



Friday, 16 November 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Page
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	167
Speeches by Mr. Cooper (Liberia), Faris El-Khoury Bey (Syria), U Myint Thein (Burma), Salah-el-Din Pasha (Egypt) and Mrs. Sekaninova-Cakrtova (Czechoslovakia)	

President : Mr. Luis PADILLA NERVO (Mexico).

General debate (*continued*)

[Agenda item 8]

SPEECHES BY MR. COOPER (LIBERIA), FARIS EL-KHOURY BEY (SYRIA), U MYINT THEIN (BURMA), SALAH-EL-DIN PASHA (EGYPT) AND MRS. SEKANINOVA-CAKRTOVA (CZECHOSLOVAKIA)

1. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) : One might wonder why such a small country as Liberia finds it necessary to take part in this general debate which concerns the destinies of mankind, especially after the speeches of the great Powers such as the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and so on. Liberia is a small nation with no great armies, navies or air forces and would have little to contribute to the fate of the world if that fate rested upon the might of armed forces. Our very existence as a State springs not from our might or the force of power to liberate ourselves from grinding oppression and cruelty but rather from the remorse of conscience of those States which have exploited the weaknesses of our race.

2. It therefore can never be a reproach to us that a portion of our race was exploited to maintain the fruits of luxury of the western countries, as history has shown that man in his greed for the comforts and conveniences of this world was never hesitant in exploiting his weaker brother, regardless of what race or of what creed. The reproach, therefore, must always be levelled at the exploiter, for in exploiting his less fortunate brother he has violated all the principles upon which the dignity of man rests.

3. We, the Liberian people, have maintained our independence not through any physical force, as we have already pointed out. We have neither armies nor navies to maintain and protect our independence, but have chiefly relied upon the moral conscience of our two great colonial neighbours, on their honesty and moral integrity to respect the sanctity of their obligations which were couched in the various treaties signed between us. We regret to say, however, that these obligations have not always been scrupulously respected.

4. It is therefore from this standpoint of the sanctity of treaties and the moral obligations of nations that we have resolved to participate in this general debate. It goes

without saying that the existence of all small nations must rely upon the moral integrity of the great Powers to respect the sanctity of treaties.

5. We cannot therefore but view with alarm the disagreement among the great Powers. We have had our hopes for the last three years dashed asunder by the refusal of the great Powers to agree on any formula for world peace.

6. As long as there is such a disagreement among the leading nations of the world the small nations, mindful of their own fate, are bound to reach decisions on world affairs not necessarily based upon a sense of right and justice but chiefly on grounds of their national interests and security of their sovereignty. It therefore does not matter what eloquence might be displayed by the great Powers in setting forth the rightness of their cause ; this will have very little effect on those nations whose right to existence is in some way or form linked to one or the other of the conflicting Powers.

7. It implies, therefore, that the almost insoluble divergencies of views among the great Powers have shown that in the political phase the United Nations has become paralysed and static. As long as this situation prevails, and as long as the great Powers feel that they are not bound to respect the wishes of any majority on any issue and can thus ignore such wishes without penalty either by illegal means, that is, by total disregard for the will of the majority, or through legal means by the use of the veto under the Charter, such lofty ideals as saving coming generations from the scourge of another war or the reaffirmation of our faith in fundamental human rights, or the establishment of conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, or the promotion of social standards, become mere phrases used to appease the conscience of mankind.

8. Under such conditions the small nations are bound to look elsewhere for their national security, and we find them either members of some regional pact or aligning themselves on the side of some great Power ; for they can never be unmindful of the rape of Ethiopia, or the subjugation of Norway, Belgium and Denmark by Hitlerite Germany. Small nations like mine must therefore ever be mindful of the old Aesop fable of the lion, the ass and the fox. The

lion, the ass and the fox went on a hunting expedition and between them managed to kill a deer. As king of the beasts, the lion called upon the ass to divide the spoil. The ass relying upon justice and right based upon fair play, divided the game into three equal parts : one for the lion, one for the fox and one for himself. No sooner done than the ass was pounced upon by the lion and destroyed. The king of the beasts then called upon the fox to make the division. The fox being mindful of the fate of the ass, in dividing the spoil awarded the bulk to the lion, retaining an infinitesimal part for himself. The lion was much pleased and in addressing the fox said, " Sir, where did you learn such good manners ? " The fox in reply said, " Sir, from my dead brother the ass. "

9. As long as might still continues to be on the side of the biggest battalion, as long as the high principles of the Charter still continue to remain a Utopian dream, no one should or could expect little nations like mine to sacrifice their national existence upon an artificial altar of right and justice. No power of speech, no coercion will induce them, the small nations, to follow such a blind and unrealistic course. They will cast their votes and lend their support where their national interest is best served and secured. This does not mean that the small nations have lost faith in the United Nations as the most effective instrument of international peace and security, but as long as such lofty ideals remain a Utopian dream, some other form of national security must be substituted.

10. In other spheres, however, such as in the economic and cultural fields, great progress has been made by the United Nations. Technical assistance is being brought to many under-developed countries for the promotion of science, education, health and agriculture. My country is one of the recipients under the technical assistance programme. Already a technical assistance mission from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization is working in Liberia. Experts from the World Health Organization have begun to arrive to assist us in the fight against malaria and other tropical diseases. Supplementary agreements have just been signed with the International Labour Organisation for the sending of experts to assist us with our labour problems. A United Nations Information Centre for West Africa has been established in Liberia and we are happy to say that it has already made much progress in enlightening the peoples of that region of the world about the activities of the United Nations. There are many other countries like mine which are receiving this kind of practical assistance. This is the kind of progress which has spelled progress for the United Nations in a disturbed world.

11. This magnificent work of the United Nations, fulfilling as it does the needs of less advanced, undeveloped and under-developed countries, would now seem to be threatened by the lack of agreement among the major Powers—a disagreement which, if continued, is bound to end in another world catastrophe. If mankind is again plunged into a third blood bath, the responsibility will clearly rest at the door of those who under the guise of national, political and strategic interests have rendered agreement, peace and social progress impracticable.

12. We have heard a lot about world peace, a peace that must embrace all nations and races without distinction. The Liberian delegation must therefore here endorse whole-heartedly the declaration made by one of the representatives speaking from this rostrum that one of the fundamental conditions of real peace, one of the indisputable prerequisites for making the United Nations truly universal, is respect for the political aspirations of countries which

have been in the school of so-called " tutelage " for decades, if not for centuries.

13. In this connexion, my delegation hopes that the benevolent attitude evinced with respect to dependent peoples in Asia, whether spontaneous or not will also be extended to the dependent peoples of the African continent, and that the administering Powers will not hold the view that owing to the backwardness of Africans in dependent territories the same investigation carried out by commissions in the Middle and Far East in ascertaining the preparedness of these peoples for self-government should not apply to Africans.

14. My delegation, however, notes with some degree of satisfaction that certain of the colonial Powers have introduced reforms in territories under their administration with a view to finally educating the inhabitants of such territories for self-government. However, this does not apply to all the colonial Powers. We find that some colonial Powers, instead of improving the backwardness of African peoples, have found it more to their advantage to keep them in a perpetual state of ignorance and backwardness, thereby hoping to exploit them more easily. My delegation speaking for, and in the name of, the Government and people of Liberia, earnestly hopes that in the not-too-distant future either through the United Nations or otherwise the liberation of the continents of Africa and Asia will become more than a mere dream, in fact a reality.

15. In the annals of history, it would appear that the continent of Africa has been regarded merely as a source of raw material and cheap labour, fit only for the extraction of super profits to enrich one or two countries. We are of the considered opinion that this economic and social inequality should now be considered an anachronism, and that the vast wealth of the African continent should be used not for the enrichment of certain countries, but for the benefit of the world in general and the African in particular.

16. It is to be admitted and is generally put forward from this very rostrum, that in some cases subjugated people have to some extent benefited by the rule of the conquerors, but it must also be admitted that in nearly every instance the conqueror has never failed to demand and receive his pound of flesh. To continue to use such arguments, such as the benefits of Western culture and civilization as a means to justify continuous occupation, subjugation and exploitation, as if without such foreign rule the conquered people could not have continued to exist as a nation and social unit, is not only misleading but absolutely false, and cannot be borne out by the facts of history. Before the coming of the Europeans, there were, and in some cases still are, great empires in Asia and Africa whose scholars and scientists have contributed much to the so-called Western culture and civilization. As one writer has said, " Few things are more galling than to be told by those whose favours we have to accept that without these favours we would hardly be alive. "

17. In conclusion, we should like to record our appreciation to the French Government and people for the very cordial and warm reception extended to the various delegations attending this General Assembly in Paris and we should like to believe and hope that the motto of the French Revolution, " Liberty, Equality and Fraternity " was not conceived with a view to being applicable to any particular nation or race or any particular people or creed, but rather to the world in general and mankind in particular.

18. Faris EL-KHOURY Bey (Syria) : It is rather a hard task, coming to this rostrum after so many illustrious

speakers, to discover new, up-to-date ideas worthy of being addressed from this platform to the whole world. For this reason, I shall be very brief in making my points, either in disagreeing with some ideas presented by other speakers, or in expressing the support of my delegation broadly, and in principle only, of certain important proposals submitted by the leading Powers, especially that proposal [A/1943] presented by the three western Powers concerning regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and armaments, and the other one [A/1944] presented by the Soviet Union regarding measures to combat the threat of a new world war and to strengthen peace and friendship among nations.

19. Since the opening of this session, the world has been listening with the deepest interest to the declarations of the chief representatives of the sixty nations assembled here trying to solve the vital problems of the world and to relieve the tension undermining the desire of eliminating war and ensuring peace. I wonder if those listeners were satisfied or disappointed when they heard the elaborate speeches delivered here and broadcast all over the world? Were those who listened satisfied or disappointed? They were very anxious to be assured that there would be no war and that peace was guaranteed, but were they assured in that sense? Certainly not. They were also eager to hear that the signatories to the Charter of the United Nations were remaining loyal to their pledge to refrain from the threat or use of wars, and to their faithful promise to fulfil in good faith all the obligations assumed by them under the Charter. Did they hear anything of that sort? Certainly not. Up to now we have not heard any assurance to that effect. Nations are supposed to stand by their pledges of honour and preserve the confidence of their agreements. I am afraid the anxious listeners were disappointed when they heard nothing to assure them that there would be no war, that the armaments race would be terminated and that the huge funds expended in producing and accumulating war materials would be diverted to social and economic projects, to ameliorate the conditions of the needful peoples and countries, thus preventing poverty and class discrimination. That is the only way to eliminate communism in the non-communist countries, and the only way to exhibit the demerits of communism in communist countries.

