the revolution. To protect whom? To protect the people? No indeed! *Pax Britannica* was maintained to protect not the people but the Sultan, and British oil interests. It is significant that the first task of the British troops was to protect the oilfields and installations.

72. Well, the overwhelming power of the protector succeeded in crushing the popular uprising. But hundreds and even thousands of the freedom fighters of Brunei and Sarawak fled to Indonesian territory—indeed, to the only territory where they could escape the superior weapons of the protectors. They found protection and safety in my country. It was these people, these refugees, returning to their own land, to their homes and families, in order to continue their fight for freedom, who carried out what the representative of the United Kingdom termed "armed

incursions". Evidence of it was found during the United Nations ascertainment.

73. Mr. RAMANI (Malaysia): In asking for this opportunity to exercise my delegation's right of reply to some of the statements made on 8 October [1233rd meeting] by the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, Mr. López, regarding Malaysia, I am most anxious not to say anything which will stir again the embers of controversy. Enough, and indeed more than enough, has been said about the circumstances of the coming into being of Malaysia. It is providential that I was called to this rostrum after the previous speaker had spoken, because I strongly feel that the time has come to pause in this controversy and allow the dust to settle.

74. I share the conviction of the Secretary for Foreign Affairs who, with a happy turn of phrase, in closing his very able statement said that faith and patience, vision and energy are now the dominant need—not the scoring of points or debating advantage. If in spite of that conviction I have ventured to come to this rostrum it is only to correct some of the factual inaccuracies that have crept into that statement, and the inevitably unsound conclusions that proceeded from them. If, as we both hope, our two countries must come out of this testing time and rebuild our friendship, there is more need than ever that our two countries understand each other's point of view aright. Without such understanding we shall only build the stately mansion of which he spoke with our eyes on the superstructure and forget that its foundations are on sand. I shall, however, content myself with answering some of the major reasons which he protested were standing in the way of his country's accepting Malaysia.

75. Mr. López referred to the Manila documents—there were a number of them: the Manila Accord, the Joint Statement that followed, and the Manila Declaration—as evidence of the balanced structure he helped to create. They were, he said, based on three essential conditions, which he listed as follows: first, the United Nations ascertainment had to be made by a fresh approach; secondly, there should be complete compliance with principle IX of General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV); and thirdly, observers should witness the ascertainment.

76. As to the first, he complained that the fresh approach by its very terms meant that "the ascertainment should not rely on previous British procedures and findings". Having listened with attention to his speech to us and having read and re-read it with care, I crave leave to wonder if he is not attributing to paragraph 4 of the Joint Statement a meaning that it does not and cannot bear. That paragraph is the foundation of the jurisdiction of the Secretary-General, if one may use a term familiar in domestic law, and its terms should therefore be constantly borne in mind. With your indulgence, I shall read it:

"Pursuant to paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Manila Accord, the United Nations Secretary-General or his representative should ascertain prior to the establishment of the Federation of Malaysia the wishes of the people of Sabah (North Borneo) and Sarawak within the context of General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV), principle IX of the annex, by a fresh approach, which in the opinion of the Secretary-General is necessary to ensure complete compliance with the principle of self-determination within the requirements embodied in principle IX, taking into consideration:

"(i) The recent elections in Sabah (North Borneo) and Sarawak but nevertheless further examining, verifying and satisfying himself as to whether:

"(a) Malaysia was a major issue, if not the main issue;

"(b) Electoral registers were properly compiled;

"(c) Elections were free and there was no coercion; and

"(d) Votes were properly polled and properly counted; and

"(ii) The wishes of those who, being qualified to vote, would have exercised their right of self-determination in the recent elections had it not been for their detention for political activities, imprisonment for political offences or absence from Sabah (North Borneo) or Sarawak."

