

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



903rd PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 13 October 1960,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 8:</i>	
Adoption of the agenda (<i>continued</i>)	
First report of the General Committee (<i>continued</i>)	691

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

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda (*continued*)

FIRST REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/4520) (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: I have received a request from the President of the Republic of Guinea to be heard first this morning because he will be leaving in a very short time for a visit to another country. As the Assembly is aware, the first speaker today should be the United States representative. If there is no objection to my granting the request of the President of the Republic of Guinea, I call on the President of the Republic of Guinea.

2. Mr. Sékou TOURE, President of the Republic of Guinea (translated from French): I should like first to thank the United States representatives and the other representatives who were to speak at the beginning of this meeting for their kindness in allowing me to take the floor at such short notice. I should be failing in my duty to the Assembly if I did not attempt to create a climate of greater understanding and to direct our discussion towards collective and constructive action, for the immediate welfare of the colonial peoples and of all mankind.

3. I was to have left by air at 8 o'clock this morning, but I decided to cancel my departure, because I am now the only African or Asian Head of State left in New York. I am sure that if our friend and doyen, Mr. Nehru, President Nasser, President Nkrumah or any other African or Asian Head of State were here, he would feel it his duty to do as I am doing, and to intervene in the debate which began yesterday in order to change its direction and to eliminate the negative factions which were beginning to reduce its importance in the eyes of the peoples of Asia and Africa, and indeed of the whole world.

4. Every age has its own imperatives. The fundamental imperative of our age is respect for the freedom of all peoples and the establishment of world peace, for the progressive development of all nations. That is impossible without a spirit of understanding between great Powers and small, between peoples, races and religions. It is impossible without the coexistence of all peoples of the world. We know that there are problems on which everyone may speak as he wishes,

according to his own temperament; but there are other problems which cannot be considered as personal problems, and still less as problems related to the existence of this or that system or block. Such problems concern the very foundations of a life of dignity for every human being, whatever political or economic system he may choose and whatever his religion, colour or nationality.

5. There can be no doubt that the problem of freedom is the greatest problem in the world. No people and no thinking person can think that freedom is divisible or that it belongs to a single people, race or religion.

6. The debate we began yesterday concerns the decision the United Nations must make, on behalf of all mankind, not to grant the right of self-determination, but to recognize self-determination as the inalienable and natural right of all communities. Although I was not present at yesterday's meeting, I was able to follow your debate, thanks to the technical progress which has given us television. I was very relieved—as I am sure all representatives were—when I heard one speaker after another, in spite of the differences in their philosophies and in their attitudes towards certain economic and political facts, agree on the great importance of the subject under discussion and proclaim their wish to take part in the debate, on behalf of their peoples and Governments. I felt that fundamentally there was no difference of opinion with regard to the USSR amendment [A/L.312/Rev.1] before the Assembly. There was in fact unanimity. The only disagreement concerned form and procedure.

7. We, the peoples of Africa and Asia, thank all representatives here for their understanding of a problem which must be solved if our culture and civilization are to attain their full worth and dignity. I deeply and bitterly regret that the last speech made yesterday, which led the President to suspend the meeting, had none of the helpful spirit we had hoped to find. I think we all agree that even the person responsible for that incident will not want, on reflection, to repeat it. I would therefore appeal to all those taking part in this morning's debate to avoid taking an obstructive attitude towards one another and to remember our common responsibility towards all the peoples of the world.

8. Morality is not the private possession of any one people. Political and philosophical thought belongs to all peoples, although the degree of their understanding may differ. This means that freedom, both from a moral and philosophical and from a historical point of view, is not the concern of colonial or former colonial peoples alone. When a colony is freed, the metropolitan country is made free. Complexes disappear and new human relations are established which can provide a basis for the harmonious development of the former metropolitan country and its former colony.

9. We therefore appeal to the group to which the Romanian representative belongs to avoid propaganda in the debate and about it, since such propaganda may lead the peoples to lose sight of the true significance of the outcome of the debate, which is the deep, honest and unanimous support of all nations for an ideal that has always been proclaimed as that of each of our nations, and especially as that of the United Nations: freedom and the right of every people to self-determination. We also appeal to those who have felt that they are under attack to realize that world public opinion will understand no answer but a solemn affirmation of the United Nations' unanimous will to adopt the amendment.

10. We do not think there can be any disagreement about such a vital problem. The Asian and African countries feel that it is mainly their responsibility to ask the Assembly to think of the welfare and future of their peoples, whether they speak or not, and every one knows what is in their minds. To the Western countries, as they are called and especially to the nations which have, in the course of history, taken upon themselves the responsibility of colonizing a country or a State, I would point out that there are representatives in this hall who were not here on 5 November 1959 [837th meeting] when I first had the honour to address you. One year of history has therefore seen the political liberation of new States.

11. Although some may be in a greater hurry than others, we all agree that there is a trend towards the independence of all nations and that decolonization is an essential and irreversible movement. As decolonization is inevitable, it is surely better that the process should be carried out with support and understanding, thus helping to build a better world, instead of feeding the fires of discontent which may lead to conflict and all its familiar consequences; mount up casualty lists, hatred, growing lack of understanding and the deepening of the historical abyss.

12. It is time to put a stop to all that, the more so as at this fifteenth session of the General Assembly, the representatives of the colonial Powers have had to say that their countries accept the liberation of the States which are here today, although it may well be maintained that independence is not something granted. That is true, because independence, like the authority of an organization or a man, is not given or granted or stolen or imposed: it is won, and then built up through effort, work and merit.