20. The actual conflict threatening world peace is waged between adherents of these two social doctrines or régimes: one, communism—offensive and seeking expansion; the other, democracy—defensive and seeking self-preservation. The peace-loving peoples of the world want to be assured that these social régimes will not collide by force of arms. The misunderstandings between the parties should be dissipated by their meeting together and discussing all the different points, trying to find a solution in good faith. They are bound to do so. In the last session the General Assembly adopted a draft resolution¹ presented by Syria and Iraq asking the great Powers to meet and solve among themselves, in the spirit of the Charter, all their differences. The resolution [377c (V)] was adopted unanimously, including the Big Five, who promised solemnly to comply with this recommendation. Unfortunately, nothing has been done in that direction up till now.

21. Mr. Dean Acheson put before the General Assembly, in his introductory speech, a proposal for the regulation of armaments, in agreement with his two western colleagues, Mr. Anthony Eden, United Kingdom representative, and Mr. Schuman, representative of France. But Mr. Vyshinsky,

representative of the USSR, branded this proposal as fantastic and ridiculous. He presented another proposal with the same aims, but with different means. This is a case which necessitates their meeting together to discuss their respective views in private, away from propaganda platforms.

22. These proposals of both sides are not new to the United Nations. They have been presented and debated several times, but they have been neglected. In 1946 the General Assembly adopted a resolution [42 (I)] on the basis of which Member States were called upon to submit to the Security Council adequate information comprising detailed figures of their armed forces and armaments of all kinds. For this purpose of regulation and reduction, the Security Council established the Commission for Conventional Armaments. This Commission has worked hard. During the two years in which I participated in its work as a member of the Security Council, 1947 and 1948, it worked hard and tried hard, but in vain, to obtain any information of that nature. Now the same fate will meet the tripartite proposal, because one side cannot be expected to disclose all its armaments and subject itself to verification while the other party remains cloaked in secrecy and mystery.

23. As to the other proposal of Mr. Vyshinsky, it will be defeated as usual and the plan for disarmament will remain in oblivion. The race for armaments continues to frighten a world which is awaiting the explosion. We are certain that neither of these two conflicting sides will venture to take such steps which will brand them as aggressors by initiating war; but these mobilized millions of men cannot remain under arms forever without action. Precedents in history have shown unwarranted acts by isolated armed forces on frontiers, and such things may happen at the present time with reprisals.

24. I am afraid that the wave of optimism which lightened men's hearts for a short time before the opening of this session has now turned to dismay after hearing the introductory speeches of the leaders of world policies. The hopes of nations were concentrated on this Organization, but finding the United Nations is impotent even in implementing the principles of its own Charter so far as a strong Member is concerned, the small nations can be excused if they lose confidence. This deplorable state of affairs would appear to put a duty on the sponsors of the Charter in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals² to meet again at once and seek a way out of this crisis. Consideration of the horrible weapons which can be adapted for mass destruction and which both sides possess makes it evident that so-called victory of one side in any future war could only mean destruction of both sides. The burden has to be borne by the small nations as well as by the big Powers. How much more convenient and better it would be if the leaders of the big Powers were to pronounce from this rostrum that there will be no war, and that they have agreed among themselves to meet together and solve all the world's problems which are now pending? What joy it would spread over the whole world if they did this, instead of coming here and facing each other with fists ready to strike.

25. The whole problem is that the big Powers in the United Nations are disagreeing among themselves and do not keep the pledges which they made in the Charter to refrain from the use of force and to preserve and maintain international peace and security in any circumstances. That disagreement has also led to another problem, reference to which is included in the items on the agenda for this

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, First Committee, 371st meeting.*

² See *Documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, Volume 111, San Francisco 1945.*

session, namely, that of the admission of new Members. We have about a dozen new applicants whose applications are still on the shelves of the Security Council, due either to lack of a majority or to the obstruction of the veto. Many times has the question of the admission of new Members been discussed in the General Assembly, in the Main Committees, and in the Security Council without any result being reached simply because the Big Five do not agree on the admission of these applicants. The opinion^a given by the International Court of Justice put an end to these discussions, and I do not see what useful purpose is served in putting this item on the agenda, and in what way the problem can be solved. There is no way so long as the admission of a new Member depends upon a two-thirds majority in the General Assembly adopting an affirmative recommendation of the Security Council. As long as this affirmative recommendation is not obtainable unless the Big Five agree, it is useless to discuss it any more here. As long as the provisions of Article 4 of the Charter stand, there is no other way out of this impasse. It will be seen that all the decisions of this Organization depend upon the full concurrence of the Big Five. The Big Five are responsible for these disputes and for the dismay which is felt by the whole world because they do not agree and because they are preparing themselves for war.

26. Where are those promises which were made before; where are the four freedoms? They are not to be found anywhere. These four freedoms are now absent from the world more so than they were in the last century. If the Big Five would meet together and agree on the principle of universality, which was advocated in the Security Council and which got many adherents and supporters in the General Assembly, that is to admit all applicants without distinction or discrimination, it would help to solve the problem. This Organization is intended to be universal; it is not intended specially for certain States. Why should we not try to get the whole world here? It is far easier to manage otherwise unmanageable people if they are Members rather than if they are not.

27. One of the representatives referred to the Atlantic Pact with approval, and then went on to welcome the so-called Defence of the Middle East Command. I should like to call your attention to the passage where the speaker to whom I refer put these two projects on the same level of correctness. I have to disagree on this point emphasizing the obvious difference between the two. The Atlantic Pact is a treaty of alliance between the twelve signatories who negotiated its terms and concluded the text therein with mutual consent for defence of their own territories against any external aggression. This convention is similar to the Collective Security Pact concluded last year by the seven Member States of the League of Arab States and falls under the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter. The Defence of the Middle East Command, however, is not the same thing. It was prepared and signed by four States other than States of the Middle East, and those Middle East States had no knowledge of this pact concluded in their absence to defend them. They were not consulted and were unacquainted with this project.

28. If the Atlantic Pact has its justification in the Charter of the United Nations, this intruding quadripartite formula cannot find justification in any international usage. The Middle East States are masters of their own policy, and no defence can be imposed upon them from outside. If the western Powers wish to make an approach to the Arab

States in the Middle East in regard to a political understanding, they should first find a satisfactory and just solution of the Arab complaints.

29. Instead of doing so, they overlooked the Egyptian crisis and the Palestine catastrophe, with its refugees, and proceeded to draft a kind of intervention in Arab domestic affairs impinging on their sovereign rights. I do not know if the authors of that project expected the Arab States to acquiesce in that arrangement while such sad events were being perpetrated around the Suez Canal and in other Egyptian territories, and whilst the resolutions of the General Assembly regarding the repatriation of the Arab refugees of Palestine received no support from the big Powers, who were themselves responsible for the implementation of those neglected resolutions.

30. Another representative referred to the case of Palestine, advising the Arabs and Jews there to live together in friendship and advocating the peaceful co-existence of peoples of the same area. That was wise advice, probably emanating from goodwill, but the representative knows very well that peaceful co-existence must be based on justice and respect for the rights of neighbours, which is not the case in Palestine at present.

31. In this connexion I want to say a few words on the item of Palestine which has been inserted in the agenda for this session, as it has been inserted in every agenda for the previous four years and no doubt will continue to be included for many future years and keep the United Nations busy. In November 1947 this General Assembly adopted a resolution [181 (II)] dividing Palestine into two parts, giving 60 per cent of the country to the Jewish immigrants and 40 per cent to the Arab inhabitants of the land. As soon as this resolution was adopted by the General Assembly, the Jews started the tactics of intimidating the Arab citizens there who were living in the portion allotted to the Jews, in order to put them to flight. They did this by different methods of persecution.

32. So, late in 1947 and early in 1948 the Arabs of the districts of Tiberias and of Safad fled from the country and went to Syria and the Lebanon. A little later, about 1 April of that year, during the Mandate—because the Mandate for Palestine was only terminated on 15 May 1948—about 40,000 Arabs in the big city of Haifa also fled from the country. A little later a similar incident took place in Jaffa. The Jewish Haganah attacked Jaffa and between 70,000 and 80,000 Arabs left the country and took refuge abroad.

33. It should be noted here that, during the Mandate, the Mandatory Power deprived the Arabs of arms of all kinds, so that they were completely unarmed while the Jews were well armed. It is sad to relate that the Mandatory Power neglected its duty and allowed the Jews to have armaments, so that when the declaration of the partitioning of Palestine was made by the partitioning plan, the Jews were well prepared to execute their vicious plans to expel the Arabs from their homes in order to appropriate those homes and property.

34. So it went on until the termination of the Mandate on 15 May 1948, when the Arab States marched on Palestine to repatriate their refugees and to establish peace there. The United Nations and the Security Council intervened seriously in an effort to stop the fighting in Palestine, to create a truce, and afterwards an armistice. This was achieved.

35. In the end the numbers of refugees reached the very large number of between 800,000 and 1 million. Before

^a See *Competence of the Assembly regarding admission to the United Nations, Advisory Opinion: I. C. J. Reports 1950, p. 4.*

this crisis Palestine had 1,250,000 Arab inhabitants and 600,000 Jews. Now in the Jewish territory there are about 500,000 Arab owner-inhabitants. The Arabs were all expelled from their homes before the termination of the Mandate. After it, the Jews seized on a dispute with the Arab States to attack other territories inhabited by Arabs, allotted to Arabs in the partition plan. I refer to western Galilee, including the districts of Acre and Nazareth which were occupied without resistance because there were no Arab forces at all in that neighbourhood. The Jews also attacked the districts of Lydda, Ramle and Beersheba, occupying them practically without resistance because there were no Arab forces there either, and they expelled the rightful Arab inhabitants and so increased the number of refugees to about 800,000 or 1 million—I am not sure of the number now, but the relief agency which is working on this subject puts the figure at over 800,000. Some are scattered in the Lebanon, some in Syria and others in Jordan and Gaza which is now controlled by the Egyptian forces.

36. This large number of refugees who have been deprived of their homes, their fields, their palaces, their gardens and their roads, are looking from afar upon their own land and territories, looking at the Jewish immigrant intruders who came recently to take their places, who are collecting the fruits of their gardens, who are living lavishly and snugly in their homes and exploiting their fields; while the Arab refugees are left outside, under trees or in tents, suffering every kind of hardship from heat in summer and from cold in winter. They are there with their children. They cannot go in because, if they tried to do so, rifle bullets would pierce them.

37. This is the situation in Palestine. The matter ought definitely to be settled by the United Nations. The resolution [194 (III)] of the General Assembly in 1948 was that the Arab refugees in Palestine should be repatriated as soon as possible, and that those who do not wish to be repatriated should be recompensed and resettled elsewhere. The General Assembly set up a Conciliation Commission to implement that resolution. It was composed of three Powers who have been acting since 1948, until now without any result. They could not attain anything in face of the Jewish resistance to allowing any refugees to go back to their homes because the homes left by the Arabs were already occupied by new Jewish immigrants from abroad during this time. The number of Jews was already doubled by those immigrants in order to utilize and occupy the homes and properties of the Arabs who had been expelled from their country.

