

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



**904th
PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 13 October 1960,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 8:</i>	
Adoption of the agenda (<i>continued</i>)	
First report of the General Committee (<i>concluded</i>)	701
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	
Speech by Mr. Souvanlasy (Laos)	709
Speech by Mr. Okala (Cameroun)	711
Statement by the representative of Cuba . . .	718
Statement by the representative of Nepal . .	721

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

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda (*continued*)

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

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will continue the discussion on the allocation of the item 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".
2. I call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Poland.
3. Mr. RAPACKI (Poland) (translated from French): I appreciate the extremely difficult situation in which the United States delegation is placed, and I shall not engage in polemics with respect to the arguments which, for lack of others, that delegation felt obliged to put forward this morning from this rostrum [903rd meeting].
4. I propose to address myself to the subject before us. In attempting to decide which questions are to be considered in plenary meetings and which are to be considered by Committees, the only provision we have to guide us is paragraph 23 of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Methods and Procedures, which I quoted the day before yesterday [900th meeting, para.142]. These recommendations imply—and this is a matter of common sense—that the General Assembly meeting in plenary should examine those questions which are particularly important and urgent. We have just such an important and urgent question before us in the problem of the menace to world peace resulting from aggressive actions on the part of the United States against the Soviet Union. What is more, this is a question in which the facts are unassailable and the legal issues perfectly clear. It involves extremely serious violations of the territorial sovereignty of other States by military aircraft and, far worse, a doctrine officially proclaimed by the Government of

a great Power—the United States—that such actions represent a normal form of behaviour towards other States, in the case in point, towards another great Power—the Soviet Union.

5. There is no need for the General Assembly to have recourse to Committees, for it is self-evident that such a policy implies contempt for international law, undermines the foundations of peaceful relations among States, and creates a direct threat to peace, security and national sovereignty. Everyone knows the effect this policy has already had on the international situation. It made it impossible to hold the Summit Conference, which was to have paved the way to a new relaxation of tension, and it led to a very serious crisis in international relations.

6. Nor is there any need for the General Assembly to adopt a complicated procedure in order to obtain a sufficiently clear understanding of the incalculable consequences which such a policy might have in the future. It is obvious that no State can be content to look on passively while foreign aircraft fly over its territory, undoubtedly engaging in espionage and capable of releasing a nuclear charge at any moment. Sooner or later, a strong reaction is bound to occur. The resulting chain reaction might lead the world to disaster.

7. In the face of such grave dangers, it is essential that the General Assembly should express its views with the greatest possible authority through its supreme body, that is to say, in its plenary meetings. It is also essential that it should express its views as soon as possible, without wasting time on an unnecessary procedure. Any signs of indecision or condonation on the part of the United Nations with regard to the doctrine or the practice of flights over the territory of other nations can only encourage all those with a predilection for such methods in international relations to commit further actions of a provocative nature, actions whose consequences may prove incalculable.

8. The firm attitude adopted by the Soviet Government, an attitude which the Polish Government endorses, has halted the chain reaction set off by United States military circles. The danger nevertheless remains great. Despite the statement made by the President of the United States at Paris regarding the suspension of such flights, and despite the Security Council resolution of 27 May 1960^{1/} appealing to all countries to respect each other's sovereignty, a new violation of the territory of the Soviet Union by the RB-47, a United States military aircraft, took place on 1 July.

9. We heard denials and even counter-accusations from the United States. But I would remind the Assembly that, on 25 May 1960, there was also a

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Fifteenth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1960, document S/4328.

pronouncement by the United States with reference to the Summit Conference, which expressed the view that, in such cases, it is preferable merely to issue a "covering statement", at least until there has been an "exposure". The United States Government, to this day, has not definitely renounced the doctrine of flights over foreign territory. Even today, in spite of the opportunity offered him by the Soviet Premier, the United States representative did not repudiate this doctrine, but contented himself with a futile attempt to vindicate it. There is therefore no guarantee that such incidents, fraught as they are with the gravest dangers, will not be repeated.