13. What would be the historical, moral and political meaning of any understanding which the colonial Powers have shown towards certain peoples presented here, if those Powers were to refuse to adopt this draft designed to extend to other colonial peoples the same dignity and freedom? Such a contradiction would take away any credit which the colonial nations might have acquired by the positive aspect of their actions. This positive aspect certainly exists. We are fighting colonialism; you are fighting it; we want it to disappear and so do you. Every phenomenon has a positive and a negative aspect. We know that never in history has any white, yellow or black people had to ask to be colonized by another people. Colonization is therefore against nature. Certainly there are economic and cultural interests. But independent nations—all of which are interdependent—co-operate more closely with one another than a colony with its metropolitan country.

14. Free Africa has therefore become a field for fair competition in efforts to promote its development and the co-operation of its different peoples, on the basis of mutual advantage. All constitutions of the world, whether they can be described as colonialist, liberal or revolutionary, call for respect for human and democratic freedoms. But how can we ensure respect for the freedoms of the individual when the people to which he belongs is denied the freedom to govern itself?

15. The colonial Powers will understand that they have reached a historic turning point and that they must take this course not merely for the sake of form, so that world opinion cannot say that they have shown themselves to be champions of colonialism, but with all their hearts, in the conviction that only freedom can build and that nothing can be built except in freedom.

16. We know that there is a gulf between the proclamation of a right and its exercise. It is necessary to consider the conditions in which it will be exercised, the extent of the resources available and, especially, the conscience of each people's leaders, which determines how they use the attributes of sovereignty. Although there are schools open to all children in the United States, in France, in Guinea and in the United Arab Republic, the children do not all benefit in the same way from the education provided. The first need—and herein lies the whole responsibility of the United Nations—is to recognize every people's right to independence and to bring about understanding and solidarity, so that those who lack experience may profit from the experience of others, always on a basis of mutual respect.

17. We therefore declare, on behalf of all our brothers and of the Asian and African representatives, that you can help us by adopting this amendment without further debate. You will thus show that this hall is near a statue, the Statue of Liberty. I believe that the Statue of Liberty does not stand for American freedom; it glorifies the freedom of all peoples and of all men, for freedom is indivisible; he who would divide it is no longer free. We must all remember what has been considered the highest level of human thought in the history of our countries. Although not all the speeches of the men who freed our countries have been published, the key words, the vital ideas, are always remembered. Here, in this country, there is the Lincoln Memorial where you can read an engraved message that is not addressed to America alone but is universal. The worth of man and of a people depends on the place in their heart which they give to other men and other peoples.

18. In this matter the United Nations has already made its choice—the Charter proclaims it as the mission of the United Nations—and I do not see how there can be any more difficulties in the discussion. Some say that the question should be taken to the plenary meeting; others that it should be taken to a Committee, so that the technical aspect of certain secondary problems can be discussed; but I think that the importance of the debate will be lessened if the United Nations does not make its decision unanimously in a plenary meeting.

19. An African proverb says: "Anything which prevents you from telling the truth today, or anything which prevents you from doing good today, will make

it still harder for you to tell the truth tomorrow and to do good tomorrow". I ask all representatives here to give the same answer to the heartfelt aspirations of all our peoples and the hope of mankind. We may not agree on the conditions in which freedom can be exercised, on political and economic systems or on social laws but, when we consider respect for the dignity of men—whether they are white, black or yellow—and the affirmation of the right to self-determination, our differences must not affect our universal agreement.

20. This is why I hope that Members of the United Nations will heed the appeal I have made in all humility on behalf of all Asian and African delegations. I appeal to all those who have been free for centuries and I ask them to give us their active and committed support, so that the amendment may be unanimously adopted, and so that the African peoples and all others may fully understand the historical value of the United Nations.

26. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States of America.

22. Mr. WILCOX (United States of America): Mr. President, you may recall that I was interrupted for a rather lengthy period during the course of my brief remarks yesterday [902nd meeting]. As I was about to say when I was interrupted, the United States originally felt that the agenda item referred to in the Soviet amendment [A/L.312/Rev.1] should be considered with due deliberation, and in accordance with our normal procedures, in the First Committee.

23. The procedural debate which we have had thus far in the Assembly has shown the intensity of feeling among nations around the world on the question of national independence and human freedom everywhere. Bearing in mind these considerations and the views expressed by many delegations on the matter of allocation, the United States delegation is quite ready to see the substantive discussion of the item before us take place in plenary. The broad scope of the subject matter and its universal importance to all peoples makes this appropriate.

24. On behalf of the United States delegation I wish to commend the President of Guinea for his speech, based upon the major thesis with which the United States delegation heartily associates itself, that all men should be free everywhere. I would hope that this item can be assigned to plenary without objection.

25. Mr. ORMSBY-GORE (United Kingdom): This morning we have listened to a very remarkable statement by the President of Guinea, and I will do my best in the few remarks I have to make to follow the constructive lead which he has given to us all.

26. The issue we were discussing yesterday afternoon was a simple one. It was whether the item on the independence of colonial territories already included in the agenda should be discussed straightaway in plenary or should go first to a Committee, in the normal way, and then come to plenary. That was all. On this question the United Kingdom took one view. It so happened that this was the view which had been recommended to the Assembly by the General Committee. As I explained yesterday, the United Kingdom view, that this question could best be discussed in the first place in the First Committee, was in no sense an attempt to diminish the importance of the subject.