38. The General Assembly repeated the same resolution at the fourth session in the year 1949 [resolution 302 (IV)], and again in 1950 [resolution 393 (V)], but all in vain and up to the present time nothing has been done and not a single refugee repatriated or allowed to return to his home.

39. It is a pity that the representative of Israel, criticizing yesterday from this platform a speech delivered by our Iranian colleague, Dr. Jamali, said that he would refresh Dr. Jamali's memory by reminding him that it was as a result of the Arab State's attack in Palestine that the tragic problem of Arab refugees had been created. I am sorry to say that this gentleman is Mr. Shertok, who has been aware of events from beginning to end, who is now Foreign Minister of Israel and was the representative and Secretary-General of the Jewish Agency during all the time of the Mandate, and who was sitting with me in the Security Council during 1947 and 1948. All these matters are well known to him. How does he ignore the situation and the events? He either distorts facts or forgets, but I

do not think his memory is so bad that he forgets such conspicuous things which are so evident to everybody and must be especially to himself.

40. I wish now to refresh his memory, as he tried to refresh that of Dr. Jamali yesterday. Dr. Jamali's memory is correct, it does not need to be refreshed, but Mr. Shertok's memory ought to be refreshed. I remind him now that it was not the attack of the Arab States on Palestine which caused the crisis of the Arab refugees, because the Arab refugees were expelled from Palestine before the intervention of the Arabs months before that. As I have already stated, this exodus from Palestine as the result of intimidation and terrorism started in December 1947 and continued until the month of May. In the middle of May the Mandate was terminated and the Arab States intervened on 15 May. This was the first intervention of the Arab States, while this exodus took place long before, as I have stated; and I think that Mr. Shertok remembers very well a discussion in the Security Council which took place before the intervention of the Arab States, during which I stated that the number of refugees from the homes of Arabs amounted at that time to about 400,000; and Sir Alexander Cadogan, representing the Mandatory Power, replied correcting this figure, saying it was not 400,000 but perhaps 300,000 or 250,000 up till then. Mr. Shertok was present and knows all this. Now he says that the intervention of the Arab States after 15 May gave birth to the problem of the Arab refugees. You see that it is not as he said, and I am sorry that this gentleman has taken such an attitude in denying facts which he knows are facts and correct just as I have related them.

41. I hope, and all the Arab world hopes, and the humanitarian centres of Europe expect, that this problem of refugees will be solved in a good way, in a right way, by the execution of the resolution of the General Assembly, by repatriating them to their homes. This is justice, this is right, and anything else would certainly be neither justice nor right.

42. U MYINT THEIN (Burma): The debate has dragged on, and I shall not tax the patience of this august Assembly by making a long statement. I desire merely to express the hopes and fears of a small country. My delegation must, however, join their fellow representatives in according thanks to the people and the Government of France for extending to us their traditional hospitality and in enabling us to conduct our deliberations in this historic city. In return for France's unstinted kindness to the United Nations how nice it would be for the representatives present at this Assembly to come to an accord on controversial issues and sow the seeds of peace at this session so that the sixth Assembly, despite its unpropitious beginning, may go down in history as the Assembly of Peace and for ever associate Paris with peace that has so far been elusive. It would be an appropriate gesture of the United Nations' gratitude to Paris for its hospitality.

43. The Burmese delegation have listened carefully to the contributions made by the representatives of various countries in this debate. They are impressed at the flights of oratory, and they would like to accept the sincerity of their utterances, but they are saddened at the display of vehemence in the ventilation of their grievances.

44. The Burmese delegation are not only saddened but alarmed at the uncompromising stand taken by the leading Powers. Faced with the difficulty of deciding whether a particular move is made in earnest or merely for propaganda purposes, the Burmese delegation are bewildered. They cannot help but feel that there is so much distrust, so much

suspicion, so much intolerance, that they ask themselves, now that unity is lacking in the United Nations is there any hope left for peace? It is indeed sad that six years after the cessation of hostilities the world situation remains tense with the prospect of a worsening and hope for a respite becoming dimmer. Simultaneously the prospects of yet another war continue to grow. God forbid that it should come. We have seen war. Our unfortunate country was fought over twice. In 1942, when the Japanese hordes came in, the retreating army followed the scorched earth policy.

45. Then came the dreadful years of occupation, with their nightmarish horrors and bombing and strafing by Allied airmen. In 1945 came the Allied advance and the consequent withdrawal of the occupying army, with the killing and harassment characteristic of a beaten army; there was also more bombing by Allied airmen of all the structures which still stood and which could have served as a shelter for the retreating army. We were eventually liberated—but at what a price and with what dreadful loss of life. The scars of war remain in Burma even today, so that we are unable to forget what we should like to forget.

46. Can one wonder, then, that the Burmese dread war? And, if the Third World War should come, would it not be the small nations—geographically situated, unfortunately, in the path of war—which would be the first to suffer? No one wants war, for even the fruits of victory are poisonous and uneatable. But each side accuses the other of promoting a new war. Everyone yearns and shouts for peace, but it is apparent that no amount of shouting or the mere putting forth of formulae for peace will achieve the desired object, until and unless the spirit of compromise is fostered in this Assembly and we endeavour to eradicate the distrust, suspicion and intolerance which seem to pervade the United Nations today.

47. That, then, is our fear. The Burmese delegation, even if they represent a very small nation, are no less sincere in their desire for peace. They therefore make a fervent appeal to the representatives of the major Powers, who can shape the destiny of the world, to endeavour to effect a change of heart which will pave the way for a spirit of compromise—which, again, is the basic ingredient of the remedy for misunderstanding and the means of steering the world away from the horrors of a conflagration.

48. I now come to our hopes. Despite the frustrating atmosphere, we still have the greatest faith in the United Nations. Believing as we do that everyone would like to avoid a conflict, we pray that our appeal will not be in vain. The Burmese delegation welcome and fully endorse the call of the representative of the United Kingdom for tolerance, patience and restraint in order to build a worthy world. The Burmese delegation hope that every one will answer this appeal, so that peaceful co-existence may be ensured.

49. After all, the contention that peaceful co-existence is impossible is belied by the events of our own lifetime. Even if we ignore the years of the last war, during which, it might be said, the necessity of facing a common danger compelled what are now known as the major blocs to embrace each other, there was still the decade before the outbreak of that war, when the contending nations of today did manage to live together in peace and harmony, despite their differences in outlook and ideology. If it has been possible for the former deadly enemies of the Second World War to become friends once more, is it too much to hope that former allies will also be able to do the same?

50. I have endeavoured to lay stress on the fact that the world is tense today because of the unfortunate differences in outlook of the leading Powers. It will be realized, however, that there are other causes as well. To my mind, one major cause is the continuing domination by certain Powers of those who have unfortunately become subjected to their authority. As the representatives of a nation which has only recently recovered its independence, it is understandable that the Burmese delegation should have strong views on the question. Experience has shown that a timely recognition of the legitimate aspirations of a subject nation can give birth to a new and fruitful relationship between the governors and the governed. Failure to recognize such legitimate aspirations can but bring bitterness, hatred and chaos.

51. While on this subject, may I be permitted to raise the question of racial prejudice and discrimination. We should be ungracious were we not to acknowledge the fact that no such problems seem to exist in France. We wish we could say the same for the world in general, but we are not without hope and we look forward to the day when the world will be one big brotherhood of men, where individuals will be judged on the basis of their personal merits, without reference to race or colour.

52. After this recital of controversial issues, I turn to an issue which involves no controversy but which is, nevertheless, of paramount importance. I refer to the necessity of making the world a happier place to live for, the millions of its inhabitants who, as things stand, are going through life in exactly the same way as their forebears have done for generations. The most hopeful development of this century has been the realization in the more highly-developed countries that there can be no genuine peace until some substantial adjustment is made in the disequilibrium which exists in the living standards of the peoples of the world. This, in our view, is the biggest long-range problem which confronts the United Nations. We are happy to be able to say that the United Nations has shown a keen awareness of its existence and that earnest endeavours are being made to tackle this gigantic issue. So long, however, as the present political tension lasts, we must face the sorry fact that the United Nations will be able to do little more than scratch the surface. A good beginning has now been made, and it is our fervent hope that, with a reduction in world tension, it will be possible to divert for this purpose a substantial proportion of what is now being spent on defensive measures.

53. My delegation desire to make a general observation on the question of the economic development of under-developed countries. In our view, economic development should aim at developing the human rather than the material resources of a country. One of the main causes of the present trouble in Asia is that, in the past, material resources and not the people were developed, because economic progress was regarded as sufficient. Economic progress unaccompanied by the enhancement of human welfare is self-defeating.

54. These, Mr. President, are the thoughts which come to the mind of the Burmese delegation as we embark on the work that lies ahead of us. We express them in the hope that they will be considered in the spirit in which they have been made. Our fond wish is that we shall be able to leave Paris with the feeling that our deliberations have carried us nearer to the cherished goal of the United Nations.

55. SALAH-EL-DIN Pasha (Egypt): In this general debate, each of us, in his turn, tries to make his contribution

by throwing as much light as possible on the conditions and prospects of world peace and on the welfare of the peoples of the United Nations whom we represent.

56. I have no hesitation in expressing my belief that the leaders of the world are sincerely endeavouring to serve and to bolster world peace and world prosperity. Nevertheless, I doubt whether in this endeavour they have chosen the best and the most effective way to attain the worthy goal which is both theirs and that of all human society.

57. We are still as far as we could be from agreeing on the control and regulation of arms, in accordance with the stipulations of the Charter. The result has been an appalling increase of the burdens of an already overburdened world, with no prospect in sight of putting an end to the mad race for armaments, which, in addition to its damaging effect upon the economy of the world, is a source of more and more tension and anxiety among the peoples of the United Nations and of the world at large.

58. My Government, therefore, welcomes all constructive suggestions and efforts, with a view to carrying out the stipulations of the Charter in this respect, and—to quote from Article 26 of the Charter—promoting “the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world’s human and economic resources” and the formulation of plans “for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.”

59. We are, furthermore, as far as we could be from translating into reality the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations by giving it the moral and material strength provided for in the Charter, so that it could fully shoulder its responsibilities and ensure the prevalence of the rule of law in international relations.

60. I still hope, however, that the United Nations will make another try, or even, if necessary, try again and again until it will have found the right road to peace and the effective means to preserve it.

