



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
Speech by Mr. Kuznetsov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)	401
Speech by Mr. Benhima (Morocco).	405
Statement by the representative of the United States of America	409
Statement by the representative of Saudi Arabia	409
Statement by the representative of Israel . .	411
Statement by the representative of France .	412
Speech by Mr. Krishna Menon (India).	412
Statement by the representative of Spain. . .	427
Statement by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	427
Statement by the representative of Portugal	428
Statement by the representative of Morocco	428

President: Mr. Víctor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Nikita S. Khrushchev, in his address to the General Assembly on 18 September 1959, made a profound analysis of the contemporary international situation. He fully established the fact that the most urgent and pressing problem of the day was the problem of disarmament. Mr. Khrushchev said:

"Success in finding a correct solution to this problem will to a great extent determine the direction in which mankind is to go, whether it will be towards war with its disastrous consequences or whether the cause of peace will prevail." [799th meeting, para. 45.]

At the conclusion of his address Mr. Khrushchev, as you know, submitted the declaration of the Soviet Government on general and complete disarmament for consideration by the United Nations [A/4219].

2. It is particularly gratifying to note that, according to the joint Soviet-United States communiqué, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the President of the United States agreed that the question of general disarmament was the most important one facing the world to-day and that both Governments would make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of that problem.

3. In view of the general significance of the disarmament problem and the particular interest which the world community has shown in the new Soviet dis-

armament proposals, the Soviet delegation deems it necessary, now that the general debate is concluding, to draw the General Assembly's attention once again to these proposals.

[The speaker then read the text of the programme for general and complete disarmament, contained in the declaration of the Soviet Government on general and complete disarmament [A/4219].]

4. The new Soviet disarmament proposals are based on an approach to the solution of this problem which is new in principle; unlike all the other disarmament proposals put forward in the post-war period, the new Soviet proposals do not envisage simply a reduction, larger or smaller, in the armed forces and armaments of States or a prohibition of specific types of weapons. Rather they envisage the complete elimination of all the physical means of waging war in all States. If these measures are carried out, the very possibility of unleashing war will be eliminated.

5. This is unquestionably an extremely drastic programme. The danger of a missile and nuclear war looming over all peoples requires just such courageous and far-reaching solutions.

6. Everyone knows that implementation of the proposals for general and complete disarmament would bring about a radical change in the whole international situation. In his address on 18 September 1959, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR said:

"When it is physically impossible for any State to engage in military operations against other States, international relations will begin to develop under the banner of trust. Suspicion and fear will vanish; all countries will be able to behave towards one another as genuine good neighbours. The door will stand wide open to economic, commercial and cultural co-operation between all States. For the first time a reliable and lasting peace, to which all peoples so strongly aspire, will become a reality." [799th meeting, para. 89.]

7. When general and complete disarmament becomes a fact, conditions will be far more favourable for the solution of many other complex international problems. Circumstances will be more propitious to the development of international co-operation and exchanges in the economic, technical, scientific and cultural, public health and other fields. There will be an end to the artificial barriers with which States now isolate themselves from other States in order to guard their scientific and technical achievements for strategic reasons. The scientists of all countries will be able to direct their work entirely towards improving human welfare.

8. In view of the prospects which general and complete disarmament holds out for mankind, the wide response throughout the world to the Soviet Union's disarmament proposals is completely understandable.

9. The Soviet delegation notes with satisfaction that the overwhelming majority of comments express, in one way or another, support for these new Soviet proposals on the ground that they provide a basis for working out a comprehensive agreement among States which would guarantee the strengthening and consolidation of peace for all time.

10. The Socialist countries gave unanimous support to the Soviet proposals. I should like to recall some of the statements that have been made in this Assembly by way of illustrating the position of their delegations.

11. In welcoming the Soviet Government's proposals, the Indonesian representative, Mr. Sastroamidjojo, said that they "correspond with the policy of peace advocated by the Government and people of Indonesia. They are imaginative in spirit and revolutionary in scope." [815th meeting, para. 39].

12. The representative of Afghanistan, Mr. Pazhwak, said:

"The Afghan delegation welcomes the spirit of the proposals advanced... by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We think these proposals are basic and comprehensive, and we hope that their serious consideration by the United Nations will pave the way for more fruitful discussions on this long-standing problem, which has a direct bearing on world peace and security." [809th meeting, para. 89.]

13. The Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Green, expressed the following opinion about the Soviet proposals: "...I am entirely sympathetic with the general objective stated in Mr. Khrushchev's proposal, namely, a world without arms." [807th meeting, para. 56.]

14. One cannot fail to recognize the truth of the following statement, made by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Mr. Krag, in expressing approval of the Soviet proposals:

"Complete and comprehensive disarmament is of vital interest to all nations, great or small, to avert the dangers of all-destructive war and to alleviate the arms burden from the shoulders of mankind, thus enabling immense productive forces to be dedicated to raising the living standard of millions of human beings." [809th meeting, para. 16.]

15. Other delegations from Asian, European and African countries, including those of Finland, Norway, Sweden, Australia, Liberia and Saudi Arabia, have taken a favourable view of the Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament.

16. Many statesmen outside the United Nations have also urged that the new Soviet proposal should be treated with the utmost seriousness. One of these statesmen, the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, said that the plan for general disarmament proposed by the USSR was a courageous proposal deserving of serious study.

17. The United Kingdom's elder statesman, Mr. Winston Churchill, called the plan for complete disarmament put forward by the Soviet Union "striking". He said that the goal it envisaged was one to which all countries and their leaders must yearn.

18. The leading figures in the United Kingdom Government have, on the whole, also reacted favourably to

the introduction of the Soviet Union's proposals for general and complete disarmament. Thus the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, said that he welcomed the fact that Khrushchev had introduced these proposals. They should be examined carefully and constructively...

19. The leader of the British Labour Party, Mr. Gaitskell, made the noteworthy statement that he much regretted the West had not given the plan a warmer reception immediately. After all, the scrapping of all armaments and the general elimination of all types of weapons, under control, were measures that were always welcome.

20. Appeals for serious consideration of the new Soviet proposals for disarmament were made by a number of prominent United States statesmen; the leader of the Democratic Party in the United States, Mr. Stevenson, said:

"Khrushchev's proposal must be taken seriously. The only way to eliminate the scourge of war is to eliminate the means of war. And Mr. Khrushchev has proposed just what we all have preached—a disarmed world."

Thereafter, the Advisory Council of the Democratic Party urged the President of the United States of America, Mr. Eisenhower, to make prompt use of the USSR proposal for complete disarmament as a basis for negotiation.

21. It is quite clear that the Soviet proposals are warmly supported by the broad masses in all the countries of the world. No doubt, that is because the proposals express the hope of all peoples for the elimination of war from human relations.

22. In speeches both inside and outside the Assembly, a number of statesmen have been endorsing the Soviet proposals in principle and expressing ideas more or less akin to general and complete disarmament. There is no doubt that all constructive proposals providing for the settlement of the problem of general and complete disarmament must be carefully examined. Needless to say, the Soviet Government does not claim that all the aspects of this broad problem have been exhaustively dealt with in its document. Mr. Khrushchev, in a speech made at a meeting in Moscow on 28 September 1959, had the following to say on this point.

"We consider our proposals as a basis for agreement. We are ready to discuss all amendments to our document and proposals. We are also ready to discuss other proposals which may be introduced if they are designed to achieve the same aims as we are pursuing."

Thus, the Soviet Union is prepared to consider any pertinent observations which have been or may be made regarding the new Soviet proposals.

23. But it would be inaccurate, and hence wrong, to say that the Soviet disarmament proposals have called forth only a favourable response. Forces supporting the continuation of the cold war and the arms race are still far from capitulation. They naturally oppose not only general and complete disarmament but also any disarmament measures whatever.

24. We cannot overlook the opinions expressed by those who, either deliberately or because they have not properly understood the new Soviet proposals, are misrepresenting the meaning of the proposals and the

real aims of the Soviet Union. Thus, some people contend that the new Soviet proposals and, according to them, all the former disarmament proposals of the Soviet Union, do not provide for sufficiently effective measures of control over the implementation of disarmament.

25. It would be difficult to invent anything farther from the truth! The Soviet Union has always supported and will always support the most stringent international control over the execution of disarmament agreements. All the Soviet proposals for the prohibition of atomic weapons and tests of such weapons, and for the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces, have invariably been accompanied by specific proposals for establishing effective control on an international basis. However, the Soviet Union has always been opposed to divorcing the control system from disarmament measures and to control organs becoming, in effect, agencies for the collection of intelligence data under conditions in which there would be no actual disarmament. As Mr. Khrushchev said in his speech of 18 September 1959, "We are in favour of genuine disarmament under control, but we are against control without disarmament" [799th meeting, para. 64].

26. The new Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament are also based on this principle. They provide for the establishment of an international control organ, whose functions are to be extended progressively to correspond to the stage reached in the phased disarmament of States. Control is ultimately to become general and complete, provision being made for the institution of a system of aerial observation and aerial photography. In reply to a question on control at the press conference in Washington on 27 September 1959, Mr. Khrushchev elucidated this aspect of the Soviet proposals. He said:

"We certainly propose to establish, once disarmament has begun, a stage of control corresponding to each stage of disarmament, that is to say, to send representatives of other States to control the areas susceptible of control under the agreement. This will be the procedure followed throughout the programme's execution, until disarmament shall have been completed. At that time, the controllers obviously will have to remain in situ in order that each State should scrupulously observe the disarmament agreement." 1/

27. Needless to say, specific questions relating to the scope and character of the measures for controlling disarmament at the various stages of its implementation, as well as specific questions connected with other aspects of the programme proposed, will be the subject of discussion and agreement during appropriate negotiations.

28. By now it should be clear to any unprejudiced person that one important merit of the basically new approach to the disarmament problem proposed by the Soviet Union is this: it eliminates all the obstacles hitherto inherent in the control problem or artificially introduced into it.

29. Surely no one would deny that acceptance, in itself, of the solution of general and complete disarmament would be convincing confirmation of a sincere desire to establish relations on a basis of friendship, co-operation and repudiation of the use of force in the

settlement of disputes, and would lead to a significant strengthening of confidence in relations between States. In such an atmosphere of growing confidence, the solution of the problem of control would unquestionably be easier.

30. The argument advanced by certain statesmen and newspapers, that general and complete disarmament would benefit only the Soviet Union and the socialist bloc, is not helpful. The Soviet Union has proposed general and complete disarmament because of its sincere desire that the arms race shall be ended and that all peoples shall be able to live peacefully, free from the permanent and oppressive menace of another destructive war. Naturally, if other States also sincerely desire to attain that goal, there will no longer be any kind of ground for fearing to give up guns, bombs, submarines or rockets, bacteriological or chemical weapons, and so forth. All nations, without exception, will benefit from this.

31. Those who, while not openly rejecting the Soviet proposal for general and complete disarmament, seek to spread doubts as to its feasibility, are not helping the search for a way in which to end the arms race and for a radical change towards a normalized international situation. They remind us of the old Russian proverb: the mother-in-law who recalls her youth will not trust her daughter-in-law!

32. The Soviet Government, in advancing its proposal for general and complete disarmament, has proceeded from the conviction that, if the leaders of all States display good will and the political wisdom worthy of our age, the implementation of the proposal will be entirely feasible, and that so radical a solution of the disarmament problem would serve the interests of the world's peoples better than any other.

33. But in putting forward the programme for general and complete disarmament and in regarding it as entirely practicable, the Soviet Government certainly does not propose to act on the principle of "all or nothing".

34. If the Western Powers do not at the present juncture express their readiness to start general and complete disarmament, the Soviet Government is prepared, as it has been in the past, to negotiate with the other States on suitable partial steps towards disarmament and the strengthening of security.

35. In this connexion the Soviet Government deems it necessary to emphasize that discussion of the proposal for general and complete disarmament should not delay the settlement of so acute and pressing a question as that of the permanent cessation of nuclear weapon testing.

36. As a result of the lengthy negotiations at Geneva between the representatives of the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom, the positions of these Powers on the question of stopping nuclear weapon testing have already come somewhat closer together, and the Soviet Union believes that all prerequisites now exist for the final and early conclusion of agreement on this matter.

37. In this regard the Soviet delegation must express its regret at the wrong interpretation of the position at the Geneva negotiations given in the speech delivered to the Assembly on 17 September 1959 by the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Herter [797th meeting], in which the impression was conveyed that the USSR

1/ Statement reproduced in The New York Times, 28 September 1959.

was preventing the reaching of an understanding on the cessation of nuclear weapon testing.

38. It is well known that it was not the Soviet Union, but the United States which introduced a number of different proposals at Geneva with the object of delaying the conclusion of an agreement. The Soviet Union, for its part, introduced a number of constructive proposals, in which account was taken of its partners' positions in regard to all unresolved questions. The Soviet Government has repeatedly stated, and recently reaffirmed, that it is prepared to sign forthwith an agreement with the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom for the cessation, for all time, of every type of nuclear weapon test.

39. We consider that, in the matter of stopping nuclear weapon testing and in all other international questions, the parties should strive to find points of contact and mutually acceptable solutions, and not lay every possible emphasis on what divides them, or divert their energies towards seeking to establish who is to blame for the failure of past negotiations. In this connexion Mr. Khrushchev said, in his address to the General Assembly on 18 September 1959:

"I have no desire to stir up the past or to engage in an analysis of the obstacles and disagreements which developed in the course of the disarmament talks; still less do I wish to level accusations against anyone" [799th meeting, para. 62].

40. We are deeply convinced that the main requirement today is to remove the obstacles which have piled up on the path towards the solution of thorny international problems. That is the task in which the Soviet Union calls upon its partners in negotiations, and upon all other States, to help.

41. Attempts to press upon the present session questions like the so-called question of Tibet show that certain circles are concerned to prevent the establishment of a businesslike atmosphere in the United Nations. Of course, those who are using Ireland and Malaya as spearheads in this matter want to preserve the cold war atmosphere by every possible means. In this they are grossly violating the principles of the United Nations, the authority of which, as a result, is seriously undermined.

42. This session must repulse any attempts to use the United Nations for the purpose of exacerbating international relations. Our duty is to do everything in our power to help in improving the international situation, and in maintaining and strengthening world peace.

43. The study of outer space is now attracting more and more attention. In our times the wildest dreams of interplanetary flights, which only four or five years ago many thought to be impractical fantasies, are coming true. The interplanetary station, automatically controlled, which the Soviet Union has just launched, and which is now travelling on the far side of the moon, is an example.

44. In the past, mankind could not do without the exchange of experience, and co-operation, in various fields; nowadays, in the century of space and nuclear energy, the need for international co-operation is clear for all to see, and requires no proof. Indeed, it is impossible to conceive of any study of outer space in the absence of an exchange of the data collected by the scientific institutions of the entire world. How can science be confined within narrow national limits in

the century of the "sputnik" and the rocket? It is essential to establish co-operation, on the broadest possible basis and on a footing of equal rights, between all countries, in the study of outer space and its use for the benefit of mankind. The Soviet Union has supported, and will support every possible expansion of such co-operation in the study of outer space.

45. As is well known, when the United Nations *ad hoc* Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space was established [resolution 1348 (XIII)] at the thirteenth session of the General Assembly, discrimination against a number of countries was permitted. The Soviet Union, while supporting the idea of establishing the Committee, spoke against its formation with a membership which would violate the principle of equality of rights for all countries affected by its activities. However, the decision to give the Committee a membership which did not ensure the co-operation of all countries on a basis of equal rights was forced on the General Assembly. That decision impeded the beginning of genuine international co-operation in the use of outer space. The Soviet delegation regards this situation as completely abnormal.

46. Since an exchange of the results of scientific research leads to more rapid progress in the study of outer space, the Soviet Government intends to introduce a proposal for the calling of an international conference of scientists, under United Nations auspices, on the question of exchange of experience in the study of outer space.

47. We have seen that there has recently been a tendency, on the international level, towards a relaxation of tension and a normalization of relations between States. An ever-growing number of statesmen are beginning to realize the need for pursuing a policy of peaceful co-existence and one whereby international disputes are settled by negotiation.

48. In this connexion we must again mention the outstanding contribution, in the matter of confirming the principles of the policy of peaceful co-existence, represented by the visit of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev, to the United States and the forthcoming visit of the President of the United States of America, Mr. Eisenhower, to the Soviet Union. The joint communiqué published after the conclusion of the conversations between the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the President of the United States at Camp David, recording the agreement of both sides that all outstanding international questions should be settled not by the application of force but by peaceful means through negotiation, will doubtless have tremendous significance for the whole future development of international relations. All States and peoples should bend their efforts toward the attainment of the great goal—the ensuring of a firm and lasting peace.