27. But there was another view, namely, that the matter could best be handled directly in plenary and this was, of course, equally tenable in itself. As I said at the outset, we have already spent four hours in an attempt to settle a fairly simple point of procedure. It is too much time and we need to get on if this Assembly is to do the work that the peoples of the world expect us to do. To avoid further waste of time and further acrimony, I therefore propose that the item under consideration should be allocated for debate in plenary meeting.

28. I listened with respect and, I may say, considerable agreement to the important statement of the President of Guinea. I am sure that we should all do well to reflect upon it. We also believe, like him, that the debate which will take place on this most important subject should be of a really constructive nature. I am confident of one thing: that the great majority of representatives intend to see from now on that our business is conducted in a dignified and orderly manner and with respect for the fundamental rules of discussion among free men.

29. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union in exercise of the right of reply. After his intervention, I would propose, if it is generally agreeable, to put the Soviet amendment to the Assembly for what I hope and what I believe from the statements made will be a unanimous vote.

30. Mr. KHRUSHCHEV, President of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (translated from Russian): I should like to say that the delegation of the Soviet Union is highly gratified that the representative of the United States of America has agreed to this extremely important question of the liberation of the colonial peoples being discussed by the General Assembly in plenary meeting.

31. I would stress that the point at issue here is not one of procedure but one of securing substantive support for the declaration on abolishing the colonial system. We must bring about a situation in which the peoples still straining under the colonial yoke are given their freedom and independence. This freedom is not handed to them on a platter; they are waging a hard and bloody struggle to obtain it, a struggle in which millions of lives have been lost. We must therefore give them a comprehensive declaration describing what colonial bondage has brought them, indicating methods for their liberation from colonial oppression and proclaiming that all human beings—black, white or yellow, whatever their colour or creed—should enjoy the same rights.

32. I should like to say once again that no one is hopeless. Even such colonialists as the Spanish and the English—and they were the very first colonialists—even they are not hopeless. Indeed, if their brains are given a thorough washing, they begin to see the question being discussed at this session of the General Assembly in its true light; they have even stated that they would vote affirmatively.

33. You see, then, what good company we are in. Our socialist State, which is guided by the Communist Party, has submitted a proposal on ending the colonial system for consideration by the Assembly in plenary meeting, and we are very happy that our proposal has the support of the United States and that even the United Kingdom, that prototype of a

colonialist country, will vote with us. I accept their outstretched hand; it could only be to the advantage of all peoples, if we were to act in the same way in future.

34. Had the Assembly displayed the same unanimity on the question of disarmament as it has on the present issue, you can imagine what a stride we would have taken towards the achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control. I would therefore urge that the proper conclusion should be drawn: the peoples of the world must take their fate into their own hands and not assume that this question, the question of mankind's future, the question of war and peace, can be solved only by the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom and France. No, this is a question which concerns all people. We are distinguished only by the possession of the most highly perfected and the most destructive weapons. But this is not the crux of the matter. The crux of the matter is that if war breaks out, all the peoples of the world will suffer. Thus, all the peoples of the world must approach the question of disarmament and of peace throughout the world with the same sense of responsibility with which they are approaching—not were approaching, but are approaching—a solution to the question of eliminating the colonial system.

35. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal): It was not our intention to ask to be allowed to intervene on this question until we witnessed all that took place on the floor of the Assembly yesterday afternoon. If we had originally wished not to take part in this discussion it was not because we were not interested in the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial territories and peoples, but because we felt that the procedural aspect of the question—whether it should be discussed in plenary meeting or in the First Committee—could be disposed of simply and expeditiously.

36. Our stand and record on the questions of colonialism and imperialism have been on the table before the world ever since the time of the Bandung Conference, and I do not wish to refer to that at this time when we are merely being called upon to decide whether this particular item should be considered in the First Committee or in plenary meeting. We wonder why so much heat and passion should have been injected at all into the discussion of a simple procedural question such as this. After all, nobody had seriously objected to this item being taken up in plenary meeting.

37. We, for our part, do not see any ground or any occasion for the rather intemperate display of meaningless passion and fury to which all of us were witness. I would not have referred to those ugly incidents and gestures, but would have completely ignored them, if it were not for my deep concern about the effects all this would have on the prestige and dignity of this Organization to which we are all so proud to belong. I think I shall be speaking for all small nations such as mine, in Asia, Africa and elsewhere, when I say that we are not prepared to be blackmailed or bullied by gestures of superior might and authority into submission to any particular rigid line of thinking. We prize our newly-won freedom and independence of judgement more than anything else.

38. All representatives must have drawn their own conclusions from the too obvious intentions and efforts

on the part of certain delegations to strike a posture as the real and only champions of freedom and independence for dependent peoples and territories. We in the Assembly are only too familiar with the part which the United Nations itself has so far played in paving the way to the independence of territories by providing valuable background and training in self-government and administration. Some of the gestures and utterances to which we were subjected here yesterday were insulting to our intelligence and sense of dignity. I must say that it was very wise of the President to adjourn the meeting so as to let passions calm down.

39. I am taking the floor at this time because I wish to make it clear, so far as my own country is concerned, that we do not wish to associate ourselves with, and do not want to be a party to, any move which has the effect of lowering the prestige and dignity of the United Nations, from whatever quarter such a move may come.