61. Among these means, and, in the light of the clear and inspiring stipulations of the Charter, the “Uniting for peace” resolution [377 (V)] which was adopted during the previous session of this Assembly, can usefully be drawn upon. It is, indeed, a resolution which aims at the establishment of robust areas of strength and, Charter-wise, provides for ways and means to discourage and thwart aggression.

62. I feel certain that the Members of the United Nations as a whole and, behind them, the hundreds of millions of human beings whom they represent, share with me a feeling of disappointment that, until now, the spirit and the letter of the Charter are mostly unimplemented, and the resolution on “Uniting for peace” is still a mere resolution.

63. It grieves me to report to you that recent events in the part of the world from which I come are very discouraging to all those who have world peace at heart, to all those who have enough insight and enough foresight to realize the dangers which are increasingly besetting the road to peace in and around the Middle East.

64. No doubt, you all know a great deal about present conditions in the Middle East, and how they are becoming more and more explosive, because of the obstinate attachment of some colonial Powers to methods and relation-

ships which, even if they had a place at all in the dark ages of the past, have no place whatsoever in our life today, and are in complete and screeching dissonance with the Charter of the United Nations and with what should have been the free and soulful tone of the first year of the second half of the twentieth century.

65. The world knows too well how grave the situation, the disputes and the events are in that sensitive area, ranging from the west coast of North Africa on the Atlantic Ocean to as far east as at least the eastern boundaries of Iran. Many a question in that extremely sensitive area is calling loudly for an urgent solution and insistently appealing to the conscience and the foresight of the wise of the world.

66. Among these questions I mention, as an illustration and in geographical sequence, some to which I have just alluded: Morocco, Libya, the Nile Valley, Palestine and Iran.

67. Of the questions of Morocco, Libya and Palestine, you will hear during the present session of the Assembly. You have already heard some mention of the question of Palestine by several speakers who preceded me, and you will hear some more about it. Most of you will have read, in this connexion, the article in the *New York Herald Tribune* on 10 November by Stewart Alsop, after his visit to Egypt. Mr. Alsop wrote, among other things: “It is a political fact that the creation of the Israeli State has left a festering political wound here, and that the shameful treatment of the hundreds of thousands of Arab refugees from Israel acts like a permanent irritant in the wound.”

68. The stand of my Government in relation to this question and to the martyrdom of the people of Palestine, right under the eyes of the United Nations and of the civilized world, is too well-known. My delegation will, in due course, express the views of the Egyptian Government as to the long-awaited rightful solution of the question of Palestine.

69. The policy adopted in relation to this and to other questions of the Middle East by some Powers which are still enmeshed in antiquated systems is a policy which clearly demonstrates that they say one thing and do another; that they speak peace and intentionally or unintentionally endanger peace.

70. It is obvious that we cannot possibly create an area of strength, in the Middle East or elsewhere, on the basis of earning the distrust of the people of that area; of denying them their rights and begrudging them any serious, effective, honourable comradeship in the building up and in the preservation of peace.

71. The people of my country and of the Middle East will continue adamantly to refuse a status in any way less than that of comradeship, less than that of equal sovereignty with all the peoples of the earth. This is our right and our due. We maintain, and we will continue to maintain, that this comradeship should be real and not mere words. We are entitled to expect that the stipulations of the Charter relating to the equal rights of nations, large and small, be carried out and be translated into palpable, constructive realities. This equality of rights and the very peace and survival of the free world necessitate the fullest possible co-operation in the building up of the bulwarks of peace, so that aggression be discouraged and the peace and the security and the freedom of the world be really safeguarded. In all this we must remember

and keep in mind that there can be no strength where the people are deprived of the means of strength, where they are denied their rights, and where some among the mighty Powers maintain a policy of covetousness, of encroachment, of suppression and of aggression.

72. This dark picture could indeed have been much brighter and more encouraging, and the sources of trouble and instability could have been made into fountain-heads of comfort and security. This is attainable through the respect, by all, of their pledges under the Charter of the United Nations and through the action of some Powers by ceasing to cling to the disruptive, domineering systems of dark ages gone by.

73. We certainly can all build together for peace; we can discourage aggression and circumvent it. We can live confidently surrounded by righteous power and proud of our stand on justice and on the freedom of the peoples of the world. Is not all this worth trying for? I wish to trust that we all think so, although I am not encouraged in this thought by some of the recent, extremely distressing events, events which are continuing to take place even while I am addressing myself to you in this common forum of the United Nations.

74. When this Assembly was convened in New York in September of last year, heaviest among the shadows cast over the world was the war in Korea. This year we have two wars, one in Korea and the other in the country on whose behalf I have the privilege of speaking to you today. It is a real war, waged upon Egypt by a country claiming still to be an ally.

75. British land, sea and air reinforcements were rushed to the Suez Canal Zone to swell the occupation forces which had already exceeded by far the number allowed under the 1936 Treaty. These forces have taken full possession of the whole of the Suez Canal area, placed it under martial rule, and practically cut it off from the rest of the country. They took control of various public utilities, such as communications, electricity and the water system.

76. Public authorities, including the judiciary, have been direly molested. Judges have been prevented from discharging their serious and sacred duty in that part of the homeland. Some were even interned and deprived of food for two days.

77. Customs authorities and coast guards have been prevented from exercising their functions, with the result that the smuggling of narcotics appreciably increased.

78. Health authorities have been prevented from doing their work, and it is seriously feared that epidemics might ensue and spread from this area to other parts of the country.

79. The British have also prevented the administrative authorities from discharging their essential duty of maintaining internal public security, whereas the responsibilities of these authorities have greatly increased owing to the provocative attitude taken by the British.

80. Egyptian labourers who, prompted by their patriotism, unanimsly resolved not to co-operate any longer with the British forces, were brutally subjected to all sorts of coercion and intimidation. Some were even forced to work at bayonet point. Caterers, in their turn, resolved to stop supplying foodstuffs to the British armed forces, which retaliated by commandeering all kinds of supplies. British forces repeatedly fired at Egyptian military and

police forces and shot down peaceful citizens, not even sparing women and children. Egyptian newspapers have been banned, and the British went so far as to ban the "Egyptian Gazette", a British paper controlled by a Briton in Egypt.

81. Mr. Churchill seemed ill at ease when, a few days ago, he made the following answer in this respect before the House of Commons: "Here is a local paper, published in English, which is owned by an Egyptian registered company, and the controlling interest among the shareholders is held by an English woman resident in Alexandria. This paper has only been presenting the Egyptian side of the case, and I do not think it fair that troops should be left for several days before the news arrives from all the papers of all the parties in the country, and should only receive this anti-British dope."

82. I could hardly expect that Mr. Churchill would tell the House that the real reason for banning this newspaper, which he himself admits to be British-controlled, is but an understandable worry, lest the British armed forces in the Suez Canal area should know the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

83. This is only a brief account of British atrocities and of British aggression in Egypt. If all this is not war, then I do not know what war is.

84. In his eloquent statement during the present debate, the representative and Secretary of State of the United States expressed his great concern for human rights. He told us of certain happenings in Hungary and in Czechoslovakia, which he described as a brutal crush of freedom. I wonder what description he would give to the atrocities committed in the Canal Zone by his British friends and allies. I, for one, have no hesitation in calling them a shameful, treacherous aggression by the United Kingdom which constitutes not only a menace, but also a breach of international peace and security. They are, indeed, a complete repudiation by the United Kingdom of the principles and the decencies of the Charter of the United Nations.

85. It can and it should be asked why all these happenings are made to take place in the Nile valley; why the United Kingdom obstinately refuses to evacuate its armed force from Egyptian territory; why it extends its armed aggression against Egypt to ever widening areas; why the United Kingdom intensifies this aggression against a country of whom it still claims to be an ally. Is it because Egypt has resolved to live freely among the free? Is it because the people of Egypt refuse to be under the clumsy heel of foreign domination? Is it because the people of Egypt claim their right to a life worth living and want to honour their pledges under the Charter of the United Nations? Or is it that the United Kingdom is desperately clinging to the crumbling system of imperialism, of spheres of influence and of encroachment which, as President Roosevelt said, has been tried once again and failed?

86. The answer is obvious.

87. Nevertheless, our colleague from New Zealand has found fit to point the blame at the wrong party, at the wronged party, at Egypt. He spoke to us on 9 November about "the duty which falls upon all of us to honour our international engagements". He indulged in the luxury of condemning Egypt for what he called the unilateral overthrow of freely concluded agreements, and went on to say that "the repudiation of treaties might have appeared more understandable, although still inexcusable, if done

at the expense of a country which rigidly opposed all change and never listened to arguments for the revision of agreements in the light of circumstances".

88. Our colleague concluded his intervention in this respect by donning clerical robes, piously praying for Article 1 of the Charter, and asking God Almighty to preserve this world of ours from becoming an international jungle.

89. It was no surprise to any of us that the representative of the United Kingdom readily subscribed to the intervention of his associate from the South Pacific, briefly pointing, in his turn, to the respect for the sanctity of treaties as an obligation which binds all States both small as well as great.

90. It was not my intention to deal at length with the historical, political and psychological reasons which impelled my Government to announce on 16 October 1951, the end of the agreements of 1899 and 1936. In fact, however, of the statements made by our colleagues of New Zealand and the United Kingdom, I have no other choice but to take up the challenge.

91. In doing so, I deem it necessary to look, if only for a moment, into the past and, in the light of it, survey the present; though I well understand that the standard-bearers of expansionism, colonialism and imperialism dislike a retrospective survey of history which will prove to be embarrassingly too revealing.

92. The British occupation was first forced upon Egypt on 11 July 1882, in the wake of a long-schemed and contrived conspiracy. Since that date, the British have endeavoured, through an endless chain of one pretext after another, to prolong that occupation. Thus the world was made to hear from the British such things as—the protection of the Khedive, the protection of foreigners, the protection of the poor, the protection of minorities, the protection of so-called vested interests and the protection of British communications.

93. Today, the British resort to a pompous but empty pretext which has nothing whatsoever to do with the world of the Charter of the United Nations and the life and thoughts of 1951. They self-appointed and set themselves up as the defenders of the Middle East. This is what Mr. Morrison called the other day "the responsibilities of Great Britain in the Middle East on behalf of the Commonwealth and the Western Allies as a whole". Has this anything to do with our Charter?

94. Throughout the last seventy years the British have made a considerable number of solemn promises to withdraw their armed forces from Egyptian territory; more than sixty of them. In 1946 the British conceded that they should completely withdraw their armed forces from Egyptian territory not later than September 1949. If I am not mistaken, we are now well past September 1949, and far beyond September 1951. Yet the British, instead of withdrawing, are maintaining on Egyptian territory tens of thousands of their troops and are almost every day adding to them; whereas even the late treaty of 1936 limited the number of their troops which could be allowed on Egyptian territory to no more than ten thousand.