49. We have many unsettled international problems before us. Mr. Khrushchev said here on 18 September 1959, "there is, however, one problem whose solution the people of all countries big and small await with hope, irrespective of their social systems and ways of life. It is the problem of disarmament." [799th meeting, para. 45].

50. Now that international tension is being reduced, the United Nations must take advantage of this promising opportunity to make a worthy contribution to the ensuring of peace and security. The current

session of the General Assembly can and must support the proposals for general and complete disarmament and assist in their speediest implementation. That would be an important step forward towards delivering mankind from the terror of a new war and establishing lasting peace on earth.

51. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (translated from French): For several years past and until its last session the General Assembly has begun its work in an international atmosphere of distrust, alarm and threats. The periodical outbreak of regional conflicts and of crises in international relations were a severe test for our Organization and very often gave rise to increased scepticism as to its value and authority. It must be recognized, however, that whenever the Assembly has met, it has examined calmly the problems submitted to it and it has several times averted specific and imminent threats to international peace and security.

52. Thus it condemned and stopped the aggression against Egypt in October 1956 and prevented the outbreak of a general conflict in the Middle East at the time of the revolution in Iraq and the events in Lebanon. It also found, or helped to find, solutions to difficult questions which were discussed within its walls or for which it bore some measure of responsibility. For example last year peace was restored to Cyprus, and we hope that it will be strengthened and consolidated in an atmosphere of freedom and justice.

53. Nevertheless, the agenda of the fourteenth session still includes very important questions and the wishes and hopes of the world are once again directed towards our Assembly. Among these questions there are some which relate to colonial domination and to the future of the Non-Self-Governing Territories; others are concerned with human dignity and the fundamental rights of man, for which this Organization is responsible, such as the existence of over a million refugees in Palestine, and the persistence of segregation and racial discrimination. Lastly, there are questions which relate to international tension, the problems of disarmament and the cessation of nuclear tests.

54. It is in this connexion that there is a real difference between this session and previous sessions. Because this year our work has begun in a less tense atmosphere. The meeting between the President of the United States and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union is one of several efforts made, some of them by the United Nations, to attenuate differences, to reduce sterile antagonisms, to open the way for an intelligent understanding of international realities and, we hope, for useful co-operation among the nations of the world.

55. The people of Morocco, who remember the support which the United Nations gave them in realizing their aspirations and in winning back their independence, are particularly gratified at this strengthening of the role of the United Nations, and wish to reaffirm their attachment to the ideals and principles of the Organization. These ideals and principles, indeed, form part of our national scale of values as it has developed from the spiritual springs of our civilization and as it is determined by our moral code and the ethical standards which are at the root of our political institutions.

56. Apart from these results, which are undeniably very encouraging, there are others which increase our

satisfaction and our optimism. We hailed with the greatest satisfaction the accession of the people of Guinea to independence and the admission of the Republic of Guinea to the United Nations. We did so not only because that country had liberated itself courageously from colonial domination, but also because its people, who are so attached to justice and progress, will, by their presence, bring an important contribution to the development of this Organization and to the safeguarding of the values which it upholds.

57. Other countries will obtain independence next year, some of them by decision of the United Nations: the Cameroons, Togoland, Somaliland and Nigeria. We hope that they will join us as soon as possible, for there is no doubt that they will bring to our Organization, which has fully supported and helped them, a strong attachment which will further extend its influence.

58. We are pleased to note that many speakers on this rostrum have called attention to these events, which are of great significance to the immediate evolution of Africa. The very recording of these events constitutes in itself an international recognition of the future prospects and of the role of the whole African continent. All these peoples who are emerging, who have won back or are in the process of winning back their independence have, at the same time as the desire for independence, a desire for peace and co-operation, which is the only way mankind can achieve a happy destiny.

59. Frequently in the course of our proceedings, stress is laid on the need for this Organization to be universal. It is true that almost every year one or more new countries become Members of the United Nations, but we have not yet reached a sufficient degree of universality. The prolonged absence of so many nations, large or small, is likely to limit the value and effectiveness of the Organization. The regrets, however sincere, which we repeat every year, do not absolve us from our share of responsibility for keeping outside the Organization countries which for several years have expressed a desire to become Members, and thus to subscribe to all of the Organization's principles and obligations. Other countries, too, are not represented here because antagonisms over which this Organization has sometimes not been able to prevail, keeps them on the national level in a painful state of division, and on the international level, outside the community of nations and of world collaboration. Lastly, other countries, under colonial domination, are carrying on a heroic struggle, aided in their sacrifices by the justice of their cause, the support of free peoples and the confidence they have in the United Nations, which has inscribed in the Charter the right of all peoples to self-determination.

60. Our Organization, which bears a heavy responsibility in this matter, should concern itself more actively with removing the obstacles which still confront these peoples, whose courage and sacrifice in winning back their freedom are solid guarantees of their respect for the freedom of others and the safeguarding of peace.

61. My country is not content with expressing a strong desire for peace or making a simple profession of faith in it. The Government and people of Morocco consider that the maintenance of peace and its restoration where it has been disturbed are the primary duty of

every independent country and the supreme obligation of every Member of the United Nations; for without peace there can be no real independence or real freedom, and hence neither progress nor justice.

62. Some people profess the view that only an immense accumulation of armaments is capable of preserving peace. History, particularly that of the great empires, gives us many examples tending to show that the availability of the means of making war has very often led to the use of those means. However that may be, the latest endeavour to create peace has involved the great Powers for almost fifteen years in a competition in which their efforts have been devoted essentially to armaments research. As a result, the very idea of scientific progress has been modified to such an extent that today it generally refers to research with a strategic or military aim. Worse still, instead of encouraging feelings of security and hope, this progress only arouses alarm and anxiety. Nuclear experiments, in particular, which are an important part of this frantic armaments race, have aroused the unanimous disapproval of all peoples. From the first year of its admission to the United Nations, my country, through its delegation, has made it known that it condemns these experiments, whatever country makes them and on whatever territory they are carried out.

63. As we are not members of any bloc, and are therefore free from propaganda motives, we have adopted this attitude and have supported it firmly, with the sole aim of denouncing, in all conscience, a real danger for mankind, the effects of which have in fact already been tragically demonstrated. We had hoped however that the awareness of this danger and the emotion which it has aroused in world opinion would lead the atomic Powers to abandon these experiments. Strenuous efforts to achieve a relaxation of international tension and some measure of disarmament had led recently to an effective suspension of nuclear tests by the three atomic Powers.

64. Unfortunately, France made known at the same time its intention to carry out nuclear tests in the Sahara, without concern either for the risk of compromising the relaxation of international tension which had been achieved with such difficulty or for the opinion of the peoples of Africa who are the most directly threatened. Diplomatic protests were made to the French Government by most of the countries of Africa, whilst the Monrovia Conference^{2/} adopted a motion expressing the anxiety of all the independent peoples of the African continent.

65. During the first seven months of 1959, my Government sent three notes in succession to the French Government drawing its attention to the fact that the territories where it was proposed to set off explosions were in dispute and pointing out the dangers to which the nearest Moroccan communities in particular would be exposed. The last of these notes was purely and simply rejected. It was then that His Majesty's Government asked the Secretary-General to put this question on the agenda of the present session [see A/4183].

66. My delegation will give its views on all the aspects of this question in greater detail when the matter is taken up in the First Committee. But an argument has been put forward by the French Government in con-

nexion with which my delegation would like to make a few observations here and now.

67. France has described the bomb as the French Community's bomb and shelters behind what it calls the consent of the countries which form the Community to explain why it is carrying out a test in a region which is under its sovereignty. Mr. Tsiranana is not the head of an African country and Mr. Houphouët-Boigny represents only the Ivory Coast. This isolated support serves only to emphasize the categorical condemnation pronounced by the other leaders of the French Community. As a matter of fact there is only one voice on the whole of the African continent which is not associated with this condemnation, even though the people of the Ivory Coast have publicly demonstrated against the French project. Other European and Asian States have associated themselves with the whole of Africa in asking France to give up this test in the interest of its relations with the peoples of Africa.

68. We hope that the United Nations will help to avoid the creation of a new and deeper chasm between France and countries which desire to have only the best relations with it. Morocco in particular hopes for such an understanding. On achieving independence, it put aside all those feelings which a painful past might have justified, and it has enthusiastically undertaken an essentially constructive task which requires peace as a condition for its success. Unfortunately, its desire to develop a worthy and prosperous way of life continues to come up against a number of difficulties.

69. Large areas of Morocco are still occupied by France and Spain, and this constitutes a flagrant violation of the integrity of Moroccan territory four years after the recognition of its independence. French and Spanish troops are still stationed on our territory, even though we have no alliance or military agreement with these Powers and though the proclamation of independence removed all the military obligations of the Protectorate. Moreover, France, in the later years of the Protectorate, and without the knowledge of Morocco, granted important bases to the United States, the illegal nature of which His Majesty and the Moroccan people immediately denounced in spite of the circumstances, and they have continued their protests ever since.

70. For four years the Government and the people of Morocco have called for the evacuation of all foreign troops. The conversations we have begun with the Government of the United States have now reached an encouraging stage and must finally lead to total evacuation. On the other hand, France and Spain continue to refuse to recognize the very principle of evacuation, thereby perpetuating in fact and in law a situation which amounts to occupation. At different stages of the negotiations, each of the two Governments have offered to put an end to the occupation only on condition it is replaced by some sort of mutual defence pact, or has made its attitude dependent upon the results of negotiations with the other Government. Very often our legitimate claim is opposed in the name of interests which are not ours and in regard to which Morocco has clearly defined its position by proclaiming a policy of non-dependence.

71. As for the problem of frontiers, France and Spain continue to exercise their sovereignty *de facto* over territories which belong to Morocco by *virtue* of a series of international treaties to which both France

^{2/} Conference of Independent African States, Monrovia, Liberia, 4-8 August 1959.

and Spain are parties. Throughout the whole period of the Protectorate, these territories were administered in the name of the Moroccan authority and by Moroccan representatives of the central administration. Mauritania was accorded a direct and separate administration only towards the end of the Protectorate. Quite a long time after independence, when a joint frontier commission was about to meet, France set up Mauritania as a separate territory and brought it into the French Community against the will of its people. My Government, confident in the clearly established justice of its cause and in the support of the people of Mauritania, strongly reaffirms its reservations and its protests against this pure and simple annexation of a part of its national territory.

72. Spain has followed the same procedure with regard to the Ifni enclave and the territories of Saguiet el Hamra in the southern Sahara. Only a few months ago a Spanish Government decree placed these territories under Spanish sovereignty, and another decree authorized the granting of permits for mining exploration to foreign companies.

73. In view of these illegal decisions, as well as of those taken in Mauritania, His Majesty's Government has officially warned all countries, likely to be interested in the exploitation of the resources of these territories that it has never ceased to consider them as an integral part of Morocco.

74. The situation on the eastern frontier remains equally confused, for the war which has been raging in Algeria for the last five years is not only being used as a pretext for the indefinite postponement of the problem of delimitation but is also giving rise to many grave incidents and even to the occupation by the French army of Moroccan territory, as in the case of Hassi-Zerzour at the end of July 1959, which my Government brought to the attention of the United Nations.

75. In regaining their independence, Tunisia and Morocco hoped that they could devote all their efforts to constructive work to promote economic development and social progress. They hoped to be able to do so in the harmony and brotherhood of Maghreb unity, and in close collaboration with France, whose important interests and cultural influences could assure it of solid and lasting friendship and of fruitful co-operation in the whole of North Africa. Lastly, they hoped that it would be possible, in an atmosphere of confidence, to effect a complete transformation of the old relationships by getting rid of everything which in any way restricted or obstructed the blossoming of true independence.

76. The idea of any such development, however, could only be conceivable in the perspective of a Maghreb united in equal independence and prepared to collaborate with a France which was entitled to the same esteem and the same confidence in Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco. The Tunisian and Moroccan peoples have perhaps been more fortunate, but the Algerian people, after one hundred and twenty years of occupation, have been forced into an ordeal which they have done everything to avoid.

77. At two particularly decisive moments of its history North Africa has revealed the ineluctable necessity for its fundamental unity. Firstly, when the war of conquest in the last century ended in the destruction of the Algerian State, Tunisia and Morocco were assured of calamity. Today, that same necessity

calls Algeria to a common destiny at the side of its brothers of Tunisia and Morocco. It was the duty of France to encourage this harmony in order to help establish that Maghreb entity, of which it seems to have been aware only in the interests of colonial domination and exploitation.

78. For almost five years this war has been decimating the flower of Algeria and of France. In deference to this Assembly and out of respect for all the victims of this, the most atrocious of colonial wars, I shall not recount here all the horrors, the poverty and distress into which it is plunging a whole nation of noble and brave people. I shall instead try to recall all the efforts which have been made on all sides to halt a war in which there can be neither victor nor vanquished and to open the way to a solution which would restore peace.

79. Only a few months after our independence, when the war was nearly two years old, His Majesty the King of Morocco made a moving appeal in his speech at Oujda in August 1956. The National Liberation Front replied to this by sending its leaders to Rabat, where their discussions with His Majesty and the Moroccan Government were considered sufficiently encouraging to arrange for a conference at Tunis with President Bourguiba. We are all aware of the stupid act which put an end to this project and which impaired both the confidence of Tunisia and Morocco and the excellent predispositions of the Algerians for a reasonable peace.

80. We had hoped subsequently that the French genius might take the first opportunity to rectify this mistake and to make up for the seizure of the aeroplane by releasing Ben Bella and his companions. If this gesture had been made—and it was asked for on several occasions—it would unquestionably have had broad repercussions throughout North Africa and discussions could have been resumed. A last effort was undertaken jointly by His Majesty the King of Morocco and President Bourguiba, who officially offered their good offices.

81. The various French Governments all ignored these efforts and declined these offers. Yet, whatever the circumstances, the sole object of our efforts was to make it easy for both parties to establish conditions for a discussion which would lead to direct negotiations and to a solution which would be the work of Algeria and France.

82. I shall lay particular stress on the efforts of the United Nations, which having first established its competence to deal with this question, has continued ever since, in all its resolutions, to urge the National Liberation Front and the French Government to enter into negotiations.

83. At the present stage of development of this war and of its diplomatic aspects, we consider that our efforts have been partially successful. The two statements by President de Gaulle and by the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic constitute an important step towards a positive search for peace.

84. The Algerian people went into this struggle only in order to obtain the right to decide its own destiny. General de Gaulle has solemnly recognized the right of the Algerian people to self-determination and has expressed his recognition in the following memorable terms: "We shall do so as a great nation and by the

only suitable method, by allowing the Algerians freely to choose their own future."

85. There is no longer any disagreement between the parties on the objective. General de Gaulle is admittedly surrounding the exercise of this right by a series of conditions which cannot all be retained and is giving it only the degree of finality which he wants or hopes for. A right is only complete if it is exercised by the holder with safeguards which exclude deceit, violence or fraud and if the alternative it offers is not limited in advance.

86. All the French Governments and General de Gaulle himself have always recognized the irregularity of the Algerian elections. In his well-known letter to General Salan on the eve of the last referendum, General de Gaulle thought it necessary to give the representative of his Government a solemn reminder of the absolute necessity of keeping the elections free of irregularities. The guarantees called for by the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic in its statement find further support in the most recent conduct of the authorities in Algiers and in the admissions of the French Government itself.

87. As for the possibility of an election which would impair the unity of the Algerian people or the integrity of their territory, it could not be seriously proposed for their approval, for they would never agree to accept it.

88. We were surprised that Mr. Couve de Murville, who explained General de Gaulle's peace plan at great length to the General Assembly [814th meeting], did not see fit to mention the Algerian Government's peace plan. After the hopes that the positive aspects of President de Gaulle's statement aroused, the French Government itself and French and international public opinion were waiting for the Algerian Government's reply. Did Mr. Couve de Murville's silence mean that his Government was indifferent to that statement or did it betray his Government's intention to limit itself to the offers it had already made for a settlement?

89. The Algerian Government, however, affirmed with great authority that peace could be restored at once. Behind it the National Army of Liberation and the Algerian people are ready to await the verdict of the elections. In view of this very clear attitude, it behoves France to prove the seriousness of its intentions and to agree to a discussion, stripped by now of all preliminaries, which would define, first and foremost the guarantees necessary for an honest consultation.

90. At no time during the war have we been so near to peace. I recalled a little while ago the efforts the United Nations has made to accelerate the attainment of peace. I drew attention to the actions of my Government to facilitate discussion. My King and my Government, who have never claimed to be intermediaries, will continue, in view of this new hope, to encourage the two parties to meet in order to put an end to a war in which we are nevertheless implicated and finally to establish a peace which is of moment to us.