10. We must not, then, waste time referring this question from the plenary to a Committee and then back again. It should be included in the agenda of the plenary meetings of the General Assembly, as proposed in the amendment submitted by the Soviet Union [A/L.313/Rev.1].

11. The PRESIDENT: There being no further speakers in the general discussion, I call on the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union in exercise of the right of reply.

12. Mr. KHRUSHCHEV, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (translated from Russian): I should like to make use of the right of reply which is available to every representative in order to answer the statement made by the United States representative.

13. The United States representative said that he intended to defend the interests of the United Nations. He apparently regards the United Nations and the United States of America as practically one and the same, and considers this Assembly a branch of the State Department. However, this branch has begun to assert its independence. The United States representative stated that his country had not committed aggression against the Soviet Union immediately after the October Revolution. I wish to bring something to his attention. He seems to have overlooked the memoirs of General William S. Graves, who had commanded the United States army that landed in Siberia. The General gave his memoirs a very striking title: he seemed to have understood what he had done. He called his story of the United States intervention "America's Siberian Adventure". He had been in Siberia and had been evicted by the Red Army and the Siberian partisans. By the way, the United States General's book is a fairly truthful account. The United States representative should read it; he might find the information helpful in the future. It is very useful to do some reading occasionally! And I recommend to the United States representative, not Bolshevik propaganda, but the memoirs of one of his own generals.

14. I should like now to turn to another matter. The Security Council decided twice that the Soviet complaints about aggressive actions of the United States against the Soviet Union were unfounded. It is precisely because, unfortunately, the Security Council so decided that we have brought the question of these aggressive actions before the General Assembly. What else was there for us to do?

15. The United States representatives pretend to be innocent as a maiden. But this maiden has given birth—not just once, but twice, and she even contrives to do it every two months—in May and again in July. They continue to maintain that in this case the United

States is an innocent maiden who has no children. But the whole world knows that the U-2 was born in May and the RB-47 in July.

16. What are we to think of the Security Council if it will not condemn manifest and blatant aggression? It will not command respect, from anybody. Forgive my frankness, but if the Security Council acts in this way it cannot but become an object of contempt.

17. The Security Council must stand guard over peace and prevent war. But what did the Security Council do, when Mr. Herter, the United States Secretary of State, the United States President himself, and the whole world, including the United States, acknowledged that the United States spy aeroplane was sent into the airspace of the Soviet Union? The Security Council took its decision as though there had been no aggressive flights.

18. It is true that at first the United States lied about the espionage mission of the aeroplane. But we knew the people we were dealing with. Consequently, when the aeroplane was brought down, the Soviet Government decided to issue a vague statement, so that the United States of America would not learn where the aeroplane had been brought down and what had happened to the pilot, and would not know that we had material evidence. We believed that the fish would take our bait. And our assumptions were justified. The United States declared that the aeroplane had not flown over the Soviet Union, but had taken off on a reconnaissance mission. It had flown over Turkey, a weather station had received a report from the pilot that he was having difficulties with his oxygen equipment, and the pilot had subsequently lost consciousness. Then, according to the United States account, contact had been lost, and the pilot had apparently gone down over some lake in Turkey. We welcomed this pack of lies. You can imagine how pleased we were when our opponents exposed a vulnerable spot which we could strike at

19. We then announced that the United States version was a lie, that the spy aeroplane had been brought down over Sverdlovsk, and that the pilot, safe and sound, was in our hands. We added that we had the remains of the aeroplane and some of the instruments in other words, all the material evidence needed. What did the United States leaders say then? Mr. Herter asserted that the United States aeroplane had indeed flown over the Soviet Union, but that it had done so because the Soviet Union had many military secrets and the United States had to know the site of Russian missile bases for, if you please, security reasons! The President of the United States confirmed this statement and expressed approval of the act. Is this not a shocking affair, an unprecedented breach of faith? Can such actions really be permitted?

20. Incidentally, the aggressor aeroplane flew over the territory of Afghanistan in violation of its sovereignty, took off from Turkish territory, and flew in the air space of Pakistan. The pilot was to arrive in Norway and if anything went wrong, he was to land in Finland. Finland protested subsequently against the United States failure to ask its permission for the landing.