95. The core of the scheme which took expression in the stationing of British armed forces on Egyptian territory has always been to keep those forces on our territory for ever. The British have constantly maintained this objective of theirs and have, on purpose, created one of the most vicious of all the vicious circles on record. They

kept in mind that the Egyptian army must never become strong. They did this in order always to be able to say that the Egyptian army is still weak and that, consequently, British troops must stay on Egyptian territory.

96. Many an event, many an upheaval, have taken place in the world. The League of Nations came into being. The League of Nations faded away. The United Nations was set up while the smoke of the guns and the detonation of the bombs of the Second World War were still in the air. The Charter of the United Nations was formulated, and the system of collective world security was instituted. Kingdoms and empires crumbled and others arose. Armies have risen and have fallen. Generations succeeded one another. More and more new armies, well equipped and well trained, came into existence. Even in Korea, which had for many a century been completely cut away from all martial life, we have seen created in less than five years two mighty armies—one in the south and one in the north. Yet, seventy years have not been long enough for the British to set up, equip and train an adequate army of Egypt—of the same Egypt which, less than forty years before British occupation, had an army so strong as to call for the combined action of Great Britain, Russia and France to restrain what seemed to them to be Egyptian excesses.

97. Had the British been sincere in their claim that they occupied Egypt for the good of the Egyptians; had they honoured their commitments under the treaty of 1936 and of the period before 1936, the Egyptian army would have been today a force to be reckoned with and relied upon in the defence of peace, capable of bearing its full share of responsibility under the United Nations Charter.

98. But the British have never lost sight, not even for a single moment, of their objective, namely, indefinitely to delay all real strengthening of Egypt and the Egyptian army. They did everything possible and imaginable to make a sham of the Egyptian army and to make a shambles of all their commitments to equip and train it. Moreover, whenever and wherever Egypt tried to secure arms from other countries, the United Kingdom always plotted to deny to Egypt access to such arms. Nor was this the only violation by the British of the letter and the spirit of the now extinct treaty of 1936. They had no scruples in trampling over it, in tearing it to shreds. Never was it felt by Egypt that the United Kingdom lived up to its commitments or respected the so-called alliance established between the two countries.

99. One aggression after another was committed against Egypt; one attempt after another against its sovereignty, by no other party than that which claimed, and still seems to claim, to be an ally.

100. To give only a few illustrations, I would recall that they went beyond the areas assigned under the 1936 treaty for stationing their armed forces, just as they exceeded the number of troops allowed under that treaty. They refused to comply with the health and customs measures required by Egyptian law. In the Palestine question they took, and are still taking, a hostile course which has exposed Egypt to grave dangers; though, according to the treaty, the British are bound not to take in their foreign relations an attitude inconsistent with the alliance. They have pursued in the Sudan a policy calculated to separate it from Egypt and to separate Southern Sudan from Northern Sudan.

101. Indeed, the happenings in the Sudan, before and after the 1936 treaty, have been typical of British imperia-

lism. They constitute nothing less than a repudiation of solemn pledges and a betrayal of trust. Allow me to present some salient facts.

102. When the British occupied Egypt they had nothing to do with the Sudan, but they took advantage of their occupation of Egypt and of their control over its affairs to force the Egyptian Government to evacuate the Sudan, then force it to agree to a joint re-conquest of the Sudan and then again force it to sign the two agreements of 1899 for the joint administration of the Sudan. They did not claim then that the Sudan had a separate status or that they had responsibilities towards the Sudanese. On the contrary, they repeatedly affirmed that they were acting in the Sudan on behalf and in the interests of Egypt as illustrated by the Fashoda incident and by many of Lord Cromer's reports. Contrary to their declared policy they endeavoured through the Sudan administration—dual in name but British in fact—to antagonize the Sudanese, by various manœuvres, against their Egyptian compatriots preparatory to separating the Sudan from Egypt. This intention was clearly shown in 1924 when Britain took advantage of the assassination of the Sirdar and put Egypt out of the Sudan and went as far as to threaten interference with Egypt's Nile waters.

103. Now that national consciousness has awakened in Egypt and the Sudan, the British adopted new tactics to meet the new circumstances. They repeatedly declare their concern for the welfare of the Sudanese and demand that they should be consulted and be given self-government leading eventually to self-determination.

104. It can be seen, therefore, that when Egypt in the early days of occupation could not question their actions, they made use of Egypt's name and of the pretext of acting on its behalf to dominate the Sudan. When we asserted the right of Egypt and the Sudan to independence, the pretext of acting in the name of Egypt became of no use to them. The British had to turn to another pretext which was this time that they speak in the name of the Sudanese and defend their interests. It is obvious that the two pretexts are contradictory for indeed there is a great difference between administering the Sudan in the name of the Egyptians and demanding from Egyptians in the name of the Sudanese that the Sudan should ultimately have the right of self-determination.

105. May we ask who authorized the British to speak in the name of the Sudanese and who asked them to shoulder the responsibilities they claim in the Sudan? What historical, legal or moral right have they to interfere between the Egyptians and their compatriots the Sudanese who have been united from time immemorial by the Nile, by political, geographical and economic unity and by ties of race, language and religion?

106. In this connexion, I take leave to quote no less an authority than Mr. Winston Churchill. In his book "The River War", he wrote:

"If the reader will look at the map of the Nile system, he cannot fail to be struck by its resemblance to a palm tree. At the top the green and fertile area of the Delta spreads like the graceful leaves and foliage. The stem is perhaps a little twisted, for the Nile makes a vast bend in flowing through the desert. South of Khartoum the likeness is again perfect, and the roots of the tree begin to stretch deeply into the Sudan. I can imagine no better illustration of the intimate and sympathetic connexion between Egypt and the Southern Provinces... The advantages of the connexion are mutual; for if the Sudan is thus naturally and geographically an

integral part of Egypt, Egypt is no less essential to the development of the Sudan."

107. I should like to point out that Mr. Churchill expressed these views at the time that the British used to affirm that they were acting in the Sudan on behalf of and in the interests of Egypt.

108. The fact is that the British never had Egypt's interests at heart when they acknowledged that they administered the Sudan in Egypt's name and on its behalf, nor do they have now the interests of the Sudan at heart when they claim that they are endeavouring to give it self-government and self-determination. It is only a pretext to continue their administration of the Sudan for as long as possible so that they would have the opportunity of independent action under cover of the will of the Sudanese.

109. This is borne out by the fact that their repeated talk of self-government has resulted in an effete Legislative Assembly shorn of all authority whereas Egypt wanted the Sudan to have a truly representative Legislative Assembly endowed with real power.

110. When we asked the British about the period after which the Sudan might enjoy real self-government, their estimate was between fifteen and twenty years, while Egypt maintained that the Sudan should have self-government within two years, basing its estimate on the resolution [387 (V)] of the United Nations General Assembly in regard to Libya, for indeed the Sudan is no less deserving of self-government than Libya.

111. Let no one, therefore, be deceived by such manœuvres as the statement in the British House of Commons yesterday by Mr. Anthony Eden. The statement is nothing more or less than an echo and repetition of the same old imperialistic formula to perpetuate the hold of the United Kingdom on the Sudan, and to defer for as long as possible all real self-determination for the Sudanese. Just read the statement of Mr. Eden and judge for yourself. Also read, if you will, the legislation which the Egyptian Government adopted on 16 October in relation to the Sudan, which in unmistakable terms sets up a truly representative body for the Sudanese and a real system of self-government of the Sudan.

112. It should be clear by now that there is quite another side to the picture of the Sudan from that which the British have strenuously been trying to portray to the world.

113. With all the importance and the portent of the historical facts which I have just brought to your attention, they cannot match the significance and the eloquence of the present events in the Sudan.

114. Do go and see for yourselves the swelling tide of Sudanese enthusiasm for the withdrawal of British forces from the Nile Valley, for the termination of the present British Administration in the Sudan and for unity with Egypt. Go and see for yourselves what the British do to stem the rising tide: prohibition of public meetings, suppression of public demonstrations, persecution of patriots, closing of schools and flagellation of students. This is hardly convincing as a proof of the claim repeated so often by the British that they have at heart the welfare of the Sudanese.

115. The question of the Sudan has been subjected to the greatest imaginable amount of falsification and insidious propaganda. The British are now posing as the champions of the independence of the Sudan. Is it a real independence

or is it a British independence for the Sudan that they mean? Does the United Kingdom agree to withdraw all British officials and armed forces from the Sudan in order to allow scope for a free plebiscite there, free from British pressure, British influence and British propaganda?

116. We know beforehand what our Sudanese compatriots would opt for. We know that they will reaffirm their loyalty to their King and their natural unity with the rest of the people of the Nile Valley. We know above all that the indivisibility of the Nile Valley cannot be validly contested; and we know as well that neither tradition nor law would countenance such a plebiscite. Nevertheless I do, from this rostrum, and before this common forum of the United Nations, declare as a challenge to the United Kingdom that, for our part, we would withdraw our officials and our armed forces from the Sudan on condition that the United Kingdom do the same, so as to allow the Sudanese freely to express their will through a plebiscite for which the necessary machinery, atmosphere and preparation could be provided with the co-operation of the United Nations. This is a frank, clear-cut challenge which I make to the United Kingdom and which I am more than sure the British will not dare take up.

117. I have recounted in brief outline parts of the ghastly record of British imperialism in the Nile Valley. It should by now be abundantly clear why Egypt denounced those agreements which the United Kingdom had so assiduously trampled over and torn to smithereens. When denouncing the now-extinct treaty of 1936, and the agreements of 1899, Egypt did nothing more than announce their death. They had already been murdered by the United Kingdom. Let no empty talk, therefore, about the so-called ignoring by Egypt of the sanctity of treaties deceive anyone.

118. There are three score or so Member States of the United Nations represented here. Does any one or can any one of us accept to be for ever bound by a treaty to which the other signatory would not be bound; and what would the answer be if the other party completely ignores the treaty and constantly violates it? I shall not here cite the many cases in which treaties have been denounced before and the many reasons for such denunciation which are, in the greatest part, extremely flimsy if compared with the reasons which have impelled my Government to denounce the 1899 and the 1936 agreements. The denunciation by Egypt of these agreements cannot fairly be described as being done on an impulse. For seventy years Egypt has been trying to correct the situation and get rid of British intervention in the Nile Valley.