77. If anything is clear from that carefully particularized and unambiguous statement, it is the fact that far from not relying on British procedures, those procedures provide the basis, the starting-point, of the investigation to be carried out; and further, it says with equal clarity that every step in the election procedure employed and followed by the Administering Authority should be examined by the United Nations team with a view to ascertaining whether or not the whole conduct of the elections fell within the principle enunciated in that resolution. And this is precisely what the team investigated and reported on; and it is that report which the Secretary-General accepted in his final conclusions. Moreover, the Secretary-General provided clear and categorical answers seriatim to each of the specific questions referred to him.

78. In this connexion, Mr. López went on to refer to what he called certain "unwritten understandings" that had been reached simultaneously at the time of the Joint Statement. I can only regret the recourse to such a reasoning. Every written agreement patiently negotiated cannot but proceed on a slippery journey to the scrap-heap if unwritten conditions are claimed to control it. He did not, however, explain why in a series of documents prepared with such careful regard to detail as I have shown, it was found necessary or desirable not to incorporate these additional understandings if they were important, or why they had to remain unwritten.

79. One such, he claimed, was that the ascertainment—by which he meant the actual work in the territories—would take at least a month—instead of which it was, he said, "drastically reduced to ten working days". Assuming, without admitting, that such an understanding did exist, does it follow that a task carried out in a shorter time than had been estimated for it necessarily becomes vitiated in its result? But I shall demonstrate from the documents which we have that no such understanding did exist or could have existed.

80. In the first place, on 5 August 1963 the Foreign Ministers of the three Governments made the joint official request to the Secretary-General that he should undertake this task of ascertainment; and on 8 August the Secretary-General agreed.

81. Secondly, after the team had been assembled, the Secretary-General on 12 August informed all three States that the team would arrive in the territory on 16 August—as it did—and start work immediately.

82. Thirdly, on 15 August the Secretary-General wrote to me acknowledging a letter to him from my Prime Minister, in the course of which he stated:

"I have already indicated to you orally, as I have indicated to the other Governments, that I hope to complete the task and to make my conclusions known to the three Governments by 14 September 1963."

83. Lastly, as expected, the conclusions were announced on 14 September.

84. Having regard to that chronology of events, may I respectfully ask Mr. López: If this understanding that the actual task in the territories should take at least a month did exist and was felt vital for its success, as it is now made out, should not his Government have protested at once that the whole thing was being rushed through with inordinate, if not indecent haste? During all the squabbling and quibbling, to use his own language, to which he referred, no such complaint was ever made. That neither of the two Governments did so suggests the obvious answer to the claim which is now made.

85. With regard to the second complaint, the Secretary-General in turn found, as a result of the ascertainment, that on both counts—that of the wishes of the people of the territories and that of complete compliance with the principle of self-determination—there was no doubt that a sizable majority of the peoples wished to join Malaysia.

86. Similarly, Mr. López claimed that the "observers" were an "integral part"—I use his phrase—of the operation. I need only refer to the Joint Statement, paragraph 7 of which states:

"In the interest of the countries concerned, the three Heads of Government deem it desirable to send observers, to witness the carrying out of the task to be undertaken by the working teams . . ."

87. May I ask again, respectfully: If in fact the observers were understood to be an integral part of the operation, in the sense, as I assume, that without them the teams could not function properly and had no right to function, how did it come about that the two Governments in the latter stages of the operation reluctantly associated themselves with it and saw it to its completion? That conduct again answers this new line of challenge to the conclusions.

88. Moreover, in accepting the assignment, the Secretary-General made it clear to the three Foreign Ministers that neither the report nor his conclusions were to be subject to confirmation or ratification by any of the Governments concerned. In his letter to the three Governments he stated:

"When they have completed the task, the working teams will report through my representative to me, and on the basis of this report I shall communicate my final conclusions to the three Governments and the Government of the United Kingdom. It is my understanding that neither the report of my representative nor my conclusions would be subject in any way to ratification or confirmation by any of the Governments concerned."