91. On the threshold of this great hope of seeing peace restored in the Maghreb, the thoughts of the Moroccan people are turned towards the other extremity of the Arab fatherland, towards the torn country of Palestine, more than one million of whose children have been living for eleven years in the misery and sorrow of exile. My country, which in four years has welcomed

more than 100,000 Algerians fleeing the war that is raging in their country, is particularly sensitive to the distress of our Palestinian brothers, torn from their homes by the greatest injustice of the century.

92. What makes this injustice even more distressing is that it is not just the act of a single country but that it is overtly tolerated and encouraged by a large number of States whose responsibility has been, and still is, very grave. The United Nations itself, after showing itself incapable of averting the cause of this tragedy, consolidated it with a number of decisions which have never been put into effect.

93. We cannot understand the paralysis of the United Nations in the fact of decisions which seem to have been taken at a certain moment, in a sudden desire for justice, but which are being increasingly distorted, possibly in the hope that they will finally become meaningless or that the settlement of the Palestinian Arabs within the border of other brother States may pave the way for their complete integration. The head of the Lebanese Government stated from this rostrum [811th meeting] that it would be in vain to count on any kind of weakening of the determination of the refugees to return to their homeland. In the name of what justice did the Polish or German Jew, however worthy of respect his sufferings in his own country might have been, establish himself on the soil and in the home of the Palestinian Arab, who becomes in his turn "the wandering Arab"?

94. The Secretary-General, whose spirit of justice we know well and whose efforts we applaud, submitted to our Organization a report directed towards the integration of the Palestinian refugees in the various Arab countries. Morocco remains faithful to the only principle of justice that is valid for the settlement of this question: namely, the return of the refugees to their homeland. That is why my Government and my delegation have been unable to support the suggestions submitted by the Secretary-General.

95. The representatives of Israel who expound the views of their Government to us here never show the slightest interest in this basic aspect of the true problem of the Middle East. Israel, taking care not to examine the circumstances of its own creation, is only anxious to denounce what it calls the hostility to it of the Arab States. It denounces the United Arab Republic's exercise of its right to control passage through the Suez Canal, and sometimes from an international rostrum, it interferes in the internal affairs of the Arab world. This manner of forgetting the event and remembering only its results does not wipe out the real problems or change their true nature. The attitude of the United Arab Republic with regard to the Suez Canal is only a lesser symptom of the principal fact, which is the state of belligerency existing between Israel and the Arab States against which it has waged war.

96. I began my statement by expressing my delegation's satisfaction with the concrete results achieved by the United Nations in the search for a positive solution to many of the problems brought to its attention. I should like to conclude by expressing our hope that the real problems, which sometimes arise in their most complex form, may find an enduring solution only if such a solution is in keeping with the true nature of things. In the Middle East, the real problem is not a problem of the Canal nor a problem of under-develop-

ment; it is the problem of an unnatural division which has been the disgrace of the nations for the last ten years; and—I apologize for repeating the expression used by an eminent personality—that division recalls the illegitimate child placed in someone's arms and whom the United Nations is now asked to adopt.

97. In Algeria our hopes remain also very high, because the desire of both parties has been affirmed in solemn texts, on a very important occasion and this desire tends towards the achievement of peace. If this word has today become the watchword of both the French Government and the Government of the Algerian Republic, all that remains is for the two parties to prove the sincerity of their feelings and of their attitudes; then, through the United Nations or with the support of nations friendly to France and to Algeria, a just and viable solution may be found. The wish voiced by my delegation at the end of this general debate, is that this desire of the French and Algerian peoples will combine with the desire of all the Arab peoples, the desire that Algeria may be delivered from its sufferings and strife, that Algeria may at last recover that dignity of which its admission some day to the United Nations would be resounding proof.

98. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I call upon the representative of the United States to exercise his right of reply.

99. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I wish very briefly under my right to reply to make a comment in the nature of a rectification of the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Kuznetsov, in his speech. In that statement he referred to "the wrong interpretation of the position at the Geneva negotiations given in the speech delivered to the Assembly on 17 September 1959 by the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Herter". Then he said that it was the United States which "introduced a number of different proposals at Geneva with the object of delaying the conclusion of an agreement".

100. I think that I can show that the Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, did not misinterpret the actual state of affairs and that the United States did not submit proposals designed to protract the attainment of agreement. To do so, I will quote from the speech which was made here on Thursday, 17 September 1959 by Mr. Herter, Secretary of State of the United States. He said:

"There is some progress to report. The three Powers have agreed on a number of details which would have to be a part of a full accord, and technical agreement has been recently reached on the means of detecting and identifying nuclear explosions at high altitudes and in outer space. However, there are still three central issues on which agreement has not been achieved. They all relate to effective inspection, which remains the key to agreement." [797th meeting, para. 59.]

101. Then he lists these three central issues. Mr. Herter continued:

"First, there is the problem of staffing control posts—the listening-posts that would be established to register data which might indicate an unauthorized nuclear explosion. The Soviet Union has insisted that a major portion of the personnel at each control post must be from the host country, a form of self-inspection which we cannot accept." [Ibid., para. 60.]

102. Then he lists the second point:

"The second key control issue is the matter of on-site inspections required to identify suspected underground explosions. While the United States does not object to placing a limit on these inspections, we believe that the number should be based on a scientific judgement, not on political arguments. To assist in making this judgement, we have submitted scientific data bearing on the complex problem of detecting underground explosions and determining whether they are nuclear explosions or earthquakes. We remain convinced that this information should be considered, although the Soviet Union has thus far refused to do so." [Ibid., para. 62.]

103. Then he comes to the last point, the third issue:

"The third key issue in the negotiations is the veto. The Soviet Union wants the veto in one form or another. The United States firmly believes that any control system which could be frustrated in its day-to-day operations by the veto power would be worse than useless. It would create the illusion and not the reality of control." [Ibid., para. 63.] "These are the principal issues. It is clear that the points at issue are real, they cannot be ignored." [Ibid., para. 64.]

104. That is all I need to quote from Secretary of State Herter's speech, and I think they make it very clear that there was no misrepresentation, there was no accusation on our part that the Soviet Union sought to delay matters. And certainly there was nothing in here to justify the accusation that we sought to delay matters. Secretary Herter merely said in effect that here were the issues on which agreement has not been reached, and I do not think that Mr. Kuznetsov would really contend otherwise.

105. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I call upon the representative of Saudi Arabia who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

106. Mr. SHUKAIRY (Saudi Arabia): It was not my wish to intervene for the second time in the debate were it not for a statement made yesterday before the Assembly by the spokesman of Israel [820th meeting]. Thus we owe it as a duty to this august body to state the Arab position on one or two points.

107. The Israel spokesman has charged that the Arab delegations talk of the right of self-determination and at the same time deny that right "to one people on earth, the Jewish people". These are the words of the spokesman of Israel, that we deny the right to self-determination to one people on earth, the Jewish people. I can say outright that we admit the charge; it is a fact. We deny to the Jewish people the right of self-determination simply because the Jews are not a people on earth. There is no such thing as the Jewish people. There is Judaism, the Jewish religion, and a sacred religion too. There are Jewish citizens that belong to different States all over the world, but a Jewish race, a Jewish people, a Jewish nation does not exist just as a Christian nation, a Christian people, a Christian race does not exist. If we accept this concept of Jewish nationhood, what would be the status of Jews in every corner of the globe? Are they part of the Jewish people? The Jews and Jewish Congressmen in the United States, are they part of the Jewish people? The Jews in the United Kingdom, in France, in Latin America, in the Soviet Union, in India, are they part of the Jewish people? Jewish representa-

tives among us here in the Assembly, Jewish employees here with us in the Secretariat, are they part of the Jewish people? Jewish soldiers anywhere and everywhere, are they part of the Jewish people?

108. To all these questions Israel answers yes. This is the case of Israel, this is the "raison d'être" of its very existence. With yes as the answer coming from Israel, it becomes abundantly clear that the whole Arab position is fully justified. Moreover, it becomes glaringly obvious that in essence the problem is Israel and that Israel is really the problem. However, should anyone speak of the right of self-determination, Israel must keep silent. Israel has no word, has no say on the subject. The whole disaster of the Palestine question is the result of the denial, of the dismissal of the right of the principle of self-determination. The Palestine case in 1947 here in the United Nations was advocated by the Arabs as one of self-determination. The record is there on the books of the United Nations. We then declared, that it was not possible to partition Palestine against the will of its people that the people were entitled to exercise their right to self-determination. That was our position.

109. But Zionists, supported by imperialism, have succeeded in brushing aside the principle of self-determination, and Israel exists now for one reason only: because the people of Palestine were denied the right to self-determination. Had the right of self-determination been applied and been sincerely and faithfully applied, the whole catastrophe would not have started. The refugee problem would not have arisen and Israel would not have emerged. Israel's very existence today is not a fulfilment but a denial of the right of self-determination, the right of a people deeply rooted in this Hall from time immemorial. Israel occupies its seat today on the débris, the ashes, the remains of the principle of self-determination—destroyed and thrown to the winds. Had that right been respected, Israel would not have been seated here in the United Nations; it would not be able to speak so lavishly, so extravagantly and so mercilessly on the principle of self-determination. What is more, these Israel gentlemen would be seated amongst the visitors but not amongst the representatives had we respected the right of the principle of self-determination for the people of Palestine. Instead, there would have been today an all-Palestine delegation representing the legitimate inhabitants of Palestine—Jews, Christians and Moslems—all alike, because they are the people who have lived all their lives in this, their country, their homeland for generations. This is the story of the principle of self-determination which Israel has destroyed, and chooses now to lament with the tears of what—the adjective of which I do not wish to pronounce.

110. As to the story of the Palestine War, this is a long story to tell, which I shall not do. In a word, it was the Zionist forces that started a criminal war of murder, destruction and fire; and the survival of the refugee, and the holy places that are held sacred by all the religions of the world, do exist now through the Arab intervention. Mr. Churchill, describing Zionist terrorism in those days, said:

"If our dreams of Zionism are to end in this smoke of ashes and pistols, and to produce a new set of gangsters worthy of Nazi Germany, many like myself will have to reconsider the position we have maintained so long in the past. Those responsible must be destroyed—root and branch."

111. Arab measures which were taken in 1948 in relation to this "root and branch" of Zionist terrorism is called here by the Israel spokesman, Arab aggression. It is not a difficult task for Israel to describe a defensive action as being offensive; for Israel, it is simply a matter of changing one letter or two, and the defensive becomes offensive. This is how Israel had chosen yesterday to describe its treacherous offensive against Egypt in 1956, that campaign which the United Nations knows full well, of which the United Nations was seized, that campaign which placed the world on the brink of war, has been so easily and lavishly described by the representative of Israel here as a defensive war, and as an innocent defensive war—and what innocence.

112. The statement of the Israel spokesman on peace is not genuine nor serious enough to call for my comment. It was Mr. Fawzi, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic, who as far back as 1951 had said to the Security Council the following, "The first statement we heard this morning which was made by the representative of Israel"—Mr. Fawzi was commenting then on a statement made again by the Israel representative only yesterday, but with all the span of time in all these years, this comment of Mr. Fawzi is still maintained as good and valid. Mr. Fawzi said, "the first statement we heard this morning which was made by the representative of Israel, speaks of peace"—and rightly Mr. Fawzi chose the word "speaks". Mr. Fawzi is a very cautious gentleman, and he selects his words and phrases—"I have already commented on such talk"—again, he uses the word "talk"—"by the representative of Israel. Among other things I said that peace is not words. Peace is acts and facts. Peace is not a million people chased out of their country, deprived of home and livelihood and denied the most elementary of human rights."^{3/}

113. Mr. Fawzi has put to the United Nations this test for real peace in the life of the million refugees; there are a million testimonies to show how preposterous is the plea of Israel for peace.

114. Lastly, the question of negotiations seems to be exciting, amusing and interesting. The spokesman from Israel offered immediate negotiations with the Arab leaders to settle what he called Arab-Israel problems. This is a fallacious offer. There are no Arab-Israel problems. There is the Palestine problem which first and foremost belongs to the people of Palestine—and there is no other problem. The spokesman from Israel has argued with Mr. Fawzi that there is no such thing as the Palestine question; that was his main contention, there is no such thing as the Palestine question. Well, what is there to negotiate when the very existence of the Palestine question is questionable. It stands arguable, even by its name, and its existence is denied. And still we have the courage to offer negotiations for a problem, which according to them, does not exist. Let us talk sense. Let us not talk in the air. What are the matters to be negotiated? The Palestine question comprises three main problems, already decided by the United Nations resolutions: first, the question of the refugees; secondly, the internationalization of Jerusalem; and thirdly, the territorial aspect in Palestine. Regarding repatriation, Israel is not willing to repatriate one single refugee to his homeland. On the question of Jerusalem, Israel resists the inter-

^{3/} See Official Records of the Security Council, Sixth Year, 558th meeting, para. 23.

nationalization of Jerusalem. On the territorial aspects, Israel will not concede one iota of the territory it holds. So what are we going to negotiate if Israel refuses beforehand the implementation of the resolutions of the General Assembly?

115. These are not conditions; these are resolutions adopted properly and eloquently by the United Nations. If you are not prepared to accept these resolutions, why should we meet and what should we negotiate? We would then talk *in vacuo*, and we would be meeting on a no man's land of negation and denial. You say that you are prepared to negotiate without pre-conditions, but you have already set the conditions. You will not repatriate refugees, you will not internationalize Jerusalem, and you will not give back the territory assigned to the Arabs by the United Nations. This is a denial of the very concept of negotiations, at least as far as we understand it properly here in the United Nations. This is a mockery of negotiation and perhaps I will say this is only a negotiation in a carnival procession.

116. The positions on the part of Israel that I have explained are borne out by official declarations made by Israel. These are not my descriptions. They are declarations that have become part of the records of the United Nations, and I beg your indulgence. On the question of Jerusalem, Israel has transmitted to the Trusteeship Council a document which contains the declaration made by Mr. Ben Gurion on Jerusalem. He stated:

"...The General Assembly of the United Nations has...decided to place Jerusalem under an international régime as a separate entity. This decision is utterly incapable of implementation—if only for the determined and unalterable opposition of the inhabitants of Jerusalem themselves. But for the State of Israel there has always been and will always be one capital only: Jerusalem, the eternal. So it was three thousand years ago, and so it will be, we believe, until the end of time."^{4/}

These are the words of Mr. Ben Gurion, with Jerusalem declared as the eternal capital of Israel. What are we to negotiate?

117. On 15 December 1951, Mr. Ben Gurion declared to The New York Times—and this is very interesting:

"Jerusalem is our capital. To us, Jerusalem is our London and our Washington. There can be no issue for negotiation for the question of Jerusalem."

Mr. Ben Gurion says that there will be no negotiation for the question of Jerusalem, and the gentleman from Israel has the courage here in the United Nations to stand at the rostrum and say, "I offer negotiation". With the statement of Mr. Ben Gurion, what is left to negotiate on the question of Jerusalem?

118. On the question of the refugees, which is the last problem, the Palestine Conciliation Commission's Report of 1950, stated as follows: "The Commission did not succeed in achieving the acceptance of this principle by the Government of Israel."^{5/} With this finding of fact by the Conciliation Commission, an independent organ of the United Nations, what is left

to negotiate in connexion with the repatriation of the refugees?

119. On the question of the territorial aspect, too, the permanent representative of Israel, in a letter dated 27 October 1949 and addressed to the Palestine Conciliation Commission, mind you, states as follows:

"The Government of Israel now asserts its title to the territory over which its authority is actually exercised. All that territory had to be fought for..."

It "had to be fought for", the Israel representative says, although the gentleman from Israel here speaks of peace and peaceful intentions and the peaceful record of Israel in the Palestine conflict of 1948. The permanent representative speaks of a territory that "... had to be fought for, all that territory now constituting the State of Israel. There can be no secession."

120. Is there anything to negotiate on the territorial question when Israel rejects the return of areas assigned to the Arabs by the United Nations? That is the adamant position of Israel on the whole question of Palestine.

121. Some have told me, after hearing the gentleman from Israel, that with the Israel offer of yesterday, it is implied that Israel has changed its position towards the United Nations resolutions; otherwise it would not have advanced such a generous offer of negotiation without conditions. Is this true? Has Israel changed its position towards the United Nations resolutions? The Israel spokesman has put the question to the Arabs yesterday point blank whether they are prepared to negotiate immediately. But there is a prior question to be put to Israel: Are you prepared to accept the resolutions of the General Assembly, all the resolutions of the General Assembly without any exception, including the resolution on the Suez Canal, that have been passed by the United Nations without singling any one out, without any discrimination for one resolution against another? As far as we are concerned, we declare here and now that we accept the United Nations resolutions as a whole.

122. Is Israel ready to accept the United Nations resolutions? This is the real question. This is the real challenge. It is for Israel to answer, if Israel can answer. I leave the rostrum now for Israel to answer, if it wishes and if it can answer.

123. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I call upon the representative of Israel to make a brief explanation.