40. The high office and the person of the Secretary-General have been attacked in the most virulent and destructive manner. The President of the Assembly himself and his office have been treated with scant regard and little consideration. The sanctity of the Assembly and the decorum of parliamentary usage and language are being deliberately violated. These are, to say the least, disturbing signs for the future and for the growth of the United Nations itself. We, the small countries, more than anyone else.

41. The PRESIDENT: I am sorry to interrupt the representative of Nepal, but I would remind him that the issue we are at present discussing is whether this question of the granting of independence to colonial countries should be discussed in plenary session or in the First Committee, and I would ask him to try to relate his remarks to that issue.

42. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal): I shall try to abide by the President's ruling and I shall come to the point immediately.

43. The small countries, more than anyone else, need the United Nations. The time has come for us to pause and to ask ourselves seriously, "Where is all this going to lead us?"

44. We do not subscribe to the view that all important items should be discussed in plenary session, or that the discussion of any matter in plenary session necessarily increases its importance. My delegation, like the delegation of Iraq, even now, after having listened to so many other speakers on the subject, feels that this matter could have been dealt with more usefully and profitably in the Fourth Committee, where it belongs, rather than in plenary session or in the First Committee. Since it has aroused so much passion here already and must have aroused also corresponding hopes and emotion in the minds of dependent peoples all over the world—engendered by the belief, right or wrong, that this matter will acquire a special significance if it is taken up in plenary meeting—we shall, for this reason and out of deference to the wishes of the new Members from Africa, vote for the discussion of this matter in plenary meeting.

45. The PRESIDENT: As I informed the Assembly a few minutes ago I now propose, while the President of the Republic of Guinea is still with us and in the spirit of the appeal which he made, to put the USSR amend-

ment [A/L.312/Rev.1] to the vote. If that proposal meets with the approval of the Assembly I would ask the Assembly to signify its acceptance of the Soviet amendment by acclamation.

The amendment was adopted by acclamation.

46. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of the Philippines in exercise of his right of reply.

47. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) (from the floor): A point of order.

48. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of India on a point of order.

49. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): After a long debate with the unanimous agreement of the Assembly, the President has put this question to the vote and it has been decided upon. I therefore submit with respect that the debate is closed and that accordingly there can be no right of reply with regard to anything that went on in the debate.

50. It is not my delegation's intention to prevent anyone from speaking, but the President used his authority to bring some order into this debate. I submit, therefore, that, the debate having been closed, there should be no further intervention with regard to it since the vote is over.

51. The PRESIDENT: The right of reply is a valuable right which is open at any time to any Member of the Assembly and the Chair is, for obvious reasons, extremely reluctant to establish any precedent which would tend to limit it. The representative of the Philippines has, however, heard what has just been said by the representative of India and will have gathered from the applause with which that appeal was greeted that the remarks of the representative of India have the support of a large number of delegations in the Assembly. In the light of those facts I would ask the representative of the Philippines to consider whether he wishes to insist on his right of reply. I would appeal to him not to do so but the decision is his.

52. Mr. SUMULONG (Philippines): My delegation and I are in full accord with restoring the dignity, calmness and decorum that should pervade the deliberations of the Assembly. That is why, although my delegation registered its request to exercise its right of reply before the voting took place, we did not insist on exercising that right before the amendment was put to the vote. We have abided by the request of the President, whose wisdom we respect to make our reply after the vote was taken. We are fully aware of our responsibility to this world Organization. We want the Organization to remain strong and united and respected, with its prestige undiminished all over the world. We would certainly be the last to take any step which would in any way undermine that prestige.

53. May I explain why my delegation requested the right of reply. I believe that if the representatives understand our reasons, they themselves, in our place, would have made a similar request. We do not want to exercise our right of reply for any trivial reason, but remarks were made from this rostrum yesterday which remain in the record, which were published in all the newspapers and which, I am sad to say, were not only unparliamentary and unkind, but certainly affected the honour of my country and the honour of my humble self. As I have said, we are all in favour

of restoring calm, moderation and sobriety to our deliberations. I am 100 per cent in favour of that, and I wish to say now that if those remarks to which we took exception could be stricken from the record, I would certainly be very happy to desist from making this reply. But yesterday, the head of the Soviet Union for whom as a person I should have a deep respect and for whom, as the Head of a great Power, I should have a high regard, saw fit to make the following statement:

"He is not a bad man. As he himself said, he and the entire Philippine people suffered for many years under the yoke of the Spaniards. Then the Americans took them over and they have just about received their independence, although God knows what kind of independence it is. You have to look at it very closely under a magnifying glass to see it." [902nd meeting, para. 222.]

54. How would you feel, gentlemen, if you were in the Philippine delegation's place and you heard those words? Again, the distinguished Soviet leader continued in this wise:

"The representative of the Philippines understands what colonialism is, what colonial oppression is. And it is clear that in the first part of his statement he was not speaking from his heart. What was speaking was that remnant, that thread, which still binds him, so to speak, to the master—the United States of America, which evidently must have tugged at that thread." [Ibid., para. 223.]

He was comparing me to a marionette which can be pulled up and down. How would you feel if you were in our place and heard that? He continued:

"But then, when he was stopped, he evidently thought to himself: Why the devil should I stick my neck out? The Americans themselves are not saying anything, but are hiding, and they have pushed me forward so that I should speak for them." [Ibid.]