Having regard to that clear statement of the condition on the faith of which alone the Secretary-General undertook and carried out the task, the attitude of the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines that his Government does not challenge the conclusions of the Secretary-General but takes exception to the man-

ner in which the survey was conducted by the teams, can only be regarded as an attempt to separate the report from the conclusions with a view to having complete freedom to criticize the former and, at the same time, not risk the obvious disadvantage of criticizing the Secretary-General for the latter. That attempt must fail. Even if one puts aside the question of breach of faith with the Secretary-General, surely Mr. López must see that such an attempt does involve the obvious contradiction that, having given unqualified acceptance to all the Secretary-General's conclusions, his Government refuses in the same breath to accept one of those very conclusions, namely, that the team had "accomplished a sensitive and difficult task in a relatively short period, but at the same time in a thorough and wholly adequate manner".

89. Mr. López then referred to the vexed question of the fixing of the date for Malaysia and called it, and I quote him, the "crowning gesture . . . of disregard for the Manila agreement". He, however, erroneously referred to it as a United Kingdom announcement. This was an announcement by the supreme ruler of the Federation of Malaya, the Yang di-Pertuan Agong. The reason that compelled this course has been narrated ad nauseam. It was fully explained at Manila; it was fully explained at Djakarta; it was fully explained at Kuala Lumpur and wherever else it was material and to whom else it had to be, as a statutory necessity imposed by the Constitution of Malaya.

90. It was fully explained in a statement by the leader of my delegation on 27 September 1963 [1219th meeting] from this very rostrum. I am afraid that even if I should repeat it now and forever hereafter, it is unlikely to carry conviction to those who will not be convinced. I do feel sure, however, that when the sound and fury of these days pass, as inevitably they will, and a better climate descends on the scene, my friends will see at all events this particular episode as anything but a gesture of disregard for the decision of the Secretary-General. Indeed, the Secretary-General, in his conclusions, referred to this matter in carefully chosen and precise words:

"During the course of the inquiry, the date of 16 September 1963 was announced by the Government of the Federation of Malaya with the concurrence of the British Government, the Singapore Government and the Governments of Sabah and Sarawak, for the establishment of the Federation of Malaysia. This has led to misunderstanding, confusion, and even resentment among other parties to the Manila agreement, which could have been avoided if the date could have been fixed after my conclusions had been reached and made known."

91. Mr. López, having, as I said, by an error called the announcement a United Kingdom announcement, went on to say that the announcement said that "the new Federation of Malaysia would be proclaimed on 16 September, irrespective of the outcome of the ascertainment".

92. Even though at all times my Government had not the slightest doubt as to the result of the ascertainment, and did not ever conceive that the task undertaken by the Secretary-General was in any way in substitution of the electoral processes that had already taken place, at no time did the Government of the Federation of Malaya or anyone with that Government's authority say in public or private that Malaysia would be brought into being even if the result of the

operation was unfavourable. I wish to recall, if I may, in this connexion that when my own attention was drawn to an item of news to this effect that appeared in a New York newspaper, that Malaysia would come into being "regardless of United Nations findings", I hastened to call on the Secretary-General to assure him that that did not represent my Government's attitude.

93. In this context Mr. López permitted himself the statement that: "The Secretary-General was so disturbed by this announcement that he later described it 'as a slap on the United Nations'." I can only say that in none of the innumerable documents that have led up to and evidenced the carrying out of the task is such a statement to be found. In none of the conversations at which all three representatives of the States concerned were present before the Secretary-General was such a statement heard to be made. And if I may permit myself a personal observation, the Secretary-General, I believe, is incapable of giving utterance to such an expression. The more is the pity that the statement is printed in quotation marks in the distributed copy of the statement, suggesting for it some hallmark of authenticity.