124. Mr. LOURIE (Israel): I see no reason to enter into any discussion with Mr. Shukairy on his further not very helpful expression of views on the problem of Israel-Arab relations. I note that he rejects any possibility of negotiation.

125. On a single point, let me say, however, that as to whether there is or is not a Jewish people I would recall that not only was the League of Nations Mandate based on the concept of the existence, universally recognized, of a Jewish people, but so, too, was the report of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine,^{6/} which led in due course to the resolution of this body of November 29, 1947 [resolution 181 (II)]. Let me recall, finally to the Members of this Assembly, that 6 million of my people went to their doom in Nazi

^{4/} See Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Fourth Year, Sixth Session, Annex, Vol. I, document T/431, annex.

^{5/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 18, chap. III, para. 12.

^{6/} See Official Records of the second session of the General Assembly, Supplement No. 11, Volumes I-IV.

Europe because and only because, they were members of the Jewish people.

126. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I call upon the representative of France to make a brief explanation.

127. Mr. BERARD (France) (translated from French): I have listened very attentively to the speech by the representative of Morocco, and I hope he will allow me to tell him, in all friendliness, that in view of President de Gaulle's statement of 16 September 1959, I had expected quite other words and quite another attitude from him now. It is not my intention to reply to him here. I should simply like to point out three inaccuracies in his speech which I cannot overlook.

128. I regret that the representative of Morocco should have felt authorized to take to task, individually and by name, eminent and respected members of our Community. In that connexion, I would only recall that the decision on the nuclear explosion in the Sahara was approved unanimously by the Executive Council of the Community after a free discussion among all its members, and that the only reservation raised by a single member concerned not the explosion itself, but the precautions to be taken to protect neighbouring populations.

129. With regard to what I must regretfully term "Morocco's territorial ambitions", I should simply like to stress that the people of the Mauritanian Islamic Republic have made it clear—both in the referendum of 28 October 1958 and through their Assembly elected by universal suffrage and their democratically constituted government—that they desire freedom and that they do not wish to be annexed by anyone. I deplore the possibility that such claims might impair the peaceful and co-operative relationship which exists and should exist among the members of the Community and all their neighbours.

130. Lastly, I cannot, for reasons you will easily understand, let it be said from this rostrum that the President of the French Republic or any French Government whatsoever has acknowledged the existence of irregularities in the Algerian elections.

131. It is an evident distortion of the text to interpret in that way the letter to General Salan, which on the contrary gives evidence of the validity of the elections. There are, of course, points at issue between France and Morocco, but the forum of the United Nations—intended as it is for the discussion of matters of general interest—is not the place to deal with them. They should be settled directly and in that spirit of esteem and confidence which—as the representative of Morocco recognized in at least one passage of his speech—animates North Africa's feelings towards France.

132. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): Mr. President, my delegation had the opportunity earlier during the course of this session to offer its felicitations to you on your unanimous election to the high office you hold. Today, we have the pleasure of being able to congratulate you indeed and wish ourselves well upon your return here after your brief indisposition. The Assembly would not be as fruitful without your guidance and without your presence with us here.

133. My delegation would also like to take this opportunity of expressing the feelings of our Government and country at the tragic death of the Prime Minister

of Ceylon, Mr. Bandaranaike. Many representatives have spoken here of his qualities of statesmanship and his personal qualities of wisdom and courage, and it is not necessary at this late hour for me to engage the Assembly on this sad matter. Ceylon is our closest neighbour. Its late Prime Minister was a personal friend of many of our statesmen and people. We have been often encouraged by the example of the great courage he displayed in times of difficulty in his own country and by the leadership that he gave often in regard to policies fashioned by himself and with neighbouring nations.

134. My delegation participates in this general debate at its late stage. Some seventy-nine speakers, not including those who exercised their rights of reply, have spoken for nearly sixty hours actual speaking time on the various problems that concern the world. This is not a large number of speakers, nor is it an unconscionable amount of time, when, as my delegation feels, we have here this opportunity of the general debate, not only to discuss world problems as such, but also to get some glimpse of each other's countries. It is one of the main contributions in the open sessions of the Assembly which makes for greater international understanding.

135. This fourteenth session of the General Assembly opened, in its early stage, with an address by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR [799th meeting]. It was one of the great events of our sessions and of our time, more especially in view of the pronouncements he made and the policy proposal he communicated to this Assembly. To these my delegation will address itself in later stages of our proceedings.

136. There has been a degree of criticism and, on the part of the Secretary-General, what sounds somewhat like an apology for the development of events outside the United Nations. So far as the Government of India is concerned, we do not look upon this as though we have to suffer it because we must, or make the best of a bad position. We think that the developments that have taken place in what is called "outside the United Nations" in so far as they are developments which contribute towards the progress of humanity, towards world peace and co-operation, are "inside" the United Nations, in that the United Nations is not bound by the limits of this Organization, but by the Purposes and Principles of the Charter. The Secretary-General has already pointed out the constitutional and other reasons which justify this kind of negotiations on world problems.

137. We think that it is very important, wherever possible, that those who are in a position to negotiate, who are in a position to deliver the goods, those between whom there are greater suspicions than amongst some others, should take advantage of every opportunity to make direct contacts and to confer. We in the United Nations should wish them well. We are equally anxious that our anxieties or our concerns in these matters should find a response in these others who are concerned, that we should be kept informed, that we should be enabled to educate ourselves, and instruct our judgements, and that we should be able to make our contributions as from the places where we stand.

138. The large number of speakers that have preceded me have had as their main themes the central problem of our world, namely, the tension that exists.

But their speeches have also been characterized by a degree of, or at least a desire to hope. I think it would be far too optimistic to say "by a tone of hopefulness" because that is hardly characteristic of the Assembly. The Assembly consists of large numbers of "hard-boiled" representatives of Governments and it is not as though they permit themselves to take a romantic view of problems. But right through these speeches, except where intimate problems concerning their own countries and their relations and such other factors come in, there has been in these speeches such a desire, such an anxiety, such a passion, that we may dare to feel hopeful in regard to what may happen in the future.

139. There is very profound concern about the enormous increase and development of armaments and the fact that after ten to fourteen years of discussing disarmament, the world today stands more armed than it has ever been in history. What is more, the various proposals that have been debated from time to time, though they have engaged the attention of people and have certainly led to the development of the consideration of various aspects and difficulties of the problem, have not yet led to any positive solutions.

140. Therefore, looking at the world as it is, we find today, at a time when this Assembly meets, that we are, on the one hand, confronted with hope, and, on the other hand, with anxiety. It brings to my mind the romantic—or is it not so romantic?—fantasy, of a famous historical novelist, Charles Dickens—not of our time but of a previous century—who, in one of his historical novels portraying the period when the British Crown received a communication from some of its subjects across the seas, in the American colonies, wrote in this way about the era of 1778:

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us..."^{2/}

141. The world is very much in that state and it largely reflects the state of development of our times, that we are confronted with problems about which we really have inadequate experience. Therefore a pragmatic approach, dealing with problems as they arise, and not being committed too far beforehand as to what side one should take, is necessary in the interests of the relaxation of world tensions.

142. My country has been committed to this position for a long time. In that connexion, we welcomed the statement of the representative of Iceland [820th meeting] the other day—not about fishing rights in the North Pole about which he spoke with passion, in which we do not want to participate, but in regard to the formation of blocs, not the blocs of the cold war, but the blocs inside the Assembly. We ourselves belong to various groups, and I think that groups, in so far as they seek to offer to the Assembly their collective wisdom, are a constructive force. But if, on the other hand, blocs surround themselves with walls of isolation, then we shall divide the unity of this Assembly. A degree of neighbourliness, a degree of the coming together of people who have common problems and common backgrounds, is to be expected and welcomed.

^{2/} A Tale of Two Cities, book 1, chap. 1.

143. But my delegation shares, with the representative of Iceland, the concern that our attempts to cooperate with each other should not result in our isolating ourselves from others or from the whole of the United Nations.

144. This present period is also one of considerable scientific advancement, including the proximity of human discovery to finding the origins of life itself.

145. We have also had placed before us at this session for the first time, although it had been mentioned so many times in speeches by a less notable delegation, the proposition that disarmament alone is not what we need if this world is to survive and prosper, but really a warless world. When the time comes and in the course of our observations at this Assembly, then my delegation would like to draw a distinction in content between the two proposals that are before the Assembly, one really concerned with disarmament and the other concerned with a world without war.

146. We have before us the Annual Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization [A/4132], which is not entirely of the usual character. It deals with questions of political philosophy and theory; it deals with problems that have to do with the development of this Organization in the future. And I say, in all humility, that I do not think that our Organization has given proper attention either to these problems or to the report itself. The Secretary-General's report is received as a matter of course, and we are inclined to think that our responsibilities are over when we pay him his meed of thanks.

147. We are grateful not only to the Secretary-General for this report. In his person, he embodies the whole of the Secretariat. At the end of this general debate, we should like to offer the thanks of our delegation and, if I may presume to say so, the thanks of all of us, to all those persons who make up the Secretariat, who make the functioning of the Assembly possible, who prepare the large amount of material and the considerable number of documents which we receive, and some of which we do not receive. For all these things, we are grateful to the Secretariat—to the administrative staff, to the interpreters, and to everybody concerned. Most of them are people whose names do not appear in the newspapers and do not even appear in official records. Without their diligence and their devotion to duty and the hard work they have to put in, often after office hours, it would not be possible for us to function here. May I therefore take the liberty of asking the Secretary-General to convey to the Secretariat, in an appropriate way, this expression of appreciation.

148. It is not possible for me to study this report publicly, because some of it is obviously debatable, and I do not want at this stage of the Assembly to enter into a controversy in that field. However, one may be permitted to refer to various points in the report.

149. The Secretary-General has referred to the universality of the United Nations. I am sure that, as things stand, all delegations but one in this Assembly would vote for universality as far as membership is concerned. But the observations of the Secretary-General go a little further, when this universal conception has a bearing upon function in such a way as though the concern of every Member of the Assembly

or of some of them has to be demarcated in one form or another. I do not say that this is altogether a proposition that should not be considered, but it has its pitfalls. It is one of those things that I do hope will engage the attention of the Assembly in the future—that is the development of the Organization, to what extent the United Nations has become synonymous with the entirety of its Members and the Governments represented—and, even where the results are good, to what extent, for the time being or for all time, some or all Member States have to keep out of certain matters and certain contexts.

150. The Secretary-General has also referred, expressly or by implication, to certain constitutional procedures, where, again, there are certain aspects which one would welcome and other aspects which one would want to study. We will all admit that as the work of the United Nations grows, becomes intensive, becomes more a day-to-day affair, the functioning of the representatives of Governments at Headquarters who are accredited to the United Nations would become more and more important. But my Government has always taken the view that, whether it be in groups, the African-Asian group or the European group or whatever it is, no group of representatives, whether at a particular time at an Assembly or otherwise, could, in the present circumstances of the world, in the absence of a world constitution and world law, become *de facto* a world government. Policies are to be made by chancelleries. Therefore, while we are fully aware of the importance of day-to-day consultation, this Organization will carry weight with public opinion in various countries, will have the conscious and enthusiastic support of Governments, only to the extent that, in activities from day to day, the Secretary-General's personality, the Organization itself and the scene of the changing functional context are more and more in touch with Governments and chancelleries. Mr. Hammarskjöld is fully conscious of this matter and, during the considerable time that he has between sessions of the Assembly, he takes care to visit capitals. Unfortunately, he has to do a certain amount of sight-seeing, but not included in these sights are the statesmen of those countries who are the essential part of his programme.

151. The same applies with regard to the voting procedures to which also the report refers. When we touch on this matter, we touch a very tender spot. While it is quite true that equality of status, as a British Prime Minister once said, does not mean equality of function, it is also true that, the less the capacity for and content of function, the more a person is conscious of his status! Therefore, when we touch on this problem, we shall be touching on something which requires a great deal of consideration.

152. Each State here has one vote. All are equal. The very beloved country of Iceland, with a population of 200,000 is no less important than the country of India, with a population of 380,000,000. But it is equally true that a mere massing of votes—whether it is 45 to 11 with 25 abstentions or, as in the old days, 55 to 5—does not have the same impact upon world opinion as, shall we say, a vote that reflects the real views and conditions in the world. To a very large extent, a vote in this Assembly has value in reality in direct ratio to its impact upon world opinion and the response it arouses on the part of the world.

153. The Secretary-General has also made reference to the International Court of Justice and to the greater use we should make of it. In this connexion, may I also observe that reference was made in the course of the debate to the fact that certain countries, particularly referring to us, had taken the view that we could make decisions on matters where others are concerned, and that it would be far better if we accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. Merely as a point of information, I should like to inform the Assembly that the Government of India has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, and the documents in this connexion have been circulated by the Secretariat. Of course, the acceptance contains reservations, but those reservations are not unusual. They are reservations which appertain to almost all the Commonwealth countries, and others which are common in diplomatic practice. But, apart from that, we have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

154. It is usual at this time to look at the agenda of the General Assembly. It is one of the easiest things to do because we have looked at it for ten years. It is always the same agenda because it is the same world. But there are certain changes and developments, and then our approach to these items must vary. I do not think we should be cynical and say that we discuss the same things year after year. I suppose we discuss the same things in one sense, but we often make different approaches to these problems. Certain new items have come onto the agenda, and the Secretary-General's report, I think, constitutes one of the not least necessary items on the agenda, and is a document which provides much food for thought. I hope the Secretary-General at some time will give consideration to placing the individual matters for consideration before the appropriate organs of the United Nations.

155. It is usual on occasions of this kind to refer to one's own country and the progress or otherwise therein. My delegation has given considerable thought to this practice and there is good justification for its continuance. It should be done for two reasons. One is that in our part of the world great changes are taking place. We are at present in that part of the world which in recent times has come into independence. We also represent a social and economic system which seeks to establish revolutions, political, social and economic, by and large, by consent. But over and above that we would like to discuss briefly the developments in our own land during the last twelve months or so, because it is one way of international communication. We lay increasing stress upon sending delegations, upon receiving delegations, upon communication of information. Therefore I think that if delegates who are assembled here do not use this opportunity within the brevity of time that conditions us, to inform each other of our position, we shall not be doing our duty to our own country or to the Assembly as a whole.

156. It may be that in some cases our national aspirations, our national considerations, our national prejudices and traditions, may import into this an inevitable imbalance. In India the main theme about which one may speak is its economic and social development under conditions of a planned economy. Various five-year plans have been in progress and we find that this progress has maintained its schedules, and while progress is slow—at least slow having regard to our low standards of living and our hopes—it has still been maintained.

157. From somewhere about \$17,300 million in 1948 the national income of India has risen in 1958 to somewhere about \$22,600 million. Also the standards of life of our people have gone up, but very slightly, because while the national income, to which I referred now, has gone up, the per capita income in India has not gone up in the same way because of the increase in population. It does not mean that our increase in population is proportionately higher than anywhere else, but the aggregates are larger. So from an income of \$49.4 per head ten years ago, it has gone up to only \$57.8 per head of population.

158. Since independence in our country there has been an increase in population to the extent of 67 millions. That is larger than the total population of many countries represented here. This comes about from the fact that, while the birth-rate has gone down one point per thousand of population, the death-rate has gone down eleven points. Fewer people are born, but even fewer people die. Infantile mortality has also gone down from 146 to 108 per thousand of live births in the last ten years. That results in the fact that the number of mouths to feed which press upon the means of subsistence is greater than can be catered for by the increase in wealth itself.

159. Food production in India has increased in the same way. As far as my recollection goes, in pre-partitioned India—that is, when India and Pakistan were one country—the total production of food grains in that India was about 47 million tons. In a smaller India, which is about three fifths of the previous area, last year we produced 73.5 million tons of food grains and we are still hungry. The rise in the first five years has been 15 per cent, and the following three years about 11 per cent. The production of food in the country, which may sound a rather flat proposition to put forward, is really the basis of all prosperity and peace and, indeed, is the substratum of our international peace and co-operation.

160. Side by side with the advance in food production there have also been advances in social development. I would not take the time of the Assembly by going into every item. There are a great number of them which may interest me as an Indian national, but I think the development of co-operatives in India is one of the outstanding features. In our country the position is different from that of Western Europe, from the point of view of our political and social evolution in the recent past or in current times. In western Europe democracy and a political revolution, whether violent or otherwise, conferring political power upon the masses, came after the Industrial Revolution. We have the reverse process.

161. In India, we have had full-fledged political revolution. We have placed political power in the hands of every man and woman of adult age, whether literate or illiterate, whether rich or poor, whether tall or short, and the industrial and economic progress has to come thereafter, with all the social consequences that follow from such a situation.