55. The implication is very clear. It is that even after our independence was won, we were still a colony, recognizing another country as our master and that when I spoke here yesterday I was only obeying somebody who was pulling the strings. That is why I say that, as long as these remarks stay on the record I must reply. I think that no parliamentary assembly would allow those remarks to remain on the record. Modesty aside, my friends, I have been a member of our Congress for fifteen years. I am used to being the object of criticism and attack, but we always allow those who are attacked or criticized to reply, especially when the remarks are unparliamentary and unkind.

56. That is the reason why we requested this right of reply. We did not want to inject any bitterness and acrimony and, if there is acrimony and bitterness in our debates, I beg to say that my delegation and I are not to blame. We are acting here only in self-defence.

57. Of course, I was glad to hear the Soviet leader, Mr. Khrushchev, say that I am not a bad man. Well, evidently I am not a bad man when I favour the Soviet proposal to allocate the item entitled, "Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples" to plenary meeting. When I favour him, I am not a bad man, but when, as in my statement

yesterday, I gave a construction regarding that declaration for granting independence to all countries as meaning the independence not only of a few subject peoples, but of all subject peoples, regardless of the form of foreign domination and control to which they are subjected, that, apparently, was not to the liking of the Soviet leader, Mr. Khrushchev. Then he called me a "toady of American imperialism". When you agree with him, you are not a bad man; when you disagree with him, you become a toady.

58. I am certainly at a loss to understand Mr. Khrushchev's position on orderly procedure because it will be remembered that when I made reference yesterday to certain countries in Eastern Europe, Mr. Khrushchev said that I was out of order, that I was slandering Member States in this Assembly. But when he spoke after me, then he made the statement I have quoted, calling us, in effect, a colony of the United States. He saw nothing out of order in that, nor did he hesitate or see anything wrong when he called my humble person a "toady". The interpreters had difficulty in determining what he meant: "toady", "jerk", "lackey" or what-not. It is certainly very hard. I even find it hard to read the spelling of the Russian word for it.

59. I have no desire to compete with Mr. Khrushchev, because I come from a small country, from a humble country. We are not one of the great Powers. I have no desire to compete with Mr. Khrushchev in anything, not even in the use of the vocabulary of the gutter. I can even congratulate him on his mastery of that vocabulary. But I wish to say that if he wants to bark at "toadies", "lackeys", "jerks", and what-not, then I wish to say that he is barking up the wrong tree; he is barking up the wrong tree when he turns to my country and to me, and should turn his attention somewhere else.

60. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn its attention to the allocation of item 80, which is entitled, "Complaint of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics about a menace to world peace created by aggressive actions of the United States of America against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics". In this connexion, the Assembly has before it the report of the General Committee and the Soviet amendment [A/L.313/Rev.1] which proposed to allocate this item to plenary meeting instead of to the First Committee, as the General Committee recommended.

61. The discussion on this matter is now open, and as the first speaker I call on the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union.

62. Mr. KHRUSHCHEV, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (translated from Russian): Before beginning my statement on the item relating to the aggressive actions of the United States, on which the President has invited me to speak, I have a few words to say by way of reply. I, too, have the right of reply and would like to make use of it. Briefly, I wish to say that, as I have indicated before, the gentleman representing the Philippines is not, at bottom, a hopeless individual. There is a germ of sense in him which may take solid root. He will come to see things correctly and to make the appropriate inferences. But that will obviously take time. We have a proverb that says "Every vegetable has its season". Similarly, this gentleman is obvi-

ously in the process of maturation; I think he will mature and come to understand things properly.

63. The General Assembly has taken a decision to include in its agenda an item dealing with the menace to world peace created by aggressive actions of the United States of America against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This is not a routine item but an urgent issue resulting from actions which are incompatible with normal relations between States not at war.

64. As we all know, the United States authorities have sent their spy planes into the air space of the Soviet Union on more than one occasion. On 1 May 1960, the very eve of the conference of the Heads of Government of the four States in Paris, a United States U-2 spy plane penetrated far into our country and was shot down. Mr. Eisenhower, the President of the United States, far from apologizing to our country for this flagrant act of aggression, went so far as to declare that such flights were a matter of United States state policy. What is more, two months later another United States military aircraft, an RB-47, intruded into the territory of our country, and once again the brazen aggressor was shot down.

65. Such actions by the United States have a calamitous effect on the entire international situation and are fraught with the danger of untold disasters.

66. As I stated from this rostrum on 23 September [869th meeting], the Soviet Government considers it essential for the question of the aggressive actions of the United States of America against the Soviet Union to be discussed by the General Assembly directly in plenary meeting.

67. I would ask you to bear in mind that this is not a complaint by the Soviet Union. We are not complaining. The Soviet Union is strong enough to defend its national interests on a unilateral basis. We submit this question for the consideration of the General Assembly because the United States of America has arrogated to itself the right to act contrary to international law. The United States Government asserts that such spy flights, such aggressive intrusions, are necessary for the country's security. The United States takes these actions, we are told, because it is entitled to guarantee its security, entitled to violate the borders of other countries, without regard for international standards of conduct. Thus, the United States is seeking to impose lawlessness in international affairs. This is why the matter has assumed special significance. I repeat, this is not a dispute between two States, but a question of the right of States to independence and sovereignty, a question of the obligation of each State to respect the independence and sovereignty of other States.