94. I have just one last word. Mr. López referred to the Cobbold Commission as having expressed the view that the Federation of Malaya would cease to exist as a political entity and would be succeeded by the Federation of Malaysia. I do not deny that the Commission might have thought so. Nor do I deny that it might have said so. But the Commission was making recommendations for the admission of the Borneo States some fifteen months before that admission actually came about. The real status of Malaysia is to be determined today in an objective context. Mr. López, however, did not elaborate on the significance he attached to that statement or even say if he agreed with it. But he used it, as I understand, as a stepping-stone to the argument that it had a bearing on his Government's claim to North Borneo—Sabah, as it is now called. Following his eminent example, I will not embark on a discussion of the legal, the constitutional and the political results of the coming into being of Malaysia. This is hardly the forum, much less the occasion, for embarking on such a discussion.

95. As far as the Philippine claim to Sabah is concerned, there is the clearest statement, in paragraph 8 of the Joint Statement, that "as provided under paragraph 12 of the Manila Accord, . . . the inclusion of Sabah (North Borneo) in the Federation of Malaysia does not prejudice either the claim or any right thereunder". That is a statement attested by the signature of my Prime Minister and we stand by it. If the integrity of that document, since rent asunder as a mere scrap of paper, can be restored and from that document, as a starting-point, the Philippine Government desires undertakings of a formal nature, as I understood it to be the case from the statement of the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, no doubt his Government will pursue the matter through the appropriate channels at the appropriate time, in the appropriate way. In the present context of relations between our two countries, he will hardly expect me to say more.

96. I apologise for having taken longer than I had hoped. But this statement of mine had to be made to keep the record straight. May I, if only in fairness to the Secretary-General and his team that went out to the territories, end as I began. The Malaysian Government echoes the hope expressed by the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines that the present crisis be-

tween the two countries will not harden into hostility. As he remarked so eloquently the other day, our lots have been so cast together and in such close proximity with each other that even if no other consideration existed to bring us and keep us together, it does not profit either of us to remain divided or to lend ourselves to pursue paths that will keep us apart now and divided forever.

97. Mr. KAMBONA (Tanganyika): I beg to exercise my right of reply in order to make clear the stand of my Government in connexion with the statement made by a representative of the Government of South Africa. The speaker from South Africa, in his statement this morning, had the courage to paint a rosy picture of the inhuman policy of apartheid and racial discrimination ruthlessly pursued by the present European minority Government of South Africa. In his lengthy statement, the speaker—who by the way is only a representative of a minority Government of the inhabitants of South Africa—made reference to Tanganyika in connexion with the international locust control, in a way that might have suggested the existence of co-operation between my country and his Government.

98. In order that representatives here might not be misled by this reference to Tanganyika, I wish to put the record straight. Tanganyika has recently waged a campaign against the humiliation long imposed on the African peoples by colonialism and racial discrimination which is found in its most repugnant form in South Africa. My Government has never had diplomatic relations with South Africa and has imposed a total trade and economic boycott of South Africa, because we believe that its apartheid is exactly the opposite of the policy of my Government which stands on non-racialism.

99. Tanganyika has withdrawn all landing rights for South African aircraft. And here I welcome the action of the Government of South Africa in investing £2 million in developing the international airports at Luanda, in Angola, and Cape Verde. We welcome this because we know that in a few months these two international airports will be in the hands of the Africans. South Africa's ships are not permitted to call at our harbours. In keeping with this policy of no compromise with apartheid—since apartheid is contrary to my Government's policy of non-racialism—we do not accept the South African Government's co-operation with regard to locust control or in any other field.

100. As on many other occasions, the Tanganyikan delegation wishes to emphasize that there should be no doubt in anyone's mind about the irrevocable decision of the African peoples and their friends to intensify our struggle against apartheid and racial discrimination. The recent summit conference at Addis Ababa has reinforced our unequivocal stand against this evil effrontery, which is a menace to our very existence as human beings, against this humiliation which has been imposed on colonized people and people of African origin and which has been tolerated in this world much too long.