162. I mentioned co-operatives. Ten years ago there were in India somewhere about 5.7 million co-operative societies. Today, there are 13.8 million of them. A few years ago 115,000 of our villages were covered by co-operatives; today over 179,000 of them are so covered. But still there remain some 450,000 villages to be covered. There is another project where there is much to interest the United Nations. Indeed, it figures

in the report of the Secretary-General in the part concerned with community project developments. India today aspires to cover herself with this form of village democracy and planning, economic and social, right from the bottom. Sixty per cent of our villages are covered by these projects, and 56.6 per cent of our population, somewhere about 165 million.

163. Then we come to a larger development which has international bearings. In a country like ours, which has come into the field of modern development only recently and with a standard of life indicated by the figures I have given with regard to per capita income, modern development, which requires capital goods from highly-advanced countries, and what is more, different factors which are and have been conditioned by the economy of other countries, is therefore to a large extent conditioned by our capacity to buy in foreign lands. That is, external assistance becomes of great importance. In this sphere the United Nations itself has taken part, although only on what the Secretary-General would, at least in private, call a laboratory scale.

164. The amount of external resources as far as India is concerned has come most from the United States totalling some \$1,800 million in the last ten years. Out of this \$490 million is outright aid, the remainder being loans repayable in dollars or Indian currency, with some \$200 million or so reserved for expenditure by the United States Government itself. Therefore, in the way of outright grants, for which we are grateful, there has been nearly \$500 million pumped into the Indian economy. From the Soviet Union, machinery, projects and assistance in loans or otherwise, amounted in all to \$670 million. Then we have a series of other projects which are of a more co-operative character, largely in the Commonwealth group, as indicated by the Colombo Plan, out of which Canada has been the largest donor and helper. Canada is a comparatively small country in the way of population, but it is a rich one in resources current and potential. India has received up to 1958-1959 \$176 million, mainly in the field of machinery and atomic apparatus.

165. From the smaller country of New Zealand, with a population of two and a half million or so, has been poured into India, largely through UNICEF, some \$67 million in the last ten years. Australia, one of our neighbours, has contributed to the building of hydro-electric projects and other works to the extent of \$23 million. The United Kingdom, in the same way, has contributed considerably towards equipment, apart from accommodating us by way of short-term loans. From Norway and various other countries has come assistance to India. Fortunately for us, either in the technical field or in the field of money, aid has not been a one-way traffic. India has in the same way extended either aid or loans to the extent of tens of millions of dollars to other countries whose names I do not want to mention here, since I have not asked their permission.

166. In addition to this, into our country come students—trainees, factory hands, from all parts of the world, more particularly from Asia—nominated either by the Colombo Plan or under various transfer schemes; and in this way, not only are we being helped by the increase of our own technical capacities, but also a degree of international co-operation in the field of technical development is built up. Neither political ideology, nor distance of other countries, nor racial,

religious or other differences have played a part in this.

167. India has also contributed to the United Nations Technical Assistance Programme up to \$3.5 million, and today the Government of India has announced that it will contribute \$2 million to the Special Fund if the other figures given out come up to the expected levels.

168. The index of production in India has gone up from 87 points in 1948 to 142.7 points. But no country today has any chances of survival, either by a political philosophy or even by a long history, if it does not have at its disposal considerable engineering and technical abilities, and we are glad to think that, while in 1949 we had 2,900 engineers and technicians in the country, today we have 9,300, all trained in India. There are also about 400 foreign students on scholarships in India and altogether about 3,500 students from other countries. We regret to say that the scholarships offered to various Trusteeship Territories have not been availed of fully. Of the 42 scholarships offered to Trust Territories, only twenty-seven have been utilized. There are some 10,000 Indian students in various parts of the world, the largest number being in the United Kingdom, the United States and Australia.

169. The most modern of the developments in India are in the field of atomic energy. I am happy to communicate to the General Assembly, as I have done before, that it is not only part of our policy, but a policy which is fully insisted upon and implemented and which has been testified to by Dr. Davidson in the World Survey Report—the same scientist to whom Mr. Khrushchev referred as "Davidson"—that, while the developments were of a very high order and we should soon be capable of becoming self-sufficient in the field of atomic technical equipment, there was no indication that India would venture into the field of atomic weapons. The atomic energy establishments in India employ 970 scientists and also take into training nearly 200 trainees every year from India and elsewhere. There are two reactors in operation, completely built in India itself and a third being built by co-operation between Canada and ourselves.

170. India is the country in the world using the largest amount of thorium for the production of atomic fuel. It has also gone into the development of uranium metal plants and of various other things that are required for this purpose, such as rare ores and metals. In view of the lateness of the hour, I do not intend to go into details in this connexion.

171. Alongside progress we have had, at the same time, our own share of natural calamities in addition to all other concomitants of an adverse character in developments that must happen in a democratic society. We have had devastation by floods. The worst floods in history occurred in the State of Jammu and Kashmir and recently in Assam, and also in Bengal and Bombay, causing losses of tens of millions of dollars and rendering large numbers of people homeless. Fortunately, the capacity of our people to adapt themselves to these circumstances has made these calamities less tragic than they otherwise might have been.

172. Among other developments are the irrigation developments of India, notably the Rajasthan Canal, the longest canal in the world, projected as an idea a long time ago when the British were in India and which would supply water to part of the Punjab and Rajputana and convert them into food-producing areas for the future.

173. From these matters we must now go on to various other questions which have been raised here specifically. I should like to deal first with questions with which we are intimately concerned.

174. The Secretary-General, on the one hand, and various delegations, on the other, have referred to United Nations peace forces; that is to say, the machinery, the instruments, for applying sanctionary powers or carrying out police duties, or whatever they may be called. We, as a country, have participated in this development, and continue to do so and to carry some of its burdens. The Government of India is not at present prepared to participate in a standing force of the United Nations as such and we do not think that it is a practical proposition. We are surprised to find that some countries have proposed that certain units of national forces should be allocated and demarcated for United Nations purposes. But if they are so allocated, what do they do when the United Nations does not want them? It is not practical, in the defence force of any country, to have troops allocated and demarcated in this way.

175. Secondly, for political reasons, we think that, with the present state of development in the world and in the absence of world law and of the universality of the United Nations, and in presence of the fact that we as an Organization are far from free from group politics or yet capable of taking truly objective decisions, we do not think that it would be right to place at the disposal of such an organization forces which may be moved in without individual negotiations and the consent of the people concerned. The time will come, in a disarmed world, when war is no longer regarded as a machinery for the settling of disputes, when some kind of forces organization may be required to deal with those who break the world law; but we think that it is premature at the present time to speak in terms of a United Nations force or to expect countries to shoulder the responsibility from the point of view of personnel or of money or political acceptances.

176. In this connexion I am sure that the Secretary-General will expect us to say that units of the Indian army today in the Gaza Strip are there as a peace force; and that we feel privileged to participate in this venture. But it imposes considerable burdens upon us, to a certain extent recompensed by the fact that these men, not diplomats, not university men, not men trained in the arts of peaceful operations, but in the arts of defence, have been the best ambassadors our country has ever sent out anywhere. They have no quarrels; they have left no social problems behind them, as occupying armies often do. They have created no difficulties in the places where they have gone. And this has been our experience in Korea, as well as with the officers who went to Indo-China, with the officers whom the Secretary-General asked for in a hurry for the United Nations Observer Group in Lebanon, and those who, for two or more years have stood as a peace force in true Gandhian tradition on the Gaza Strip between Israel and Egypt, giving unfortunate evidence of the fact that there is an armistice line and that the two countries are not at peace.

177. Then we come to another matter which my delegation wants to deal with as carefully and as gently as possible, namely the question of Laos. We would not have entered into a discussion of this matter except for the fact that we carry a certain responsibility in connexion with it. As the Assembly is aware, India is the

Chairman of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos.

178. In 1954, largely under the initiative and the constructive statesmanship of the then Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, Sir Anthony Eden, an agreement was reached whereby fighting in that part of the world stopped and for the first time in twenty-five years, on 11 August 1954, the guns of war were silenced in all the world.

179. As a result of those negotiations and preliminary to a cease-fire in those areas, after many years of very sanguinary warfare in which hundreds of thousands of lives were lost, agreements were signed by the parties which are called the Geneva Agreements of 1954.

180. I hope the Assembly will pardon me if I feel it part of my Government's duty to communicate to the Assembly the actual position. We have no desire to apportion blame, but, in view of the fact that the United Nations has intervened in this matter and we are part of the United Nations, I think the Assembly should be fully seized of this matter. India is the Chairman of the Commission, and the other members are Canada and Poland. Decisions were reached by majorities, except on certain major issues, but were almost always, with one or two exceptions, unanimous. There are three agreements—one on Laos, one on Viet-Nam and one on Cambodia. The parties to the Geneva agreement on Laos are the Royal Government of Laos, the French High Command and the High Command of the Pathet Lao, that is, of the dissident forces, and of the People's Forces of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

181. The Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, France and Laos subscribed to the Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference. All the Governments represented were also parties to the Geneva agreements. The Royal Government of Laos made two declarations with reference to articles 3, 4 and 5 of the Final Declaration regarding political integration and non-involvement in military alliances, and foreign military aid. The period stated with reference to the latter was the period between the cessation of hostilities in Viet-Nam and the final settlement of the country's political problems.

182. The responsibility for the execution of this agreement was placed on the parties, that is, the signatories, under article 24 of the agreement. The Commission, of which India was the Chairman, was made responsible under article 25 for control and supervision of the implementation of this agreement.

183. The special tasks for which the Commission was made responsible included the supervision of the implementation of the agreement regarding the introduction of military personnel and war material and the rotation of personnel and supplies for French Union Security Forces maintained in Laos. The Commission was also charged with the duty to see that the frontiers of Laos were respected.

184. Article 25 states:

"An International Commission shall be responsible for control and supervision of the application of the provisions of the Agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Laos. It shall be composed of representatives of the following States: Canada, India and Poland..."

185. The political procedures of the agreement are those given in Articles 14 and 15 read with the two declarations made by the Government of Laos at Geneva. These are the articles that deal with the responsibility of the Royal Government of Laos in this matter, because it was said that pending a political settlement, the rebel forces had to be grouped in certain areas. Under article 15, the parties undertook to refrain from any reprisals or discriminations against persons or organizations for their activities during the hostilities and also undertook to guarantee their democratic freedoms.

186. It is true that the political settlement was delayed for a long time. That is to say, the Pathet Lao people who were concentrated in the two places according to this agreement, took a long time before they achieved unity with the Royal Government. Without attempting to apportion blame to either party, the Government of India wishes to point out that the Commission and the Commission Chairman materially assisted with their good offices in helping the parties to reach a settlement, as stated by the Prime Minister of Laos and the representative of the Pathet Lao forces in a joint letter dated 29 December 1956. That is to say, though perhaps it was not strictly the essential duty of the Commission, the Commission brought about a settlement among these people, and at the end of it the Prime Minister of Laos issued a communiqué in these terms:

"Besides the signature of this communiqué has been facilitated by the attentive interest the International Commission has taken in the settlement of the Laotian problem, interest which in particular is proved by the opportune and correct report addressed to the Co-Chairmen"—Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd; at that time Mr. Molotov and Sir Anthony Eden—"of the Geneva Conference, a copy of which has been forwarded. Moreover, the International Commission and especially Your Excellency"—that is, the Chairman of the Commission—"did not spare their efforts to help the happy success of our talks. The results thus reached contribute in a good measure to the strengthening of peace in the Laotian Kingdom, in South-East Asia and in the world. We therefore avail ourselves of this opportunity to forward personally to the International Commission and to Your Excellency our most sincere thanks as well as those of the whole Laotian people."

187. Now the representative of Laos has said here:

"The International Control Commission, a body established by the Geneva Conference of 1954, saw that it no longer served any purpose and, considering that its task had been completed, left Laos in July 1958." [815th meeting, para. 132.]

188. We have no desire to enter into a controversy about this, but we want to put the facts historically correct. The Commission did not leave in July 1958 because its work had been completed but it only adjourned *sine die* with a provision to reconvene in accordance with normal procedures", and the Co-Chairmen also acknowledged this position. These documents were the subject of considerable correspondence between the Co-Chairmen, Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd at the time. The Government of India sent the following communication:

"The Government of India have in their previous discussions with the High Commission... stated

that" (with regard to) . . . "the Geneva Agreements on Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam respectively, the three International Commissions have to continue till political settlement is completed in all the three countries, namely, Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam. The articles referred to above provide for reduction in the activities of a particular Commission in the light of the development of the situation in the other two countries, but there is no provision in the Geneva Agreements for the winding up of any of the Commissions independently of the completion of political settlement in the other two countries. . . .

"Apart from the position of the Government of India on the general question of the inter-connexion of the three Commissions, given in paragraph 1 above, the Government of India would like to point out that there were two parties to the Geneva Agreement on Laos; one party signed for the Commander-in-Chief of the forces of the French Union in Indo-China, from whom the Laotian Government derived their authority, and the other party signed for the Commander-in-Chief of the fighting units of the Pathet Lao and for the Commander-in-Chief of the People's Army of Viet-Nam. The second party, namely the one represented by the Vice-Minister of National Defence of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, do not accept the proposal to wind up the Commission made by the Prime Minister of the Royal Laotian Government. In effect, the decision of one Co-Chairman Government, viz., the United Kingdom, which supports the view advanced by one of the parties to the Agreement on Laos, viz., the Royal Laotian Government and with which the other Co-chairman Government, namely, the USSR, and the other party to the Agreement, viz., the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam do not agree, means the unilateral denunciation, by one of the parties, of the Geneva Agreement on Laos, which is bound to have serious repercussions on the working of the Geneva Agreements not only in Laos but also in other parts of Indo-China. . . .

"While the Government of India cannot, in view of the position stated in paragraphs 1 and 6 above, support this resolution, they would like to point out that a resolution of this type which proposes to amend not only the Geneva Agreement on Laos but the Geneva Agreements on Cambodia and Viet-Nam as well, requires unanimous decision in the Commission and the concurrence of the other two Commissions."

Therefore, we took the view that the Commission could not be wound up unless there was a unanimous decision and the three Commissions had agreed. I continue:

"The Government of India are of the view that the unilateral denunciation of the Geneva Agreement on Laos and the winding up or immobilization of the Laos Commission, which are bound to have serious repercussions on the working of the Geneva Agreements and on the working of the International Commissions in the whole of Indo-China, involve a serious threat to peace in this region."

One of the charges that were given to us was the safeguarding of peace in that area.

189. Then in their reply, when we placed this position before the United Kingdom Government, the United Kingdom Government said that the reply that it had given was without prejudice to the view that the Government of the United Kingdom held that the decision

in this matter was one that the Commission itself was competent to make. Then, after that, this reply was communicated to the Co-Chairmen—and this is a very important matter. The two Co-Chairmen, namely, Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, wrote to the Government of India in these terms:

"The two Co-Chairmen took notice of the clarification of the Indian Government that this resolution does not affect the legal status of the Commission and does not reduce the competence of the Commission in implementing the tasks and functions assigned to it by the Geneva Agreements. The Co-Chairmen agreed that the resolution of the Commission of 19 July 1958"—that is, to adjourn *sine die* and to be reconvened in accordance with normal procedures—"was a procedural decision taken to adjourn *sine die* and having no connexion with the question of dissolution of the Commission. They were agreed that no question of abrogating any of the articles of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Laos relating to the International Commission, in particular article 39, was involved."

190. So the position was that, as a result of this and in order to have some practical arrangements, the Commission withdrew from Laos with this provision for reconvening. Unfortunately, the Government of Canada did not find it possible to appoint members to it. We have always said that, when things had developed badly in Laos, the international authority that remained there should be available.

191. So, to go on with the story, when the Commission adjourned on 19 July 1958 there was every prospect of the political settlement being satisfactorily implemented in detail by the Government. The need for supervision and control could be satisfied by occasional meetings in future, if necessary. The position changed later, and was reported to the Co-Chairmen.

192. When the Commission adjourned, the unity and sovereignty of Laos had been established, and peace prevailed in the whole country. The details of the political integration were being worked out. The present position of armed clashes within Laos is a reversal of the process of settlement reached with the help of the Commission—and this is the important point.

193. The Royal Government of Laos has alleged aggression and subversion by the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. Whatever may be the motives of the Democratic Republic in working for resumption of the activities of the Commission, it is clear that the Commission helped in achieving political integration and in the establishment of the unity and sovereignty of the Royal Government of Laos over the entire territory of Laos. The Commission has also been specifically directed under the agreement to see that there are no violations of the frontiers of Laos. That was one of the functions of the Commission.

194. India's view is that the present trouble is due mainly to the by-passing of the Geneva agreement procedures and the aggressive attitudes that have prevailed since the Commission adjourned.