119. Our colleague from New Zealand claimed that the United Kingdom did not rigidly oppose change and did listen to arguments for the revision of agreements in the light of circumstances. Allow me in this respect to recall the negotiations which Egypt has gone into, most patiently, year after year in recent decades. This should suffice to show how much Egypt held back and put on the brakes until they screeched. Ever since as far back as 1920 negotiations followed one another in close succession. There have been the Saad-Milner negotiations, the Adly-Curzon negotiations, the Saad-Macdonald negotiations, the Sarwat-Chamberlain negotiations, the Mohamed Mahmoud-Henderson negotiations, the El Nahas-Henderson negotiations, the Sidky-Chamberlain negotiations, the Nahas-Lampson negotiations, the Nokrashi-Stansgate negotiations, the Sidky-Bevin negotiations, the Khashaba-Campbell negotiations, and, lastly, my negotiations through eighteen months with the late Mr. Bevin and with Sir Ralph Stevenson, the British Ambassador in Egypt.

120. In each and all of these negotiations, the British never wavered from their traditional imperialistic policy. They did not seem in the least aware of the high principles loudly declared and as loudly acclaimed in this twentieth century of ours: The Wilson Principles, the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations.

121. Two points remain which the representative of New Zealand has raised and which I cannot leave unanswered. Referring to the 1936 treaty, he clearly implied that he considered it a "freely concluded agreement". Need I recall that this treaty was concluded under the haunting and heavy pressure of the British occupation? Or shall I recall in an identical case the remarks of the late Ernest Bevin, who stated in relation to the Soviet-Iranian dispute in 1946, that the British Government would regret any arrangement which might appear to have been extracted from the Government of Iran by compulsion, whilst the Soviet Government was still occupying a part of Iran, adding that it was inadmissible to negotiate, attempt to negotiate, or seek to obtain concessions from a small Power in favour of a large Power through the occupation of that country by armed forces. He also stated: "We are powerful countries; we are what is sometimes described as the 'Big Three'... But we do represent power, and power does count in negotiations."

122. We all remember that the Security Council espoused the concept so forcibly expressed by the late Ernest Bevin, that the presence of foreign armed forces in the territory of a country deprives it of its freedom of choice in negotiations.

123. The other point to which I alluded, and which was raised by the representative of New Zealand, is his reference to the Middle East as an area of vital importance to communications. It is indeed so. Our colleague has, however, overlooked the basic facts of the Middle East. Intertwined and wholly concerned with these facts and these problems are the teeming millions who are living in the area. An illustrious statesman of the East recently deplored the attempt by some to solve the problems of Asia without taking Asiatics into consideration. I do submit that it would be futile—it would be sheer folly—to attempt to resolve the problems of the Middle East without taking into consideration its people, their life, their aspirations and their rights.

124. May I recall in this connexion the resolution adopted on 3 February 1951 by the League of Arab States, which reads:

"The Arab States cannot discharge the grave international responsibilities imposed on all nations by the Charter, unless they fully secure their national rights and have their problems settled in conformity with the principles of freedom, justice and equality."

125. Egypt can rapidly become one of the sturdy columns in the structure of international security. It can and should rapidly become the centre of an area of strength, which robustly stands for world peace and discourages all temptations to aggression. This would indeed be in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, and in line with the objectives of the "Uniting for peace" resolution. We all know what the Charter says concerning the setting up of a system of world security. We all know, equally, what the "Uniting for peace" resolution stipulates in

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, N. 1, 5th meeting.*

this respect : namely, that each Member of the United Nations maintains within its national [armed] forces elements so trained, organized and equipped that they could promptly be made available, in accordance with its constitutional processes, for service as a United Nations unit or units, upon recommendation by the Security Council or the General Assembly, without prejudice to the use of such elements in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence. I trust, moreover, that the Members of the United Nations have not completely forgotten the resolution [41 (I)] which the General Assembly adopted on 14 December 1946, which says that no Member States should have forces stationed in territories of any other Member States without their free consent.

126. Neither the Charter, nor any resolution adopted by any organ of the United Nations, said that the big Powers should stymie and stifle the growth and the liberties of the less big Powers. Nor did the Charter, nor any resolution of the United Nations, say that tyranny should brand our generation as it did brand some previous ones. Nor did the Charter of the United Nations give its blessings to such betrayals as those committed by the British in relation to Egypt and the Sudan, and to Palestine.

127. The Charter stipulates for the equal rights of nations, big and small ; for the sovereign equality of all the Members of the United Nations ; for the fulfilment by all the Members, in good faith, of the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the Charter, and for a system of world security.

128. Since the end of the agreements which Egypt had with the United Kingdom, the United Kingdom, in association with some other deluded Powers, tried to sell us the self-same dope-containing " broken doll " of imperialism, outwardly painted in a different colour. We will not buy it.

129. We will, on the other hand, stand by the Charter, by the resolutions of the United Nations, and for the prevalence of the rule of law in international relations.

130. Mrs. SEKANINOVA-CAKARTOVA (Czechoslovakia) : First of all I should like to greet, in the name of the Czechoslovak delegation, the French people who have so hospitably welcomed the General Assembly in Paris, the city connected with great progressive traditions which have made them famous in history. I am convinced that the French people, like the people of my country, will judge this session of the Assembly on the basis of what it will have done for world peace.

131. The General Assembly of the United Nations is meeting already for the second time in the period when the forces of imperialism have passed from the preparation of aggression to direct aggressive acts. For more than sixteen months the war in Korea has been going on, a war which the American-British interventionists carry on with a total lack of humanity. It subjects the heroically fighting people to boundless suffering, but it has not broken and cannot break their determination to bring the defence of their freedom and independence to a successful end.

132. The Czechoslovak Government and its delegation are fully aware of the seriousness of the tasks of this session and are fully determined to contribute to their fulfilment in the interest of peace and co-operation among nations. This follows from the substance of the policies of a country which is fully directed towards peaceful construction. In its international relations the policy of the Czechoslovak Government is led by the effort to maintain and strengthen peace, to expand and deepen peaceful co-operation among nations on the basis of full respect for their sovereignty, of

non-intervention, of the recognition of their equality, and of the maintenance of contractual obligations.

133. The Czechoslovak delegation sincerely welcomes the peace proposals submitted by the delegation of the USSR to the General Assembly. These proposals consistently continue the ceaseless efforts of the Soviet Union to remove the threat of war and to secure lasting peace. They solve all of today's burning problems and express the greatest desire of all the Czechoslovak people, as well as of peace-loving people all over the world. The Czechoslovak people have already adopted these proposals as their own. Wherever people work, they are analysed and discussed in a lively manner ; they give everyone new incentive in his work of peaceful construction.

134. The development of the debate from the opening of this session to the present has clearly indicated the understanding which the United States and certain other delegations have of the tasks of this sixth session of the General Assembly and the methods which they unscrupulously use in an attempt to impose their conception on other delegations. In their opinion, the sixth session of the General Assembly should continue to move along the dangerous road on which the United Nations Organization is being dragged, away from its original mission and from the spirit and Principles of the Charter, and on which it is being transformed into an instrument of imperialist aggression. The originators and advocates of this conception in their statements and proposals completely disregard what is expected from the sixth session of the General Assembly by the great majority of mankind, by the common people of all countries. They disregard the fact that their own people are greatly suffering under the constantly increasing burdens placed upon them by the policies of war preparation and aggression. They disregard the fact that the people of their country dread the policy of forming aggressive blocs and call for the return to the policy of understanding and peaceful co-operation among nations. They are not moved by the horrible bloodshed in Korea, a state of affairs wilfully prolonged by the United States military adventurers, who cynically cover their war crimes with the flag of the United Nations.

135. What we have so far heard in this general debate has shown us how far the Organization has already been led away from its path. The evaluation made by some delegations of the past year of United Nations activities gives an expressive picture of the imperialist policies of the United States. Their conclusions are intentionally based on the thesis that war is inevitable—a thesis which is necessary for the instigators of a new war. They openly aim at the liquidation of co-operation among the great Powers. Unconcealed, they follow the road of violating the foundations of the United Nations, so that it may adapt itself unreservedly to the needs of United States imperialism. In the period in which United States policy passed to a stage of directly aggressive acts, individual attacks—even the most violent ones—on the basic Principles of the Charter were not sufficient ; that policy passed to a stage of a general offensive against the very foundations of the Organization.

136. During the fifth session of the General Assembly, the United States forced the adoption of an illegal resolution, hypocritically called " Uniting for peace ". That resolution has nothing in common with peace. Its purpose was to open the road for the extension of the aggression which had already begun, for further aggressive acts which had been planned and for a whole, permanent system of aggression.

137. What a road this is intended to be is expressively shown in the report⁶ of the Collective Measures Committee, which has been lauded to such a degree by the delegations of the American-British bloc. In this report we have before us a really wide selection, in a systematically grouped scale, of the most varied measures destined for the unleashing and conduct of an aggressive war—measures which are only very badly masked as means to ward off aggression.

138. This report leaves no doubt in anyone's mind about who is supposed to use these measures and against whom they are directed. The aggressive plans of American imperialism, the objective of which is the preparation and unleashing of a new war against the USSR and other peace-loving countries, can be clearly seen from the activities of United States foreign policy in every sector of international relations. A policy dictated by an effort to achieve world domination can have no need for any agreements on a basis of equality. This we have clearly seen over and over again at this session already during our consideration of the agenda.

139. I think it is necessary to think seriously of the lengthy discussion that took place throughout the whole of last Tuesday. The procedure used by the American-British bloc during the discussion on the agenda was a very conclusive answer to the call for tolerance which was supposed to be the crucial point that was made by the United Kingdom representative on the previous day.

140. Mr. Eden appealed to us to be moderate and tolerant. He laid great stress on respect for international law and international agreements. What proof of a serious and sincere desire for moderation and tolerance was it when Mr. Eden supported the absurd and provocative proposals which were carried through on Tuesday by a mechanical majority? Mr. Eden surely knows well that the so-called complaints of the Kuomintang or of the Tito clique against the Soviet Union and the countries of the people's democracies lack any basis whatsoever, and are intended only to create and increase tension in this Assembly. What kind of respect for international law and international agreements is it when we see here the forcing through of a proposal for the establishment of a special international commission for Germany, a proposal which is the continuation of a systematic violation of international agreements and which is in such flagrant contradiction of the Potsdam Agreement as well as of the Charter?

141. Mr. Eden said that it would be a tragedy if the United Nations Organization were to lose the character of universality and representativeness. Why, then, does his delegation contribute to this prejudice by supporting the proposal of the United States which is aimed at preventing the discussion of the question of the legal representation of China, and thus not only deny the largest nation of the world its natural right to be represented in the United Nations Organization but also prevents the Organization from successfully fulfilling its tasks?

142. Let the delegations which so irresponsibly voted for this shameful decision realize that by excluding this question from the agenda of this session they have not prevented, and will not prevent, the great Chinese people from playing their important part in the affairs of the world.

143. Mr. Acheson, and some other speakers in their statements, did not spare superlatives in relation to human

rights. The sincerity of these statements is illustrated when they seek to prevent the airing of complaints against violations of the human rights of colonial nations. Already at this stage of this year's session the representatives of the American-British bloc have given us a clear picture of their devotion to the Principles of the Charter and of the methods they apply in the United Nations Organization.