68. The aggressive flights of United States aircraft violated the sovereignty not only of our State, but also of a number of other States. They violated the neutrality of Afghanistan, the sovereignty of neutral Austria, the sovereignty of Norway, Pakistan and Turkey. Indeed, when these States learned of the flight of the United States spy plane, they made an official protest to the United States. Austria also protested when its neutrality was violated. The Governments of these countries stated, in their protests, that the United States had not consulted them and had not asked permission to carry out spy flights over their territory.

69. Unless such actions by aggressors are brought to a complete and final stop, unless they are condemned, the impression may be given that the Assembly endorses actions of this kind by the United States of America, thereby apparently encouraging it to commit further aggressive actions. The Assembly would in that case be doing grave injury to international law, for the effect would be to sanction the right of every State to resort to similar methods. This in turn might lead to a situation where each State would be compelled to rely solely on itself, on its own strength, for the defence of its sovereignty. Every sober-minded person appreciates, however, that this may result in force being opposed by force, which in the long run means war. Each country may place its own interpretation on the incursion of aircraft; it may deem it to be a military attack and consequently counter it with a retaliatory blow.

70. If troops are sent into the territory of another country, or if aircraft are dispatched there on aggressive missions, this constitutes, in fact, a military incursion by one country into the confines of another, and this is precisely how we must interpret the facts with respect to the aggressive incursions by United States aircraft into the confines of the Soviet Union.

71. If one side takes it upon itself to start a war, the other side has a right to defend itself. It is compelled to protect its sovereignty, repulse the enemy invasion and to strike a retaliatory blow against the aggressor and against the bases from which he is launching the invasion.

72. It is to these aspects of the question that I should like to draw the attention of representatives.

73. I should like to express a wish on the part of the Soviet Government in connexion with the consideration of the question of aggressive flights by United States aircraft.

74. All conflicts between countries, even bloody wars, ultimately end with the conclusion of a peace treaty. Fortunately, we have never been at war with the United States, the sole exception being the aggression committed against us by the United States immediately after the October Revolution. At that time the United States sent its troops into our territory to aid the overthrown, effete régime of landlords and capitalists. But these troops were expelled from our soil by the young Red Army of the Soviet Union. Since then not only have there been no military clashes between us, but we even fought together in that most sanguinary of wars, the war against Nazi Germany, and were victorious in the common struggle.

75. Now, too, we are doing all in our power, and will continue to do so, to ensure not only peace between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States but also friendship between our peoples and our Governments. We consider this entirely feasible, provided that the other side also strives towards this objective. The Soviet Union and the United States are situated at a great distance from each other. Both have rich and highly developed economies. Both our countries possess everything they need to continue their development, each along its own lines, the lines chosen by the peoples of the Soviet Union and the people of the United States of America.

76. We realize that the discussion in the General Assembly of the question of the aggressive actions

committed against the Soviet Union by the United States of America is being used by certain circles to intensify the "cold war" atmosphere. The Soviet Government therefore wishes, for its part, to do everything possible to avoid creating further tension in Soviet-United States relations.

77. If the United States Government were to declare in the General Assembly that it regrets the aggressive acts committed against the Soviet Union and other countries, and if it were to give an assurance that the United States Government will henceforth adhere strictly to the rules of international law and respect the sovereignty of the Soviet Union and all other countries, we would regard this assurance as an acknowledgement by the United States that it was in the wrong in this matter and we would be satisfied. We could draw a line at that point and would not insist on discussion of the question. Thus the atmosphere would be cleared, world tension would be eased and we could achieve a speedier settlement of the questions on the agenda, especially the question of disarmament.

78. If, on the other hand, the United States Government is unwilling to display goodwill and will not condemn the practice of sending its spy planes into the Soviet Union and other countries, the United Nations must condemn such aggressive actions with the utmost severity, for what we are faced with here are totally unprecedented actions by one of the major Powers against other countries, actions which are fraught with the gravest consequences for world peace and the security of nations.

79. This policy of the United States must be condemned and brought to an end so that such provocative incidents may not lead the world to the brink of war. The aggressive United States flights constitute, indeed, a step beyond this brink. That is why we must not permit the most critical issues, which raise important questions of principle and on whose solution the fate of the world depends, to be pushed into the background, and why we must not allow the forum of the General Assembly to be used for chewing over the fare prepared for us by champions of the "cold war". This would bring real discredit upon the United Nations. The peoples who wish peace to be strengthened and the world situation improved would in that case pass stern judgement on what the United Nations is doing, and rightly so.

80. The Soviet Government does not want this to happen. It is anxious that the United Nations should justify the hopes of the peoples and act as an important instrument for peace and as a faithful guardian of the sovereign rights of States.

81. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America): The United States will vote against the Soviet amendment [A/L.313/Rev.1], which is an attempt to reverse the recommendation of the General Committee. As can be seen in paragraph 16 of the first report of the General Committee [A/4520], the Soviet proposal that its complaint be allocated to plenary consideration was defeated by a vote of 12 to 3. As a result of this decision, the General Committee has recommended that the complaint be allocated to the First Committee.

82. The Soviet complaint is built upon two incidents, both of which have been considered in detail by the Security Council. In both cases the Council found that the Soviet charges of so-called aggressive actions by the United States were groundless. I may here also

interpolate that the Soviet charges of American aggression immediately after the October Revolution are equally groundless.

83. Let me repeat that in both the cases upon which this item is brought before the Assembly, the Security Council found that Soviet charges of so-called aggressive actions by the United States were groundless. The first complaint, which was based on the flight of the U-2 aircraft, was considered by the Council at seven meetings held between 23 and 27 May 1960.^{1/} The Soviet Union has repeatedly alleged that reconnaissance flights over the Soviet Union continue to be the State policy of the United States. This is, of course, contrary to fact.