195. Basing its attitude on its experience during its independence struggle, India believes in the pacific settlement of disputes. It is vitally interested in the maintenance of peace in South-East Asia and in the World. It undertook special responsibility in connexion

with the maintenance of peace in Indo-China at the request of the Co-Chairmen and, while not wedded to any particular procedures or interested in apportioning blame to parties, would like to see the adoption of procedures which would secure the cessation of fighting in Laos and the restoration of peace both inside and along the frontiers of Laos.

196. In this connexion, I should like to quote a communication made by my Prime Minister. I have already referred to the fact that the two Co-Chairmen had taken notice of the adjournment motion, which was only for an adjournment *sine die* with a proviso to reconvene. Since the Secretary-General had very kindly taken it upon himself to use his good offices and had been in touch with us, my Prime Minister wrote to him on 30 June 1959:

"The Agreement for the Cessation of Hostilities in Laos was a part of the resolution arrived at in Geneva in regard to the Indo-China settlement. In the agreements made in 1954, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam was a signatory on behalf of the Fighting Forces of Pathet Lao and these agreements were accompanied by a number of Declarations, including one by the Government of Laos, indicating in general terms that Laos would remain outside the activities of the Power blocs. Again, as a signatory of Geneva on behalf of the Pathet Lao, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam is interested in the various agreements later arrived at between the Royal Government of Laos and the Fighting Forces of Pathet Lao... We are not justified in assuming, and it would be unrealistic to assume, that the conclusions of these agreements render the problems there, which have become increasingly ominous, solely the internal affairs of Laos. The International Commission, despite its adjournment, stands charged with the responsibilities assumed under the Geneva agreements. This kind of development and situation which obtain at present were investigated when the Geneva agreements were made and these were brought within the authority and the functions vested in the International Commission and the arrangements arising therefrom to which the Royal Government of Laos is a signatory.

"We have consistently taken the view that the territorial integrity and unity of Laos is basic to the Geneva Agreements in respect of Laos. Any problem of a 'territorial conflict' between the different political groups within Laos is not envisaged by the Geneva Agreements. If, however, the 'conflict' relates to the dispute between North Viet-Nam and Laos, it will be in the nature of a border problem which can well form the subject of discussion and of mediation by and through the Commission."

197. In regard to the raising of the Laos issue in the United Nations, the Prime Minister of India informed the Secretary-General that:

"It is not clear to me how any effective action can be taken through the United Nations against a country such as the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam which is not a Member of the United Nations... In fact, any reference to the Security Council would bring these questions into the region of great Power conflicts and put an end to much of the good work that has resulted from the Geneva Agreements."

198. I want to assure the Assembly that we do not claim any vested interest in this matter, but our

country, along with Canada and Poland, has struggled for four long years to keep the peace in this part of the world. So far as we are concerned, it has been a considerable strain, and the conditions that prevail have been the subject of communications between our two partners and the Governments of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union and, latterly, the Secretary-General, all in the hope that what was accomplished in 1954—when, as I said, on 11 August the guns were silenced—could continue.

199. For twenty-five years war had reigned in the world, since Japan made its incursions into Manchuria. We think if that international body—whether established by the United Nations or not, it was within its competence, it was there merely for the purpose of peace—if it had continued its functions, perhaps, and only perhaps, the present situation could have been avoided.

200. Over and above that, we would like to make this submission. Because a country is independent, and this includes our own, and because it is a Member of the United Nations, there is no authority in international law—indeed it would be a very bad precedent—by which it can therefore repudiate agreements it has previously made. This would be a denunciation of a treaty, and it would remain a denunciation of a treaty.

201. We were among those who not only supported but made such contributions as we could towards obtaining the admission of Laos into the United Nations. The action taken by the Security Council in its wisdom is a matter for the Security Council. There was no evidence either that the presence of the Commission was not regarded as sufficiently objective or impartial or it was not considered competent after five years to be able to observe what was going on. It is our view that, if they were there and if there were arms going into the territory, that could have been detected. If North Viet-Nam was at fault—as has happened in the last four or five years in regard to the parties to the agreement—the erring party could have been called to account. It is our good fortune that, though there have been difficulties, the parties have, after some time, come to some international code of behaviour in these matters.

202. All we should like to say is this. The basis of the position of Indo-China is the Geneva agreements. There is no fighting in Cambodia, but the Cambodian Government does not want the Commission dissolved. It is kept there in an attenuated form. Viet-Nam stands divided, at the seventeenth and a half parallel, into the North and the South. Neither of them is a Member of this body, on account of this decision. We believe that it is largely the Geneva agreements and the presence of the Commission, and its objectivity, that have been able to maintain peace in that area. It should not be forgotten that, far away as this part of the world may be from the Headquarters of the United Nations, small countries as they may be there, inhabited by people on a lower standard of life, and however some may regard them as outside the centre of so-called civilization, any conflict in that area would disturb the stability of South-East Asia.

203. We all breathed a sigh of relief when, as I said, largely due to the efforts of the then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom, ably assisted by the representative of the Soviet Union and, I must say, by the Prime Minister of China and by the

Deputy Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and by all other parties—the Pathet Lao, the Royal Government of Laos and everyone else—and with the statesmanship of the former Prime Minister of France, Mr. Mendès-France, an agreement was reached and it brought about and kept the peace until recently. Our Government had the responsibility of supplying the greater part of the personnel for maintaining communications. The French Government also carried a great financial burden. The Governments of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom made financial contributions in order to keep the machinery of peace going. It is a great pity if international agreements are disregarded, and if in some way any action taken by the United Nations tends to support such disregard. There is nothing in the action the United Nations has taken that would necessarily be inconsistent with the Geneva agreements, and I am sure it is the desire of the Secretary-General to see a restoration, not necessarily of the Commission or anything of that kind—that is up to him to decide—but an attempt made to re-establish the position of the Geneva agreements.

204. The second matter that concerns us is China. I do not intend to speak at length on this matter because I do not want to stress the question of the admission of China here now; but my Government does not believe that by evading issues we enlighten ourselves or the people. Our position with regard to the participation of China in this Organization is well-known. It is a matter of great concern to us and a matter of resentment to our people that a country with whom we have been very good friends, a country which is one of our close neighbours and which has more than 2,500 miles of land frontier with us, with which we have had no troubles in the past, has taken it upon itself to commit intrusions into our territory and to proclaim that some 40,000 square miles of it belong to them.

205. We want to make our position clear in this matter. On the one hand, we subscribe to the principles of the Charter and to the set of ideas that were put forward at the African-Asian Conference held at Bandung in 1955 and by our own treaty relations with China based upon what are popularly called the "Five Principles". What is more, we shall strive as hard as we can to reach settlement on every problem by peaceful negotiation. But there are no individuals in India and there is no responsible body of opinion prepared to be intimidated, prepared to take aggression lying down. We cannot negotiate with the Chinese until they vacate the territories which they have occupied. These may be small places, they may be mountaintops, but they are our country. Therefore I say this not only officially but also with the hope that my humble voice will reach the Chinese people, with whom we are good friends: I myself have participated in these matters, and we hope that the friendship of our two great countries, which is necessary for the stability of Asia, will not be jeopardized by thoughtlessness on the one hand or by arrogance on the other, and that China will find it possible to make amends for what it has done, through the withdrawal of every Chinese soldier from our soil—and if they can find any of our soldiers on their soil we shall readily withdraw them.

206. Regarding those areas where boundaries are not marked by posts or pillars that can be seen, sometimes there may be difficulties arising from one party's going into the territory of the other. We have not violated their space, we have not violated their peace, we have

not inflicted violence upon them; and what is more, we have not come and talked to the world, or even to our own people, very loudly, even though things have reached the present stage. The purpose of my saying this, on the one hand, is to point out that we are not a war-minded people and that we believe settlement of all these problems must be achieved by peaceful negotiation. We would equally like the Chinese to know that a peaceful approach does not mean a submissive approach; that our country is not prepared to accept a violation of our frontiers, or, where there is a dispute over conditions established over a hundred years ago at least—and sometimes much more—to allow our territory or our frontiers to be altered by unilateral decisions. It may well be that after we have had negotiations some adjustments will have to be made, but our Prime Minister has made it very clear that there cannot be negotiation on the basis of a prior surrender of territories.

207. This brings us to the matter of other questions before the Assembly. The first of these is the question of colonial empire. It would be impossible for any delegate from any of the former colonial territories—or indeed, I believe, any Member of the United Nations—to participate in these debates without referring to the colonial problem. We are this year in a position to congratulate ourselves to a certain extent and to feel relieved over the fact that the problem of Cyprus—and I hope the delegation of Greece will not mind my saying that we have always regarded it as a colonial problem—has been solved at least for the time being. It looks as though, as a result of this solution, Cyprus will become an independent nation in 1960. We also would like to lay stress on the fact that it was only through recognition of the nationality of Cyprus and by recognition of the problem as a colonial one that a solution was found. There is no way of suppressing these national aspirations, either by an attempted division of a country or by playing off one Power against another. The problem of Cyprus was solved very largely by the impact of public opinion, channelled through this Assembly.

208. I would like to express our appreciation to the Government of the United Kingdom as well as to the parties in Cyprus and to Greece and Turkey, for their recognition of the Cypriot nationality, as a result of which Cyprus is well on the way to becoming a Member of the United Nations.

209. The United Kingdom can also take credit for the impending independence of the territory of Nigeria, a large portion of colonial Africa which in a few months will become an independent country and, I hope, take her place among us at the next session of the Assembly.

210. We are also pleased to hear from the new Foreign Minister of the Belgian Government [809th meeting] about the project of the Belgian Government for the establishment of independence for her Congo territories. I am not referring to the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, but to the Belgian Congo, which is several times larger than Belgium itself, and one of the richest parts of Africa. It is not for my Government to express any views as to the kind of constitution they should have, or its content or the character of their independence, but as in all things, we take these matters at face values. We have got a public declaration made with enthusiasm by the representative of Belgium before this Assembly that his Government has, of its own volition and in recognition of the right of peoples

and the readiness of the Congolese people to shoulder the responsibilities of self-government, decided to establish self-government in this area. We shall therefore look forward not with feelings of doubt and suspicion but with hope and confidence, to seeing the Belgian Congo also take its place among the African territories that have come to freedom through the action of the Assembly.

211. Our own position with regard to colonial empires is what we remain unrepentant in our opposition to colonialism. We do not think that there are any peoples who should be debarred from self-government, or that there are any particular people who, rationally, economically or otherwise are to be regarded as especially competent to govern other people. Therefore our country takes the position that, while we shall take no part in underground revolutions or in exporting revolution, we stand in firm solidarity with all those peoples in Africa, Asia and everywhere else who are fighting for their own national liberation. We recognize that nationalism properly channelled is a great constructive force, and, what is more, that if it is suppressed it is likely to go in other directions, affecting the peace of the world as well as the stability and progress of peoples and territories themselves.

212. In this connexion we should like to refer to the Non-Self-Governing Territories under Article 73 of the Charter. I have no desire to say anything that might raise a controversy and evoke the right of reply prolonging our proceedings tonight, but I would like to refer to the fact that the United Nations can claim some credit in this matter, because when we started in this business under Article 73, some seventy-four Territories were submitting information. This is an occasion when what we look forward to is the cessation of this information in a wholesome way. Out of the seventy-four Territories, seven have become independent; fifteen have ceased to send information because those who were responsible for their rule thought they were ready for independence, that they required no further examination by us. There are other Territories on which information is sent, although they come under Article 73 of the Charter. In this connexion one would like to say that if arguments are put forward in order to relieve these territories of the necessity of supplying information, then all the dependent territories would have come under this justification and would not have the benefit of justification in the demanding of their freedom either before this body or anywhere else.

213. A colonial territory is one where the majority of the population can make no impact upon the policy of the Government, which is by another country and people, and where economically, socially and otherwise, the majority is exploited. There are large parts of Africa in this condition, and there are small portions of Asia in this condition. The Portuguese representative pointed out here the other day [821st meeting] that Portugal had no colonies, as they were all part of the metropolitan territory. Portugal's reply to the Secretary-General on 8 November 1956^{8/} stated that it did not administer any territories that came under Article 73 of the Charter. That Article is very clear on this matter, and we shall discuss it in detail in the Fourth Committee.

[The speaker then read the first paragraph and subparagraph e, of Article 73 of the Charter.]

214. There are 779,000 square miles of Portuguese territory in Africa, apart from other areas, and the territory of Portugal, of which the representative of Portugal has spoken of as part of the Portuguese Republic, consists in Europe of the mainland, Madeira and the Azores, which I suppose are an integral part of Portugal. The territory of Portugal in West Africa consists of the Cape Verde Islands, Portuguese Guinea, São Tomé, São João Batista de Ajudá, Cabinda and Angola. In East Africa there is Mozambique; in Asia, so-called Portuguese India, Macau; and in Oceania, Portuguese Timor.

215. These are territories which are not self-governing and which are inhabited by people who make no impact upon the Central Government of the country and which, in a very classic sense, are colonial territories. We request the Portuguese Government to fall into line with other territories, irrespective of any claim to self-government and irrespective of any demands or complaints that may have been made, to assist the United Nations in the propagation of the idea that these territories are held in trust for human beings organized into nations or into territorial units in order to establish their national independence.

216. These territories are known, under article 134 of the Portuguese Constitution as provinces. Article 135 states that the Overseas Provinces, as an integral part of the Portuguese State, are united as between themselves and with metropolitan Portugal. Of course, that is how a colony is united. Prior to 1951, these territories were known as "colonies", but the new terminology of "provinces" was introduced by the amendments of 11 June 1951, that is, after the establishment of the United Nations.

217. Article 33 refers to "the classic mission" of Portugal to diffuse the benefits of civilization, which suggests the presence of non-self-governing peoples within the meaning of the Charter. What the Charter asks for is a record of this diffusion of the benefits of civilization. If the benefits of civilization are being diffused by educational and social progress, then that information should be sent. There is a limited measure of decentralization and financial autonomy, but the legislative power remains in the hands of the metropolitan National Assembly.

218. Portuguese citizens alone may vote or stand for election. "Natives" do not have the right unless they meet certain prescribed educational, religious, financial and social standards. Since Portugal regulates these standards, the "natives" who qualify for citizenship are kept in manageable proportions. Out of a population of ten and a half million, only 35,000 people have any citizenship rights at all.

219. By any reasonable test such as the application of the factors established by General resolution 742 (VIII) it can be established beyond doubt that they are Non-Self-Governing Territories. Moreover, article 4 of the Portuguese Constitution states that in the international field it recognizes only those limitations which are derived from conventions or treaties freely entered into. The Charter is such a treaty and Article 73 applies.

220. I have taken care not to bring the Indo-Portuguese question into the present consideration, but

^{8/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Annexes, agenda item 34, document A.C.4/331.

merely raise the whole question of colonies as such and I request, I do not demand, the Portuguese Government to provide this information under Article 73.

221. With regard to colonial territories as a whole, there are twenty colonies under France and twenty under the United Kingdom in each of which during the last few years there have been policies which will lead to self-government. But these colonial areas cover 50 million people under France and 63 million people in the case of the United Kingdom. In each case, they are twenty times as large as the metropolitan countries. My delegation does not suggest in regard to either of these two metropolitan countries that progressive policies are not the rule. If there are violations of them, or complaints about them, they are inherent in the colonial system. We hope, however, that more territories which are dependent, whoever may rule them, will come under Article 73.

222. I should like to deal for a moment with the position in Africa. To anyone who has spoken about the colonial territories, Africa stands in a category of its own, and my delegation has been delighted to notice that year after year for the last three or four years the Secretary-General has paid special attention to Africa, and the establishment of the Economic Commission for Africa is a great measure of progress about which my Government would like to express its appreciation.

223. Africa has an area of about 11,250,000 square miles and a population of 193 million people. Out of these, 5 million are Europeans, 600,000 are Asians and the rest are Africans. Of this total, 103 million are under colonial rule and 6,200,000 square miles of territory are more or less under colonial rule. It is to be noted that this Africa, which is regarded as unfit to govern, which consists of colonial territories, supplies a great part of the world's very precious resources. Africa supplies the world with 98 per cent of its diamonds, 94 per cent of its columbite, 84 per cent of its cobalt, 55 per cent of its gold, 41 per cent of its beryllium, 33 per cent of its manganese, 29 per cent of its chrome, 22 per cent of its copper and 13 per cent of its tin. All this comes from what is called the "Dark Continent". Unhappily it is dark only to its own people, it is very much a light to others.

224. Uranium is believed to exist in very large quantities, and there are large deposits of iron ore, manganese and bauxite. Two-thirds of the world's cocoa comes from Africa and three-fifths of its palm oil.

225. So here are territories occupied by small numbers of people compared with the rest of the world, covering a very large area and containing an enormous amount of mineral wealth, which it supplies to the world, territories in which the peoples are strangers in their own country.