101. As regards the racist Republic of South Africa, the words spoken by Chief Luthuli when receiving his Nobel Prize in Oslo, as reported in The Times of London of 12 December 1961, are highly revealing and pertinent. He said:

"It is not necessary for me to speak at length about South Africa. Its social system, its politics, its economics and its laws have forced themselves on

the attention of the world. It is a museum piece in our modern times, a hangover from the dark past of mankind, a relic of an age which everywhere else is dead or dying except in South Africa. Here the cult of race superiority and of white supremacy is worshipped like God, and a verse is found in the Bible to justify it.

"To us all, free or not free, the call of the hour is to redeem the name and honour of Mother Africa."

102. Indeed, there is no need to talk too long about the heinous and repugnant doctrine and practices of apartheid. The basic facts are known to everyone. What is required now is to consolidate our ranks and to strengthen our action to remove the cancer of apartheid from this planet, in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

103. As for my country and people, we are determined to combat the evil of apartheid and racial discrimination in Africa and in the world, and no amount of wishful thinking or pious warning will deter us or confuse us. We know, too, that we have many reliable friends in this fight for true human freedom and that victory is ours.

104. Mr. THOMAS (United Kingdom): I come to this rostrum not to reply to the statement of the representative of Indonesia—although I must admit that I was sorely tempted to do so—but, in fact, to reply briefly to the Foreign Minister of Somalia. In his statement today, Mr. Issa denounced—in somewhat violent terms, I am sorry to say—his interpretation of Her Majesty's Government's policy in regard to the Northern Frontier District of Kenya, the northern part of which is predominantly inhabited by people of Somali origin.

105. I must confess I was surprised that not once in his somewhat lengthy denunciation of Her Majesty's Government's policy did the Foreign Minister of Somalia refer to the conference which took place between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of Somalia some two months ago in Rome, when I had the honour to lead the British delegation. For it was during that conference that Her Majesty's Government's policy on the Northern Frontier District was firmly and frankly stated to the Government of Somalia and, as I am sure the Foreign Minister of Somalia will agree, received the fullest support of the Kenyan Ministers who were present. I should add that there were Kenyan Ministers as part of the United Kingdom delegation which I led.

106. At that conference, I explained that we hoped that Kenya would become fully independent on 12 December 1963. As representatives know, Kenya now has—apart from certain exceptions—internal self-government. It was our hope that in December it would become fully independent.

107. I explained that since the United Kingdom would be responsible for Kenya only until December of this year, my Government was convinced that it would be wrong for it to take a unilateral and arbitrary decision about the frontiers of Kenya contrary to the wishes of the Kenyan Government. The elected Ministers of Kenya, who, as I have said, were present, confirmed that such a decision would be quite unacceptable to them.

108. In the view of my Government—a view which was approved by the Ministers of Kenya—an agreement on this problem should be arrived at by the African countries

concerned, within an African framework. At the meeting in question, the Kenyan Ministers told the Somali Ministers that they were willing to continue discussions with the Somali Ministers at an early date, without any preconditions. They also recognized the interest of Somalia in the future of the people of Somali origin in the Northern Frontier District.

109. Unfortunately, and to the regret of my Government, that conference ended without agreement. But the Ministers of Kenya said that their offer of direct talks, without preconditions on either side, remained open. I expressed the view that on further reflection the Somali Government would accept this offer. I express the same view today.

110. I should like to say this to the Foreign Minister of Somalia, for whom I have the warmest respect: It is wholly untrue to say, as he has said, that the inter-

ests of the United Kingdom are served by a state of tension and conflict in the Horn of Africa. Indeed, my Government desires nothing more than that the people of that area should live in peace and in growing prosperity. It was precisely with this in mind that we decided that it would be wrong of us to take a unilateral decision on the frontier problem posed by the Foreign Minister of Somalia.

111. I repeat that we consider that it is in the interest of everyone that a solution should be sought by the African countries concerned, in an African framework. This, I believe, would be in accordance with the views expressed at the Addis Ababa Conference. I am confident that it will be approved by the vast majority of nations represented in this Assembly.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.