84. Let me repeat what President Eisenhower said in Paris on 16 May 1960:

"...these activities had no aggressive intent but rather were to assure the safety of the United States and the free world against surprise attack by a Power which boasts of its ability to devastate the United States and other countries by missiles armed with atomic warheads. As is well known, not only the United States but most other countries are constantly the targets of elaborate and persistent espionage of the Soviet Union.

"There is in the Soviet statement"—Mr. Eisenhower went on to say—"an evident misapprehension of one key point. It alleges that the United States has, through official statements, threatened continued overflights. The importance of this alleged threat was emphasized and repeated by Mr. Khrushchev. The United States has made no such threat. Neither I nor my Government has intended any. The actual statements go no further than to say that the United States will not shirk its responsibility to safeguard against surprise attack."

The President concluded:

"In point of fact, these flights were suspended after the recent incident and are not to be resumed. Accordingly, this cannot be the issue."

85. Let those who would blame the failure of the Summit Conference on this incident keep in mind that the Soviet propaganda build-up, which forecast a failure at the Summit and sought to place in advance the blame on the United States, started in Pravda and Izvestia, the two leading papers of the Soviet-controlled Press, long before the plane incident. All through March and April the United States was the target of a mounting barrage of scurrilous cartoons and articles in these two papers, which contrast with their omission of such material in the months preceding the Summit Conference of 1955. The significance of that fact, in a country where the Press is an integral instrument of government, is quite clear.

86. But let us return to the subject of this item. The outcome of the Security Council's consideration of this question is known to all United Nations Members. The Soviet Union draft resolution, which sought to condemn the United States for what the Soviet Union alleged were aggressive acts, was rejected by a vote of 7 to 2, with 2 abstentions.^{2/} It was supported by

only two Members of the Council—Poland and the Soviet Union.

87. The Security Council subsequently adopted a resolution at its 863rd meeting, on 27 May, which had been presented by Argentina, Ceylon, Ecuador and Tunisia. This resolution, for which all Members voted except the Soviet Union and Poland—which abstained—appealed to all Member Governments to refrain from the use or threats of force in their international relations. It also requested continued efforts to achieve a constructive solution of the question of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, and urged the Governments of France, the United Kingdom, the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to resume discussions as soon as possible.

88. Since that time the USSR walked out of the disarmament discussions in Geneva and brought down a United States plane over the high seas.

89. The second part of this complaint is built around the downing, on 1 July, of a United States RB-47 airplane over international waters. It is an attempt to shift the responsibility from the USSR, where it obviously belongs. This incident was considered between 22 and 26 July 1960 in four meetings of the Security Council.^{3/} There the United States presented a completely factual account of what happened to the RB-47. We showed that at the time the Soviets claimed to have shot down the RB-47 near the coast of the Soviet Union, it was in fact fifty miles from the coast of the Soviet Union and that twenty minutes later the RB-47 was at a point 200 miles away from the point where the Soviets claimed they downed it. These were the facts, and the Soviet Union never even attempted to refute them. The plane never—and I repeat, never—came within thirty miles of the Soviet coast.

90. Again, all Members know the outcome of the Security Council's consideration. The Soviet draft resolution, which sought again to condemn the United States for what it alleged were aggressive acts, was supported only by Poland and the Soviet Union.^{4/} It was opposed by all other members of the Council.

91. In order to be sure that no possible shred of doubt would persist about the facts of the case, the United States then proposed that there be an impartial investigation of the facts or a referral of the matter to the International Court of Justice for impartial adjudication. The Soviet Union vetoed this impartial investigation of the facts.^{4/} At the same meeting, the Soviet Union also vetoed a humanitarian resolution expressing the hope that the International Committee of the Red Cross be permitted to fulfil humanitarian tasks with respect to the surviving members of the crew. And to this day the Soviet Union has not allowed any outside agency or Government to have any contact with the surviving crew members.

92. In spite of the false charges which have already been exposed in the United Nations, the United States, in keeping with our usual practice of favouring full debate of accusations against us, has supported the inclusion of this item. In our view, the recent stand taken by the Soviet Union in the Security Council, where it vetoed an impartial investigation of its charges

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Fifteenth Year, 857th-863rd meetings.

^{2/} Ibid., 860th meeting.

^{3/} Ibid., 880th-883rd meetings.

^{4/} Ibid., 883rd meeting.

against us, makes it all the more desirable—in fact, all the more necessary—for the full facts to be brought out clearly in the First Committee.

93. This is not a general appeal about a general subject; it is a complaint based upon two specific incidents. Therefore, we think that the recommendation of the General Committee is right, and we will vote against the Soviet proposal to take it up in plenary.

94. The PRESIDENT: The Chair would like to take this opportunity to remind delegations that the question before it is a purely procedural one—the question, namely, whether item 80 should be discussed and decided in plenary meetings or in the First Committee. Discussions of the merits or the substance of the item are therefore only in order to the extent to which they bear directly on the procedural question, which the Assembly is now dealing with.

95. Mr. DAVID (Czechoslovakia) (translated from Russian): The Czechoslovak delegation associates itself with the view that, in the existing circumstances, the repeated aggressive actions of United States military aircraft against the Soviet Union, which have involved a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the USSR, constitute a grave danger to world peace.