226. This brings me to the other part of the colonial empire, which presents another picture—Algeria and West Irian. The Indonesian delegation in its wisdom decided not to request that the question of West Irian be placed on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly. The Government of India considers West Irian as unfinished business, that is, that part of Indonesia which, as is the case of Portuguese Goa, still remains under alien rule. I do not desire to go into the technical and legal questions which have been discussed so many times. Time after time the General

Assembly has appealed to the Dutch and Indonesian Governments to negotiate so that West Irian may be united with the rest of Indonesia and so that the liberation of the former Netherlands colony will be complete.

227. I would like to say, on behalf of our Government that has very friendly relations with the Netherlands Government, that any policy of this kind would make the Netherlands Government much more appreciated in the Asian continent, establish friendly relations between Europe and Asia, and be a blow to the doctrines of racialism and imperialism which are likely to endanger world peace. A progressive though small country like the Netherlands, with a great technical and industrial capacity which must survive very largely by the help of a clientele from the large populations of the world, in its own interests and, in addition, as a response to the appeal we make, will, we hope, find it possible, without any pressures from anywhere else and perhaps of its own volition, to enter into negotiations with the Indonesian Government so that this problem may be solved forever.

228. Then we come to the question of Algeria. I am going to say very little at this moment because the item is on our agenda and no doubt it will come up later for discussion.

229. My Government and delegation will support the demand of the Algerian people for full national unity and independence, and in due time for their taking their rightful place as an independent nation in this Assembly. We do not subscribe to the allegations made by one side or the other because we are not in possession of these facts. But to us, it does not signify whether a place is well governed or not so well governed, ill-governed or much worse governed even than it may be. People are entitled to their independence. Colonialism must end even if the colonialism is a benevolent one. Therefore, we shall support the claim of Algeria for independence. We hope that the recent pronouncements made by General de Gaulle, coupled with the position that under his régime a country like Guinea has been able to become independent, may lead to a position where the French Government and the President of the French Republic will find it possible to initiate negotiations with the people who are fighting them. After all, if there is to be peace in Algeria, the first step is a cease-fire, but you cannot negotiate a cease-fire except between people who are engaged in firing. Therefore, the necessity of negotiating logically follows and all the political questions may come afterwards, when negotiations for a cease-fire have begun. There is no use negotiating with a number of Algerians who may be in France or in New York or somewhere else, in order to stop the fighting in the mountains or elsewhere in Algeria. Therefore, direct negotiations with the Algerian National Liberation Front, that is the Government that is in control of a great part of the territory, with a view to finding a way out. I am not here for a moment saying there may not be matters to discuss; we are not prepared to reject out of hand the approach made by the French Government and we certainly do not question their motives. But it is difficult for us to accept as self-determination for Algeria, self-determination in which the whole of France participates. That would be very much like an equality in the sandwich that was sold by a person who was mixing horse flesh with the sandwich. He was asked, "What is all this?". He said, "It is only a fifty-fifty proposition, one chicken to one horse."

230. Then we come to the Trust Territories. This is a sphere in which the United Nations can congratulate itself, and we are happy to think that Western Samoa, under the very enlightened administration of New Zealand, will now pass on to independence. We should like to pay our tribute to the Visiting Missions, to the New Zealand Government and to the Samoan people who have all co-operated in this development. We hope that there will be no hitches and that in a very short time Samoa will take its place among us as an independent territory and decide the nature of its own association with New Zealand.

231. We have the Trust Territories of the Cameroons and French Togoland. The Cameroons is being discussed in the Fourth Committee; I do not wish therefore to go into this problem here. We hope that the Territory of Togoland will take its place, in the same way as Ghana, with us next year.

232. We have another and different kind of problem in regard to South West Africa. South West Africa was a C Mandate under the League of Nations and ought by rights to become a Trust Territory. The World Court has expressed different opinion on certain aspects of the questions referred to it in this matter, but the United Nations has always taken the view that South West Africa ought to come into trusteeship. We hope that the Union Government, in spite of all the positions it has held so far, will recognize sooner rather than later that it is more in harmony with its own position, with the contribution the Union Government has made to the founding of this Organization, with the principles that it, apart from "apartheid," often exposes in this Assembly, to come to some position whereby South West Africa, in the view of the overwhelming majority in the Assembly in accordance with the principles of the Charter and the obligations which it had undertaken in the League Covenant, will come under trusteeship.

233. There is one other thing I should like to say. As large numbers of Trust Territories become independent, the Trusteeship Council has to do less and less. But the Charter provided for this Trusteeship as a new way of treating colonial Territories. May I take this opportunity to make an appeal on behalf of the Government of India and say that one hopes that the enlightened Administering Powers will now find it possible to place other Territories that are Non-Self-Governing under Trusteeship so that they may become independent very soon. That is what is provided for in Chapter XII of the Charter, because that would be the best way of proclaiming what they have constantly proclaimed on this platform: that Trusteeship is the intermediate step and an enlightened one provided for by the United Nations and by the League of Nations. We may hope that in this way Territories may be placed voluntarily—nobody can force them—under the provisions of the Trusteeship Council.

234. I should like to take a much briefer time than I would otherwise have done as regards the question of race relations. There are items on the agenda of the Assembly to be discussed in Committees. Therefore, I do not wish to go into this at great length. However, I have to because the Foreign Minister of the Union of South Africa on this rostrum [811th meeting] not only merely made an attempt to defend the policy of the administration in regard to race relations, but he also expounded a policy which he thought should be accepted by the world. Now it is quite true, I entirely agree with him, that there is not a country in the world, including

my own, where there is not social discrimination based on race, caste, creed or colour or whatever it may be. There is not a country in the world which can say, "we are free from this". But equally, there is not a country in the world except the Union of South Africa which is not trying to get away from it. The difference between the "apartheidists" and the others is that the latter recognize it is evil and recognize their weakness and error in that they are still tolerating it. But in the other case it is put to us as a kind of historical pattern of Africa that must be followed. In support of this, we are told that the Dutch went to South Africa before the Bantus. But who went there before the Bantus: the Hottentots and the Bushmen? They are also human beings. If the Union Government is prepared to bring the Hottentots and the Bushmen to self-government, that would be even a greater contribution.

235. So I do not think there is any use going into the history of who came there first and who did not. My Government has not, and I hope never will, argued that people should be turned out of Africa because of their racial origins. We regard these territories as multi-racial societies where many races must co-exist. That would be so in the case of Algeria, that would be so in the case of South Africa, and in other cases too. So when the Foreign Minister of the Union of South Africa tells us "We are today strangers in the lands of our immigrant forefathers" and that the United Nations wants to turn them out, it is not historically or politically correct. No one has suggested that "apartheid" in reverse should be practiced. What we have said is that there is nothing scientific or defensible on any grounds in racial discrimination. Indeed, UNESCO appointed a committee to examine race problems. It produced a report.^{2/} I am not going to quote from that report as I do not have the time. The Committee examined this question in great scientific detail, the question whether there is a scientific basis for racial discrimination. The Committee came to the conclusion, on scientific grounds, that there are no reasons whatsoever for the practices that obtain politically, socially or otherwise. If I may, I will commend this scientific investigation to the notice of the South African Government.

236. We stand fully opposed to the whole doctrine of "apartheid." If the Foreign Minister of the Government of the Union of South Africa tells us: "What is there to complain about, we are going to have a white Africa and a non-white Africa," then we say that is not the whole story. If there was a white Africa and a non-white Africa and if the former stepped out of non-white Africa there might be something to be said for it. But a white Africa and a non-white Africa are to be under white Africa. Therefore, "apartheid" only goes to a certain extent. It is not a complete "apartheid". I am not supporting it even if it were to be so. Therefore, the argument that is put before us in defence of "apartheid" is a position totally contrary to the principles of the Charter, totally contrary to the investigations made in the scientific field, totally contrary to the sense of human dignity and, what is more, is a position that is likely to lead to racial conflict in Africa of a character which can only be inferred by people if they would just look at the numerals: 193 million people as against 5 million. That is the hard logical fact to be faced when the time comes. What is more, the industrial development of Africa, all that I

^{2/} UNESCO: *The Race Concept* (Paris, UNESCO, 1952).

have spoken about a few moments ago is not possible without the manpower of its populations. If they are good enough to produce wealth, they are good enough to enjoy political power.

237. I propose, in view of the time, to deal with economic development problems in Committee. The most outstanding experience of our time has been the visits of great personalities as between their respective countries. If I may say so, it began with the so-called "iron curtain"—a word not permitted to be used in correspondence or otherwise by the Government of India—and we think its abandonment will be a small contribution to the lowering of tensions, just as the abandonment of the words "running dogs of imperialism" would be on the other side.

238. The first of these visits started when Mr. Bulganin, then Prime Minister, and Mr. Khrushchev visited India three or four years ago. Later followed the visit of our Prime Minister to the USSR, and then that of Mr. Khrushchev to the United Kingdom and then that of the British Prime Minister to the Soviet Union. The United States Vice-President went to the Soviet Union. The United States Vice-President went to the Soviet Union, and later the Soviet Prime Minister visited the United States.

239. In as far as it merely concerns Soviet-United States relations, it would not be my place to comment upon them, but there are world problems involved in the matter. We have at all times stated that we believe in direct talks between the United States and the Soviet Union. As early as 1952, speaking before this Assembly, my delegation said that there are two great Powers in the world. The peace of the world depends upon them and we would subscribe to any proposal to have direct negotiations between them. There is no dignity, no face-saving, involved in this matter. The only way that the problems of this world can be settled is by direct negotiation between countries who are so powerful, who are so strong and who have the capacity to make decisions.

240. I will not quote the statements. There are statements made year after year from 1952 to 1957 where we have made appeals in this Assembly for direct talks between the Soviet Government and the United States Government. It is not for us to speculate about what has happened between these Heads of State. But there is no doubt that we all recognize that when they see each other face to face, one thinks that the other fellow is not so bad as he thought he was. At least it does that much good.

241. But this has been a political visit and, so far as the United Nations is concerned, it is very important for the statement made by the Soviet Premier before this Assembly [799th meeting], followed by observations by other delegations subsequently. The Soviet Premier's statement, to the mind of my delegation, falls into two distinct parts. One is a proposal for disarmament which belongs to the same category as the discussions that have gone on here for what is called the balanced reduction, limitation and so on of armaments. The other is an entirely different proposal—for a warless world, the kind of thing that a Government like ours, which has not the economic or political power or the power to influence has constantly appealed for—that is, disarmament alone cannot bring about peace or settlement in our world; we must have a situation where war is outlawed.

242. We regard the proposals put forward as proposals not of a visionary character, as they are called, but as reflecting vision. My Prime Minister, when he heard of this, said:

"It seems to me as a proposal, a brave proposal, which deserves every consideration. Whether humanity, that is various countries concerned, is brave enough to put an end suddenly to armies, navies and air forces, I do not know. But the time will come, will have to come, when something of this kind will have to be adopted because in this era of atomic and hydrogen weapons and ballistic missiles, war has become an anachronism."

243. Therefore we were happy when the General Committee, without any dissenting voice, admitted the item put forward by the Soviet Union with regard to general and complete disarmament [A/4218]. On the face of it, it may look like the same item put down by two different parties, but we think that the two different propositions are: one the balanced reduction of armaments and the other the abandonment of war as a manner of settling disputes; and what is more, the community of the world is established in society where force has a municipal character and a municipal character must necessarily, as a corollary, come under world law. Therefore, this is the first great movement towards a world State or towards the congeries of people who are characterized by so many differences. We make no reservation for ourselves in subscribing to this objective. It is not an objective which means something that will not happen now, but something which we hope we will work for and, for that reason, speed up the course of disarmament.

244. We are happy to think that the Secretary of State for the United States also supported this, saying:

"...it did echo sentiments that are very widely held, that, if it were practicable and if it could safely be done, the type of disarmament that Mr. Khrushchev has spoken about is a highly desirable thing for mankind. From that point of view it must be taken very seriously."^{10/}

Members of the Assembly will be aware that it is not always that the Soviet Union says of the United States or the United States says of the Soviet Union that the other party "must be taken seriously."

245. From the West German Defence Minister also comes a similar statement when he says that the proposal was a wonderful, excellent idea and that he shares the opinion of Mr. Khrushchev.

246. The Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom told us that [798th meeting] it was important to make a fresh start with disarmament. Similarly, other countries in uncommitted areas like Burma, Yugoslavia, my own country and Afghanistan welcome it, especially in under-developed areas, not merely because of its economic consequences, but because we do not see a world surviving in the context of modern war where it is possible to annihilate not only vast populations but even kill the character of the population, if any did survive, for the future with all the genetic consequences of an atomic war. Therefore, my delegation will support the priority consideration being given to the discussion of the item.

^{10/} From a speech of Mr. Herter, reproduced in The New York Times, 23 September 1959.

247. We shall also approach it from the point of view of a warless world with all its implications. At the rate that the world is going, we do not share the view that, because a four-year period has been set, it is impractical. On 4 October 1957, the first Russian "sputnik" went up, followed by so many United States bodies of the same kind. Two years later, another of these things went round the moon. We did not think in 1957 that these great things could happen so soon. Indeed, we are moving in the world of scientific advances as from 4 October 1957, in a manner, as my Prime Minister once said, which makes the Atomic Age look like the Stone Age.

248. The progress of the world cannot be measured merely in the terms of the calendar. Einstein quite rightly in his relativity dissertations points out that time is event, so we may say that events must measure time. Time by the clock is not always what calculates or what conditions the consciousness of human beings, nor must it be the ruling factor in this matter.

249. On the other hand, the Soviet Prime Minister or those who have followed him have not ruled out the other problems, namely the immediate problems for limitation of armaments. My Government stands fully committed and publicly proclaims the view that there cannot be any limitation by agreement except with control. We have never been able to understand this argument about which comes first, the chicken or the egg. You cannot have control without disarmament or disarmament without control. We think the plans on this should be simultaneously developed so that when the agreement to disarm is reached the control machinery will have been agreed to, and the control apparatus should also be agreed upon in the same way. We are glad to think that both in the East and the West, so-called, there have been advances in the consideration of the problems of control and the problems of surprise attack, and we are also told that there may be some agreement in regard to outer space. In this connexion, may I say that time after time less significant delegations like ours have put forward suggestions in this way which have not found favour so far as the votes, to which reference was made, are concerned. Some years ago, the United Nations rejected, I believe by 38 votes to 22, or something of the kind, the proposal^{11/} made by the delegation of India that technical examination of the methods of controlling nuclear explosions would be the way out. But we had the pleasure of hearing the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom say a few days ago [798th meeting] that this had been put forward by him—not in terms of the proposal we put forward, but at any rate the idea of the use of technical criteria for this purpose—and therefore they had reached agreement.

250. We have asked for a long time, from the year 1949, for an armaments truce, and also for the Secretariat to start what they call the blueprint for a disarmament treaty so that the arguments would be in regard to particular details and not merely to phrase juxtaposition.

251. I would not like to leave this rostrum without referring to two other matters. One is in regard to the Suez Canal. I refer to the Suez Canal not because anything I say will make a difference in this problem, but because, as I have said repeatedly, the problem is not

the Suez Canal, it is something else. I do not intend to tread where angels fear to do so, but I would like to point out the position of my Government in this matter.

252. Two or three years ago, when the question of the Suez Canal came here and the attack on Egypt by three countries took place, the United Nations intervened and there was all the argument about this problem also. We have always said that the right of free navigation under the 1888 Constantinople Convention must be accepted by parties. We have never moved away from that position and we were completely in favour of the development of the instrument that was deposited with the Secretary-General by the Government of Egypt.

253. We therefore think that this problem is fully covered and pursuant to the principles laid down in the 1888 Constantinople Convention, paragraph 7 of which states:

"(a)... The Suez Canal Authority, by the terms of its Charter, can in no case grant any vessel, company or other party, any advantage or favour not accorded to other vessels, companies or parties on the same conditions.

"(b) Complaints of discrimination or violation of the Canal Code shall be sought to be resolved by the complaining party by reference to the Suez Canal Authority. In the event that such a reference does not resolve the complaint, the matter may be referred, at the option of the complaining party or the Authority, to an arbitration tribunal composed of one nominee of the complaining party, one of the Authority and a third to be chosen by both. In case of disagreement, such third member will be chosen by the President of the International Court of Justice upon the application of either party.

"(c) The decisions of the arbitration tribunal shall be made by a majority of its members. The decisions shall be binding upon the parties when they are rendered and they must be carried out in good faith..."^{12/}

254. Soon afterwards, in order to set all doubts at rest, we are glad to note that the following declaration also was transmitted to the Secretary-General on 18 July 1957:

"I, Mahmoud Fawzi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Egypt, declare on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Egypt, that, in accordance with article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice and in pursuance and for the purposes of paragraph 9 (b) of the Declaration of the Government of the Republic of Egypt dated 24 April 1957 on the Suez Canal and the arrangements for its operation, the Government of the Republic of Egypt accept as compulsory ipso facto, on condition of reciprocity and without special agreement, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes that may arise under the said paragraph 9 (b) of the above Declaration..."^{13/}

255. So that as far as we are concerned, if there is a violation of any legal rights, intra-national or international, they are today justifiable. Therefore, if the

^{12/} See Official Records of the Security Council, Twelfth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1957, document S/3818.