144. Mr. Acheson, in his speech, indulged in symbols. The United Nations for him is a symbol of peace, Korea a symbol of aggression, and Mr. Oatis a symbol of the freedom of the Press.

145. Yes, the United Nations is a symbol of peace but this is to be found only in its original spirit which is expressed in the Charter. It is precisely those policies of the Government of which Mr. Acheson is a representative which divert the Organization from its original mission and have led it so far away from it that this "symbol of peace" has already, for more than a year, covered up the brutal and criminal war against the Korean people.

146. Certainly, Korea is the symbol of aggression, the aggression of an imperialistic power against a small country which, with the assistance of the Soviet Union, had liberated itself from the yoke of the militaristic clique of Japanese imperialists and had started to lead an independent life. Mr. Acheson declares that the United States is proud of playing the leading part in the Korean war. Has he thought, in this connexion, of how the nations of Asia look upon this role of the United States, how they look upon the fact that the members of a small and heroic nation of Asia are dealt with as inferior members of the human race, whom American soldiers contemptuously call "gooks", regardless of whether they come from the north or the south of Korea? Mr. Acheson is proud of the American bombs, of the mass barbarism, and of this war that is being fought in gross violation of all the rules of international law.

147. He can be really proud: according to data furnished by the Agent General of the so-called United Nations programme of assistance to Korea, Mr. Donald Kingsley, one million Koreans have been killed and the damages have reached the sum of two billion dollars. Mr. Acheson complained that the hopes of the civilized world that the mass persecutions of the Hitler régime would never be repeated have proved to be in vain. He could not have referred better to the acts committed daily under the alienated flag of the United Nations by the American heirs of Hitler in heroically fighting Korea.

148. Mr. Acheson in his speech touchingly spoke of American policy as being directed towards expansion of opportunity for the pursuit of human happiness.

149. The Korean people know probably best what happiness American policy brings. The nations of Asia who know the American conception of happiness refuse it flatly, and the nations of Western Europe refuse it as well. To them the forced alliance with the United States brings already now a deterioration of their standard of living, the "guns or butter" of Goering, and an even worse outlook was indicated to them by Senator Taft and the former Secretary of Defense, Marshall, when these gentlemen at this year's session of the Panama Canal Association and in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations declared that it was less expensive for the United States to conduct a war with soldiers of other nations, and that the American contribution was dollars rather than soldiers—other countries would supply the soldiers.

150. How does the United States Government care for the happiness and welfare of its own citizens? Nowhere in the

⁶ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 13*.

world are there more unhappy people than in the United States ; nowhere in the world is there so much war hysteria ; nowhere in the world do young people resort to mass-consumption of drugs out of a panicky fear of their own future ; nowhere in the world has crime grown to such a monstrous extent as in the United States ; nowhere in the world are powerful criminal syndicates so closely interlinked with public administration as in the United States. Mr. Acheson must know all this quite well from documents which in the United States enjoy the greatest authority—from reports of the Kefauver Committee of the United States Senate.

151. When Mr. Acheson speaks here of the dangerous subservience which results from thought control and makes aggression possible, it sounds strange from the lips of the representative of a country where terror is spread around not only by the Ku-Klux-Klan, but also by the very official Committee on Un-American Activities.

152. The present atmosphere in the United States is, I think, well characterized by the Supreme Court Justice, William G. Douglas who, according to the *New York Herald Tribune* of 10 November, said to the students of Brandeis University :

“ We are drifting in the direction of repression, drifting dangerously fast. Fear has driven more and more men and women in all walks of life either to silence or to the folds of the orthodox (point of view). Fear has mounted—fear of losing one's job, fear of being investigated, fear of being pilloried.”

153. Yes, such a thought control really makes aggression possible. In the United States, propaganda for peace is being punished as crime and war propaganda has an open road and receives full support.

154. In our country war propaganda, and thus also inciting to aggression, is being punished as a crime. If Mr. Acheson wants to care for human happiness he should begin with this worthy work first of all at home.

155. Another symbol of Mr. Acheson's is Mr. Oatis. He is to Mr. Acheson the symbol of free journalism, and Mr. Acheson states clearly what is in his view the main purpose and sense of free journalism. After a proper training in a school—of course not in a school for journalists but an espionage school—Oatis “ honestly sought ” information on frontier security measures, on the disposition of armed forces and on other military matters, and this information he delivered to American military authorities. Mr. Oatis is really more than an individual victim of his employers : he is a serious reminder that for Mr. Acheson and for the ruling circles of the United States of America freedom of the Press means freedom to collect information on defence and security measures, and that therefore the American idea of free journalism is one where this activity would be subjected to the American C.I.C., which cares very little about the provisions of Article 14, paragraph 3, of the draft International Covenant on Human Rights^a prepared by a United Nations Committee which excludes from the activities of a journalist everything which concerns the defence of a country and its national security.

156. Mr. Acheson abounded with big words also when he spoke of peace. “ We must work for peace, for understanding, for a reduction of tensions and differences ” said Mr. Acheson. What does the United States Government do for understanding ? That was clarified by President Truman when, on 20 September 1951, he declared at a

Press conference that the United States of America “ must now rely on force rather than diplomacy ”. The principal objective of the United States policy was declared openly by another of its spokesmen, Senator McCarran, on 17 August last, when he declared that the United States should “ let the world clearly know in all it says and all it does that its objective is the overthrow of Soviet dictatorship by all means at its disposal ”. He recommended the complete rupture of diplomatic and trade relations with all—as he calls it—“ Communist States ” and their expulsion from the United Nations Organization. He urged the United States of America to give all possible assistance and support to what he calls, and hopes to be, underground insurgent groups in Eastern Europe.

157. The discriminatory policies in economic relations, the limitations and rupturing of trade relations, the arbitrary violations of treaties, the cutting of transportation links, the systematic violation of frontiers and of the air space, the support of revanchist groups in Western Germany, the broadcasting of American radio stations inciting to criminal actions, the sending of spies, saboteurs and terrorists—all these concrete manifestations of American policy prove that Senator McCarran was not only expressing his personal desires, but that he authentically expressed the real objectives of the United States Government and the means for their achievement.

158. This is the real face of the work for peace, for understanding among nations and for a reduction of tensions and differences of which Mr. Acheson spoke. This is its real face as we in Czechoslovakia know it from first-hand experience.

159. Under such a conception of work for peace it is not surprising when Mr. Acheson boasts of the conclusion of the so-called “ peace ” treaty with Japan as a positive achievement of American peace policy. The so-called “ peace ” treaty with Japan is in fact a foundation for a military alliance with the resurrected Japanese militarism which is represented by the circles which have been condemned as war criminals by international military tribunals with the participation of the United States itself. In reality they create by this treaty and its supplement, the Pacific Pact, a base for their aggressive policies in the Far East.

160. This treaty of which Mr. Evatt, known to many delegates here, declared, as reported by *The Times* of 5 September last that it was “ an obvious and shameless abandonment of all principles of international justice and a danger to the physical as well as economic security of the nations of the Southern Pacific ”, is thus in the opinion of Mr. Acheson a model act of peaceful policy.

161. San Francisco has at the same time become a symbol for new American methods in international relations and an expression of the unscrupulous enforcement of the objectives of United States foreign policy. As the statesmen of the Western Powers and their Press openly declare, the spirit of San Francisco is to be extended to Europe as well.

162. The resolutions adopted at the conference of the foreign ministers of the United States, the United Kingdom and France in Washington and at the Conference of the NATO Council in Ottawa prove that United States imperialism speedily completes the transformation of Western Germany into the main base of imperialist aggression in Europe.

163. For the acceleration of the complete re-militarization of Western Germany the American military circles enlist as

^a See document E/1992.

their assistants notorious generals and officers of the Nazi army including the worst war criminals. This is a fact that we must constantly keep in mind when we hear Mr. Acheson speak of peace, defence and human rights.

164. In the *New York Times* of 24 January of this year we read :

“The Supreme Commander [Eisenhower] today before his departure to Paris has again made a statement which should convince the Germans, especially the soldiers, that the West is ready to recognize them as their honourable comrades in arms if they will carry out the tasks of the restoration of European military power.”

165. This statement of General Eisenhower is especially important when we note his statement made before the arrival of new American troops in Germany that for him there is no difference between Nazis and other Germans. This General Eisenhower declares in 1951. The development of the United States policy in Germany will stand out best and more clearly when we read what he said in the first issue of the *Neue Zeitung*, the newspaper of the American armed forces published in Munich on 18 October, 1945. He wrote :

“The denazification will be carried out by us by all available means. It will not affect only party members, but everyone who in any way enjoyed privileges from the Nazi régime. There will not be any indispensable national socialists. In addition to national socialism also German militarism must be destroyed.”

166. Today, however, not only General Eisenhower and the United States Government, but also the British and French Governments find the former Nazi criminals “indispensable”—*indispensable* for the preparation of war against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies.

167. Against the will of the peoples of all countries which had suffered immeasurably under the hitlerite occupation, whose best men died on Nazi scaffolds, in prisons and concentration camps, the United States Government did not hesitate at least to pardon the already-condemned hitlerite war criminals. The sentence of the armaments king and the main support of the hitlerite régime, Alfred Krupp, was annulled and all his property was returned to him. According to his own statement Mr. Krupp now works “in the old traditions of his family” and with him also the other hitlerite gun-makers.

168. Released are not only generals and officers but also criminals who carried out Hitler's foreign policy of conquest, his war propaganda, who condemned people to death and served as hangmen, who were in charge of concentration and extermination camps, who enslaved occupied countries and who committed their hideous crimes in all sectors of the Nazi system. These criminals committed their crimes not only on citizens of the Soviet Union, which made the greatest sacrifices and which crushed the hitlerite fascism, not only on my countrymen and the citizens of other occupied European countries, but also on members of other nations. Among the criminals who had been sentenced to death and now freed is Joachim Peiper, the commander of a military unit which bestially murdered 142 unarmed American soldiers who had been captured by the Germans at the battle of Malmédy in Belgium. How will the United States Government justify to the American people and to the relatives of these murdered men the pardoning of their murderer ?

169. The British High Commissioner for Germany, Kirkpatrick, already today speaks of amnesty for Hess, Raeder, and Dönitz.

170. The American imperialists refuse to extradite these war criminals for punishment to the countries where they committed their bestial crimes condemned by all civilized mankind.

171. For American pay Nazi generals, officers and strategists of Hitler's marauding war, such as Halder, Guderian, von Manteuffel, and others, now work.

172. The worst representatives of Prussian militarism which for several generations had been terrorizing Europe have been chosen by American imperialism as an ally. To the mercy of these people it would like to deliver Germany and, with the aid of the so-called Schuman and Pleven Plans, also the countries of Western Europe and their peoples.