96. We decidedly cannot agree that the question of aggressive actions by the United States of America constituting a threat to world peace should be relegated to the background. On the contrary, it is essential that special attention should be focused on this question and that, in view of its importance, it should be examined directly by the General Assembly in plenary meeting.

97. The facts which the General Assembly has before it are a matter of common knowledge. After a United States U-2 aircraft was shot down deep inside the territory of the Soviet Union on 1 May 1960, the Government of the USSR submitted irrefutable evidence that it had been engaged in an espionage mission, with the result that the official statements of United States authorities to the effect that a civilian aircraft was involved and that only a technical error had led it to violate the borders of the USSR collapsed like a house of cards. The Government of the United States thereupon cynically proclaimed that actions constituting a flagrant violation of the fundamental rules of international law applicable to relations among States in peacetime represented its official policy.

98. The case of the shooting down of the United States military RB-47 aircraft, which, despite emphatic warnings by the Government of the USSR, committed a second violation of the territorial sovereignty of the Soviet Union on 1 July 1960, showed that the statements made by the United States Government and by President Eisenhower personally that aggressive and provocative flights by United States military aircraft against the USSR had been discontinued were false and were intended merely to put the peoples off their guard.

99. The United States Government is resorting to all sorts of fabrications in its efforts to escape responsibility for the provocative RB-47 flight. The statement by the United States representative which we have just heard is another example. But what value can be attached to these assertions by spokesmen for the United States? Suffice it to recall once more the state-

ments published by official United States agencies after the announcement that the U-2 aircraft had been shot down, statements which turned out to be false from start to finish, to demonstrate that these assertions are intended to deceive world public opinion.

100. The aggressive actions carried out on orders from the United States Government have shown what a threat to the peace and security of peoples the reckless policy of the Pentagon entails. Yet the United States Government hypocritically accuses the Soviet Union of creating a tense international situation.

101. Everyone knows that, by dispatching the U-2 aircraft, the United States caused the breakdown of the Summit Conference. That fact was recognized, incidentally, even by the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate. Yet the United States Government tries to put the blame for the breakdown of the Conference on the Soviet Union.

102. It is characteristic that, in its statements, the United States Government frequently reverts to the stories it put out in connexion with the RB-47 incident but carefully avoids any reference to the shooting down of the U-2 aircraft. We need but glance at President Eisenhower's latest statement. In his address to the General Assembly [868th meeting] he said not a word about the U-2 aircraft. Similarly, in the letter he wrote a few days ago to the Heads of State of five neutral States, he deliberately made no mention of the reason for the current deterioration of relations between the United States and the USSR, namely, the U-2 incident and the cynical statement that it is the official policy of the United States to order espionage flights. This practice of concealing the true state of affairs is apparently the main reason why the United States Government is trying to keep the question before us from being discussed directly by the General Assembly in plenary meeting.

103. The Czechoslovak delegation categorically opposes these manoeuvres. The General Assembly at the present session has a grave responsibility to the peoples of the entire world to discuss this question and resolutely condemn aggressive actions by the United States which constitute a flagrant violation of the fundamental principles underlying the very existence and activities of the United Nations. We therefore consider that in view of its exceptional importance, the question of aggressive actions by the United States of America and the danger to world peace which they entail should appropriately be given full and thorough consideration by the General Assembly in plenary meeting.

104. It would be a dangerous error to suppose that this important question concerns only relations between the USSR and the United States. The aggressive actions of United States military aircraft directly affect the sovereign rights and the security of all countries. Is it not a well-known fact that in the course of those flights the sovereignty of a number of States is systematically violated, as was the case with the U-2 flights?

105. The aggressive actions of the United States military aircraft, which entail flagrant violations of the fundamental principles of peaceful coexistence and co-operation among States, including the principles of State sovereignty, non-intervention in the domestic

affairs of States and, above all, the principle of peaceful coexistence and the prohibition of aggressive measures against other States—these actions are entirely incompatible with the obligations which the Government of the United States has assumed under the Charter. The effect of the provocative actions of the United States is to keep the peoples of the entire world under a continual threat of military conflict. If the United Nations is truly to defend the cause of peace, it must resolutely oppose the policy of lawlessness and aggression pursued by the United States in its international relations.

106. The aggressive and provocative actions of the United States are also directed against the security and territorial integrity of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. Despite the fact that the United States Government has undertaken not to repeat such actions, there are many cases of flights by United States military aircraft over the sovereign territory of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, flights which are clearly of an aggressive character. There has been a whole series of such flights during the current year. The Czechoslovak delegation will deal with these actions in greater detail when this item is under consideration.

107. The delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic expects the General Assembly to discharge

the responsibility which the Charter has entrusted to it as one of the principle organs of the United Nations responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security and to condemn the aggressive actions of the United States. It is convinced that decisive action by the General Assembly against the dangerous attempts of the United States Government to apply lawlessness and force rather than the principles of law and justice in the conduct of relations among States will do much to further the struggle of the peoples for world peace and security.

108. Mindful of the grave consequences for world peace which would inevitably flow from a continuation of the aggressive actions of the United States against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the Czechoslovak delegation fully supports the USSR amendment that the item "Complaint of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics about a menace to world peace created by aggressive actions of the United States of America against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" should be examined by the General Assembly in plenary meeting. That forum is the most suitable place in which to discuss such an important question, a question which directly affects the vital interests of the peace-loving peoples of the entire world.

The meeting rose at 1.00 p.m.