^{13/} Ibid., Supplement for July, August and September 1957, document S/3818/Add.1.

^{11/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Twelfth Session, Annexes, agenda item 24, document A/C.1/L.176/Rev.4.

existing situation is something that militates against the interests of the parties concerned, or of international behaviour, I think that we should follow the advice of the Secretary-General and evoke the operation of the Court.

256. I have to race through the last part of my Statement. I express the support of my Government in regard to what may be called the warless world plan which was put forward by the Soviet Prime Minister, a plan which is the same as we have spoken about the outlawing of war. But we think that side by side with it must come other matters.

257. Mr. Khrushchev referred to the fact that \$100,000 million was spent in the making of armaments and that if this money was saved, it would go towards the development of the world as a whole. I have not the time nor the facts before me to detail these matters to you. Not only do we have hope, but we must work for a warless world, a world without war. A world community would thus be established. At the present juncture it has been placed in the context of measurable time.

258. There then arises a new situation. Today in this world we have 2,800 million people. Whatever may be your personal views on this matter, at the end of this century there will be 5,200 million people in this world. We are increasing at the rate of sixty million a year. And arising from this, my delegation would like to put to the Assembly the fact that the Secretariat should be charged with producing the blueprints of what may be called "a world plan of development". It is not only a question of the Special Fund or the technical aid, or this or that other thing, but how we are going to subsist in this world with 5,000 million people, where, on the one hand, the per capita income of a prosperous country is somewhere about \$1800 per head, while in other places it is \$58 per head, while there are large pockets of unemployment, while there is the position that industrially and socially some are backward, and where there is the problem of feeding these vast populations. A world of peace cannot be a world of imbalance. A world of imbalance would be a world that is not at peace.

259. My delegation would submit for the consideration of the Secretariat that they produce the blueprints of a world plan, which should be the main concern of the Second Committee from next year onwards. It should not be a question of tinkering with this or that, but it should be recognized that the \$100,000 million that would be saved would not go to the production of consumer goods which would find their place in the under-developed areas. No under-developed country is prepared to take imperialism in reverse. It should not be forgotten that when the making of armaments in the present armed world has stopped and the producers who are now consuming the \$100,000 million in one way or another turn to peaceful occupation, the under-developed world at the same time is also producing goods.

260. It is not now as in the nineteenth century where some people were hewers of wood and drawers of water and some people produced raw materials and other people produced finished goods. In the remainder of the century that is before us, the position will be that there will be a large quantity of production. Equally, there will be large populations. The problem of feeding, housing and, what is more, of establishing

a balance between communities and social developments, will become the world problem, especially in a warless world, because at the present moment suspicions and fears divert the attention of people away from these problems.

261. This cannot be solved either by loan schemes or by charity schemes. They can only be solved in the context of a co-operative world where each party, big or small, poor or rich, makes his own contribution, where the world is taken as one picture, where there are no communities outside world law and outside the United Nations, where production has to match the requirements of the community, and the conception, as regards under-developed countries, of profit-making loans, would be regarded as an anachronism. The under-developed country that at the present moment may feel very much heartened by the taking of a loan from a developed country has to carry in the years to come all the servicing of those loans and mortgage its future in that way.

262. It is not a question merely of technical assistance as we knew it before, but of a world plan, and the Secretariat, in the first instance, may well produce working papers so that we could side by side, as a corollary of a disarmed world, proceed in this way. Therefore, it is not as though we do not have the problem before us. The problem has been brought nearer by the picture of a warless world that is put to us at the present time. I would therefore submit to the General Assembly that this would be one of the tasks that we could undertake. But we could not approach any of these problems if we approach them from the point of view of suspicion, from the point of view of "well, it is a vision of the future".

263. There is a difference between visions of the future and just being visionary. There is a difference between schemes on the one hand and dreams on the other. A world that is as largely populated as ours is likely to be, where there are populations of different types of development, can only be tackled from the point of view of world planning. With our minds on considerations of outer space, the time is fast coming when there will be the reverse of what I am told is the theological doctrine that the ills of this world are solved in heaven. Very soon the time will come when the troubles of heaven will have to be solved in this world, because the quarrels between the different countries using space for one thing or the other has to be settled terrestrially.

264. Therefore, this world reveals itself to us as the small planet that it is. It will take its place in the perspective of creation, and we hope that this economic aspect which we have now begun to tackle by way of SUNFED, the Special Fund, the International Development Association, bilateral loans, and so on, becomes a vast human concern, a project that arises from the principles of the Charter, from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and our conception of a warless world, and things of that kind.

265. But for all this, the approach to this matter has to be one where the ends and the means are not separated much one from the other. We could not move toward these projects without faith, and that faith cannot just merely be an idle hope that something would happen. It might be the realization of the truth as we see it, of our faith in the destiny of humanity.

266. As we said at San Francisco, our people and our Government believe in disarmament only as a means to an end. It is a means that shares the character of its end, as all means should do. But in the next decade disarmament alone will not be enough. Therefore we ought to address ourselves in the next decade to our main purpose, and if we have said it once we are prepared to say it one hundred times if necessary; there is only one way before the world, and that is for nations to renounce war as an instrument of policy. This Organization now has to address itself, as a longer-term project, to the idea of renouncing war as an instrument of national policy. Disarmament or limitation of armaments is a good thing; it is an advance on present conditions; but it is not the establishment of peace. We can establish peace only when the nations have decided to abandon war.

267. This will be possible, when these weapons of mass destruction and of terror are eliminated, once confidence is established and once it is possible for us in this Assembly, for example, to say, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, that errors of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat them. If we are able to trust to reason and not to passion, it will be possible to do this.

268. Let us therefore realize that, in the face of these great problems, it is our business to listen to the voice of destiny. History is replete with examples of the truth that the solution of problems by means that are contrary to ends always results in tragedy. That was the fate of the Congress of Vienna. That was the fate of the League of Nations. One cannot reconcile great dreams with narrow schemes. If we rely on schemes, we will be schemers. If we are going in pursuit of an ideal, then we should not be obsessed by the thought of the poet who, in the mid-war years, reflected the temper of that period of great despondency and cynicism when he said: "In this great hour of destiny they stand, each with disputes, jealousies and sorrows." But instead we should say, like the bard who belonged to the age of the Renaissance and of constructive endeavour, that "we must take the current when it serves, or lose our ventures".

269. Our ventures today are the ventures of peace—a world that is rid of war, a planned world from the economic and social point of view, and, what is more, not lost in idle dreams but inspired by lofty and realistic vision, harnessed to constructive endeavour by the Organization that is ours, by the ideals that are contained in the Charter. Our ventures—the venture of peace, the venture of world community—we dare not lose. This is our charge and our obligation.

270. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I call upon the representative of Spain to exercise his right of reply.

271. Mr. DE LEQUERICA (Spain) (translated from Spanish): This afternoon the representative of Morocco expressed his delegation's regret that the Governments of Spain and of another Power, whose representative has already dealt with the matter authoritatively, have refused to withdraw their troops from Morocco and have thus perpetuated a state of occupation. I must correct this statement, the total inaccuracy of which is all the more surprising since, if my understanding is correct, the representative of Morocco is also the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs of his country. Negotiations on this subject are being conducted legally

and correctly by the Governments of Morocco and Spain.

272. I find it therefore surprising and not at all in accordance with diplomatic usage that the matter should be brought before the United Nations, in distorted form, and with the implication that an appeal to this high tribunal could bring about the desired results. In Spanish, such a procedure is called "chalanceo"—although I hesitate to use such a slang term in front of our President who is a member of the Royal Spanish Academy. In case that is the wrong term, I believe the French equivalent would be "maquignonnage" (horse-trading). The United Nations is above being used for such purely private designs.

273. Although I am not competent to go into the substance of the matter, I cannot let the question pass, for it has been dealt with in black and white only two or three weeks ago in an article by Mr. Benjamin Wells, a well-known correspondent of The New York Times—unfortunately, I have not been able to find the exact text—in which he stated that the immense majority of the 60,000 troops who had been stationed by Spain in its former Protectorate of Morocco had now been withdrawn, leaving only about 7,000.

274. I regret that an attempt is being made to mislead the United Nations and particularly that matters should be submitted to it which are not within its jurisdiction and consideration of which could only be detrimental to its great authority.

275. Although this matter, too, is beyond the scope of our usual concern, I must also refute the erroneous statement by the representative of Morocco that Ifni and Saguiet el Hamra are not Spanish territories and that Spain therefore could not take steps to improve the standards of living and legal status of their inhabitants. That is not true. The Province of Ifni is historically Spanish, and is specifically recognized as such in article 8 of the Treaty between Spain and Morocco dated 26 April 1860, which cedes forever ground that shall be sufficient for the formation thereon of an establishment, similar to that which Spain possessed there in ancient times.

276. The remote origin of Spain's rights may well become lost in the convenient obscurity of the past; for all practical purposes, however, these territories have not been under the effective sovereignty of Moroccan monarchs since the fifteenth century, as is proved by the fact that in 1767 the Sultan himself states in a treaty between Spain and Morocco that he does not consider these territories to form part of his dominions.

277. These are undisputed facts. I do not know whether it would still be normal practice, as it formerly was, for the two Governments to discuss the matter between themselves, but Spain is in no way afraid to claim its legal title to, and its clear practical right to, sovereignty over those territories.

278. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I now give the floor to the representative of the Soviet Union.

279. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Our delegation deems it essential to reply briefly to the speech of the United States representative.

280. Mr. Lodge, quoting from the speech of Secretary of State Herter [797th meeting], merely confirmed the

fact that the United States was indeed delaying the reaching of an agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapon testing. The three issues cited by Mr. Lodge show quite clearly that these issues were taken up at Geneva and have been used, at least up to the present time, in order to delay the reaching of agreement, and in an attempt to place responsibility for the delay on the Soviet Union.

281. I should like to inform Mr. Lodge that the speech which the United States Secretary of State delivered here contained even more obvious attempts to place on the Soviet Union the responsibility both for the general absence of any kind of co-operation in the field of nuclear energy, and for the armaments race. In order not to take up much of the General Assembly's time, I will quote only one part:

"In the early years after the development of atomic energy... The Soviet Union refused to co-operate, apparently believing that its late start in the atomic energy field would prejudice its national interests if an international approach were adopted. The deadly arms race of the past decade stands as an ugly witness to the human tragedy of that Soviet non-co-operation." [797th meeting, para. 74.]

282. These quotations speak, I think, for themselves. The Soviet delegation reserves the right to discuss the substance of these questions in greater detail at a later stage, when the disarmament problem is debated in the First Committee.

283. Now, taking advantage of the opportunity, I should like to emphasize that if the United States is ready to conclude forthwith an agreement on the cessation of all atomic weapon testing, we shall be only too glad to hear it. For its part the Soviet Union is ready to do this, and considers that all the necessary conditions for the immediate conclusion of such an agreement now exist.

284. The Soviet Government, by introducing a constructive proposal in regard to all unsettled questions, is in fact proving its sincere desire to stop the tests. It was stated that it will not resume nuclear tests if other Powers possessing nuclear weapons do not resume them. The Soviet Union urges the United States and the United Kingdom to follow its example.

285. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I now call upon the representative of Portugal to exercise his right of reply.

286. Mr. J. S. DA COSTA (Portugal): The Portuguese delegation has been forced to exercise its right of reply to assertions made by the Indian representative concerning the doctrine contained in Chapter XI, of which Article 73 constitutes the main provision. As a member of the Portuguese Parliament where I previously represented the electoral district of Goa, and now represent Oporto, the second largest city of Portugal, I feel that I am fully qualified to clarify the Portuguese position on this issue.

287. The reasons why the Portuguese Government, faithful to the constitution of the nation, replied in the negative to the Secretary-General's inquiry should be well known to this Assembly as they have been clearly explained to previous Assemblies by the Chairman of our delegation. Portugal does not administer any territories covered by Article 73, sub-paragraph e, of the Charter. National constitutions are the legal expression of social reality. The historical, geographical and

political position of my country led Portugal to what has been defined as the "Non-Europe". The other great institutions for multi-racial communities, when instrumental in the formation of the country and its collective ideals, together with the consequent absence of racial prejudices, led Portugal to the creation of true local communities by miscegenation, spiritual assimilation, and inter-relation of cultures and interests. Thus the Portuguese people, by strength of spirit, not by force of arms, became one people dispersed throughout four continents, and kept a genuine feeling of community united by the same national faith.

288. This social reality cemented by centuries, this absolute unity of the Portuguese people, makes us a certainly unusual example of an egalitarian, multi-racial society, corresponding with a political unity of all territories. The Portuguese Constitution is the legal expression of social reality when it establishes in its Article 135 that the overseas provinces are integral parts of the Portuguese estate. Furthermore, Article 5 of the Portugal Constitution provides equality before the law as everyone, regardless of origin, may participate, and does participate, in the administrative life of the nation or in the making of the laws.

289. As an expression of the true unity mentioned before, the political unity of the territory and the unity of the people, the Portuguese estate is a unitary republic with only one Supreme Court which secures the equal interpretation of the law to all. There is only one National Assembly elected by direct universal suffrage. As a final result of these realities, the sovereignty of the Portuguese nation is one and indivisible, and it cannot, therefore, acknowledge any specific international status which would differentiate between parts of the same national territory. Such an international status would have to be applicable to non-self-governing territories, which is entirely outside the Portuguese case, for it is clearly defined in the constitutional structure of Portugal that all parts of the national territory and their respective populations are independent with the independence of the nation. We could not discriminate against this segment of the population, for such a system, I insist personally as a Goan, would imply racial discrimination which Portugal has never practised during its centuries of nationhood.

290. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I call upon the representative of Morocco for a brief explanation.

291. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (translated from French): I regret that the part of my speech which concerns our relations with Spain should have given the representative of that country the opportunity to make use of unparliamentary language on this rostrum. I thought that the President himself might take exception to that discourteous word. Since he did not do so, may I be allowed to reply myself to the representative of Spain.

292. The representative of Spain wished to refer to a historic text and he apologized for being unable to find it immediately. I can tell him at once that he was referring to the Treaty of 1860 in order to defend his country's position in connexion with Ifni; I may add that he must have read the Treaty very hastily. There was no question in the Treaty of any cession of territory; there was simply a fishing concession. The dispute between our two countries has arisen precisely

on account of the difference between the Spanish interpretation of that text and the Moroccan interpretation, which is more in accordance with the historic case in question.

293. As far as the expression "maquignonnage" is concerned, I regret that the Spanish representative should have used it to describe the manner in which I expounded my Government's views on the subject. Negotiations did in fact take place some months ago; I spoke of them only to indicate the position in which the matter stood after the termination of those negotiations. The Spanish representative, speaking of me, said that the Head of the delegation of Morocco was also Under-Secretary of State; I am obliged to correct him. I do not hold that post but I took part in the negotiations and, in accordance with diplomatic usage, I shall not refer to them but shall simply say that unfortunately they were unsuccessful and that the de jure and de facto situation of the Spanish troops has not been in any way changed.

294. The Spanish representative asserted that only some 7,000 soldiers remained on Moroccan territory. The reduction in the number of Spanish troops can be of advantage only to the Spanish Government. As long as a single soldier remains upon Moroccan soil the principle of the occupation of the country by foreign troops remains. We are not negotiating with Spain about arrangements which would be useful for its budget or for the deployment of its army. We are asking for the

troops to be evacuated. Whether there are 7,000 or 20,000 Spanish soldiers, the problem is the same as far as we are concerned. We do not think that Spain has any imperialist designs on our country; whether there are 100,000 or 7,000 soldiers on our frontiers we are confident that they are not there to attack us. Hence the reduction made by Spain in the number of its troops is of no possible interest to us; it is simply a matter of troops going back to their own country, a reduction in the budget, an arrangement that makes the task of the general staff easier.

295. With regard to the territory of Saguiet el Hamra there again I am afraid the Spanish representative's memory is at fault. But I can place at his disposal some texts which are known to his Government, to which he himself has referred and to which his Government does not refer in the same manner. In any case, they are at his disposal in order that he may find out all about the Saguiet el Hamra situation and the historic development of that territory, which today has come under Spanish sovereignty by a unilateral act on the part of Spain, in defiance of all of the international treaties on the subject.

296. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I move that the Assembly stand adjourned until 10.30 tomorrow morning.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 7.25 p.m.

^