173. The illegal three-Power proposal [A/1938] for the establishment of a so-called impartial international commission for Germany, which so grossly violates the Potsdam Agreement as well as the Charter, is also a part of this policy. If the western occupation Powers and their German helpers would really want the unification of Germany on a democratic and peaceful basis, for which the policy of the Soviet Union ceaselessly strives, they would not prevent the German people from holding free elections, as proposed by the People's Assembly and by the Government of the German Democratic Republic, which truly fulfils its obligations and effectively contributes to the maintenance of world peace.

174. After the Washington and Ottawa decisions, the United States Government has already begun openly to incorporate Western Germany into its Atlantic aggressive system.

175. This aggressive system has today been fully joined by the Tito clique. This act was demonstrated to us also at the General Assembly, right at the beginning when it came with the provocative so-called complaint slandering the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. It is not necessary to deal with the substance of these invented and completely absurd lies and slanderous statements ; their real meaning was unmasked by yesterday's Press reports announcing the signing of a special pact concerning American deliveries of arms and inspection of the Yugoslav army by United States army officers. They were disclosed by the leader of the Tito delegation himself yesterday in this Assembly hall when he spoke of the necessity of foreign aid to his Government. This aid is a wage for the treason the Tito clique has committed on its people, when it placed its independence and sovereignty under the dollar protectorate.

176. Mr. Acheson, Mr. Eden, and certain other delegates in the general debate lauded the organization of the aggressive Atlantic bloc and its methods as a solid bulwark of peace built in harmony with the Charter.

177. In reality, it is an organization which is to mass the armed forces of all the Western European countries in one European army under United States command. In the interests of this aggressive plan which the United States, in contradiction to Article 51 of the Charter, cynically pretends to be a regional defence plan, all Western European countries have been forced to let America order them to adopt a tremendous armaments programme.

178. Simultaneously, the United States exerts a merciless political, economic and propaganda pressure on Western European governments, and even on such a great Power as the United Kingdom ; it threatens them with stopping economic or military aid each time the European countries

do not show sufficient disposition to increase military expenditures or to lower the living standard of their people. At the same time the United States tries to spread the methods of the Committee on Un-American Activities all over its sphere of influence. It sees to it that everywhere the administrative and police machinery properly work for the interests of Wall Street and suppress all progressive, democratic and peace movements.

179. This is the real meaning of the Atlantic Treaty, the aggressive aim of which during the past year has become even more apparent. After the inclusion of Italy, the admission of Greece and Turkey and the extension of the Pact thousands of miles from Atlantic shores completely unmask the falsity of all argumentation about the regional character of the pact. Such argument is as false as the long ago unmasked arguments about its defensive character, and thus the word "Atlantic" ceases to be a geographical term and becomes a synonym for aggressiveness. By artificially whipped up war hysteria the "security" lines of the United States are to be projected to places thousands of miles distant where military bases could be built against the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the people's democracies.

180. The Atlantic bloc, however, threatens not only the security and independence of nations against which it is aimed, but also the freedom and sovereignty of the nations which are being forced into it. For instance, *The Times* well expressed the meaning of the term "mutual co-operation" in the American concept when it said in August last that the United States "taking Western Europe by the scruff of the neck and shaking her from time to time... is now pressing a rifle into her hands".

181. What the picture of the sovereignty of the Member States of the Atlantic Pact actually is was shown clearly in the American *Harper's Magazine* of last May in an article by James Reston. It is there stated:

"Before the public we maintain that the North Atlantic Pact Organization is based on equality of the bond of twelve countries. Secretly, however, we have created an organization of such a kind as to have all the power concentrated in the hands of a narrow military committee. In this committee not all the twelve members are represented, but only the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and France. However, even the decisions of the three usually take place outside the framework of the organization between us and the British. This the French do not like."

182. When the reluctance of the Western European States had especially clearly appeared at the Ottawa Conference, as, for instance, reported by Anne O'Hare McCormick in the *New York Times* of 19 September 1951, the newly created North Atlantic Treaty Organization Committee was formally extended to twelve members, but only to have its activities immediately concentrated as usual in the hands of the three great Powers and more specifically in the hands of its American Chairman.

183. The North Atlantic Treaty is, therefore, neither regional nor defensive and is moreover the prototype of an unequal treaty. It is an aggressive war pact which is contrary not only to the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter, but also to the basic principles and objectives to maintain international peace and security and to the principle of sovereign equality of all the Members of the Organization.

184. If there were further need of evidence it was given to us by Senator Taft himself who, according to a Reuters report published in the Paris Press yesterday, declared that

the Atlantic Treaty was a denial of all principles included in the Charter of the United Nations. Similarly this was indirectly confirmed here on Wednesday last by the representative from the Union of South Africa when he declared the so-called Middle East Command to be a logical extension of the Atlantic Pact. In this Command are represented the governments of countries from all parts of the world except from the area which this supposedly "regional organ" tries to rule, and which, as the representatives of Syria and Egypt pointed out, do not intend to accept it.

185. The North Atlantic Pact was expanded to an all-inclusive international organization with its own economy, powerlessly subjected to Wall Street, with its own army commanded by an American general, with its own navy commanded by an American admiral. The United States thus aims at supplanting as soon as possible the United Nations Organization for all practical purposes by another organization under the leadership of the United States with completely concrete war objectives similar to the objectives of defeated Hitler, that is, world domination. The Atlantic Treaty—that is the American conception of uniting nations.

186. How sincere the politicians of the Atlantic bloc are in their assurances of peace we can find out now in this place. As a mockery of the General Assembly, as a mockery of their own proposal for limitation of armaments, they call to Paris conferences of generals and economic experts who prepare further increases in armaments, they plan the calling of a special conference of the Atlantic bloc, they invite to Paris the Chancellor of the puppet Bonn Government.

187. The Czechoslovak delegation warmly welcomed the fact that the Soviet Government, through its Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. Vyshinsky, submitted to this General Assembly the proposal [A/1944] that the General Assembly declare the membership in the aggressive Atlantic Pact, and the construction of military, naval and air bases on foreign territory, incompatible with membership of the United Nations Organization. The declaration of the incompatibility of Atlantic Treaty membership with United Nations membership is an essential prerequisite for the United Nations Organization to return to its mission as expressed in the Charter. The American-British bloc already, before having submitted its proposals [A/1943] to this General Assembly, announced them as a planned big "peace offensive".

188. When we heard those proposals it was clear that we had here only a worse edition of previous proposals, which had been already many times unmasked before the world, as a means for achieving the aggressive imperialistic objectives of the United States Government. They are in no way aimed at the preservation and maintenance of peace. On the contrary, they wish us to take the illegal existence of the Atlantic Treaty and the armaments race as a basis for our work.

189. We are only expected to take a note of these illegal acts, file them and register them. On that basis we should then begin to reduce armaments, starting with the least important types. As regards the most important, the most dangerous and the most dreaded weapons—the atomic ones—they present us again with the old Baruch-Lilienthal-Acheson plan, a plan which tries desperately to keep the supposed monopoly in atomic weapons in the hands of the United States; a plan which, even from the viewpoint of these criminal purposes, is today worn out and absurd, since the recent clear words of Generalissimo Stalin crushed the last remnants of the fictitious illusion of United States atomic monopoly.

190. The American-British bloc, however, does not intend to liquidate the war where it rages today, and where the danger of the extension of aggression is greatest—Korea. On the contrary, it subjects all its proposals to its aggression and postpones them till the time when, as it vainly hopes, it will have accomplished its aggressive aims. We know very well that those who were entrusted with the conduct of aggression in Korea today everything to delay even the so-called programme of Mr. Acheson as much as possible. Already more than four months have passed since the peace appeal of the Soviet representative, Mr. Malik, and for all this time the commanders of the United States interventionists and their aides have been inventing the most varied pretexts to obstruct the armistice negotiations to which they had been forced by public opinion and the desire for peace of the people of their own country. And right now, in recent days, we have been witnessing how in this criminal effort they resort even to the basest slanders of the heroic people whom they, after the example of the fabricated Goebbels propaganda, falsely charge with murdering prisoners of war. To such repulsive means they must resort to keep up the sinking spirits of their soldiers and their fighting morale, which has been shaken by the realization of the injustice of the aggressive war, as well as by its unsuccessful duration and who want to go home.

191. The proposals presented to the General Assembly in the name of the Soviet delegation by its head, the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Vyshinsky, express the consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union. They aim as always at the very core of the fears and worries of the present-day world. They answer all the burning problems of the international situation. They find response in the hearts of millions of common people. The proposals of the Soviet Union are dictated primarily against the policy of blocs, which is so dangerous to world peace. Their objective is a just and immediate end of the war in Korea. The Soviet proposals further point out the effective way to an early reduction of armed forces and armaments, and to the prohibition of atomic weapons and their international control. The proposal for the conclusion of a peace pact amongst the five Great Powers is aimed at eliminating the present international tension and the strengthening of world peace.

192. The proposals of the Soviet delegation speak for themselves. Their strength is their own inner logic. Their basis is a deep conviction of the possibility and necessity

of peaceful coexistence of nations regardless of their different economic and social systems; the constructive desire to create at any time real conditions for a lasting peace; respect for the sovereignty of all nations, both large and small; respect for international obligations.

193. Behind the Soviet proposals there is the desire, the strong will and the active support of the great majority of mankind. Vain are the attempts of certain representatives in this Assembly to cover up these facts. Their efforts are only a proof of how great an obstacle to their plans they see in the great peace movement. This is why they speak of an "artificially created mass movement", although they know from experience that a world mass movement cannot be artificially created. How many billions of dollars have been expended for various broadcasting stations, for a flood of publications, for the purchase of souls, for the corruption of leaders of various groups, parties and midget parties, and how many attempts to create international organizations have collapsed with empty, miserable and sorrowful results.

194. To speak face to face to an elemental movement of its artificial character is an old worn-out argument which has been used against progress from time immemorial. We know, after all, that the great revolutions also, of which precisely this city has given many times an example to Europe and the whole world, have always been described by reactionaries as a war of a few agitators. If you charge the Soviet proposals with being propaganda it means you do not like the fact that they have been understood by hundreds of millions of people all over the world who grasp their whole meaning and actively support them. Thus you only underline their strength. Your proposals lack it. The Soviet proposals express the desires of the common man no matter where in the world he lives and works. We are convinced they are welcomed by all peace-loving people in the world as sincerely as they are welcomed by the people of Czechoslovakia.

195. The Czechoslovak delegation appeals to all delegations who cherish world peace and the security of nations to support the peace proposals of the Soviet Union.

196. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The general debate will continue at 3.15 p.m. I hope it will end during the afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.