21. It is easy to imagine with what dangerous consequences such activities are fraught. Powers was of the pilot, and I believe that he is sincerely repentant he was tempted by high pay, and he failed miserably. Anybody who worships the golden calf, who sells his

self for money, is bound to fail in the end. When Powers was asked in court whether, if he had had an atomic bomb on board his aeroplane he would have pressed the button releasing it, he admitted that he had been told to press a button at a particular place, and had done so. And when he was asked again whether he would have pressed the button if it released an atomic bomb, he replied in the affirmative. It is obvious what would have happened in that case. It would have been the beginning of a war—worse, war itself.

22. We are all mature and responsible people here. I should like to stress that we are not raising this question to humiliate the United States of America. It is not our desire to humiliate the United States, nor was it when the aeroplane was brought down. You will recall that at that time I said that the President of the United States probably had not known about this flight. I made this statement, which was contrary to my own belief, out of respect for the President: I wanted to make it easier for him to extricate himself from the mess he was in. But he let himself be carried away into saying that he had known about the flight and had approved it, that it had been made in the interests of the security of the United States, and that such flights would be continued.

23. What are we to do? We brought down that aeroplane; we shall bring down all such aeroplanes that may be sent over our territory, and we shall strike at the bases from which these aggressor aeroplanes are sent over our country. We have no alternative. Unfortunately, under-developed countries and colonies cannot do the same because they do not have the means. But we are well able to defend our fatherland, to protect the inviolability of our frontiers and to resist any aggressor.

24. Does the United States want a war? Is it trying to provoke one? In any event, no threat frightens us. If the United States starts a war, we will have no choice but to retaliate. Every country has the right to defend itself and to retaliate if it is attacked. But we want the United Nations to condemn such acts, not only as a violation of the sovereign rights of our State in particular but also as a violation of international law in general. The United States of America has declared that it is its right and its official policy to make spy flights over the territories of other States. What are we to do? Are we to give in, or to combat such flights?

25. If the General Assembly does not display understanding of the full gravity of this issue, if it adopts the same attitude as the Security Council, we shall be unable to respect its decision and shall have to rely on our strength. For we have strength, as the world knows. We warn the Pentagon and the United States aggressors not to create provocations, for we shall not hesitate to retaliate.

26. The United States representative said here that the President of the United States had stated at Paris that these flights were not to be resumed. Note these words carefully. It would seem that they were doing us an extraordinary favour. He did not say either that there had been such flights or that there had not been any. He said that the flights were not to be resumed. But, by that statement, he admitted that such flights had taken place.

27. What do we want now? We want the President to say that the United States of America has acted improperly. We want the United States Government to admit that it has acted improperly. We want the United States Government to admit that it has acted improperly and to give assurances that it will not do so again. Instead, the United States representatives say now that there will be no further flights; but a short time ago, they ordered these flights and maintained that they had a right to do so. Furthermore, the President has already said that he has cancelled the flights for the duration of his occupancy of the White House. But this means that, when a new President is elected, the United States will resume these aggressive flights, if it so wishes. The new President may announce that it was Mr. Eisenhower who stopped the flights and that he is not bound to carry out his predecessor's promises. How can we be expected to put up with such arbitrary decisions?

28. Furthermore, it is well known that the President did not tell the truth. After his Paris statement about the cessation of the flights, approximately two months after the flight of the U-2 spy aeroplane, a military RB-47 aircraft was sent over USSR territory. We brought it down. Before I left to attend this General Assembly session, we learned that the United States intended to send a new aeroplane over the Soviet Union, flying at an altitude of 25,000 metres. I told the United States Ambassador in Moscow that we had learned about the plans for this flight. The Ambassador was warned that we were ready for it. I told him that if the United States wanted to test our anti-aircraft rocket technique, and our ability to shoot down planes at 25,000 metres, we were prepared to demonstrate what we could do. The United States authorities cancelled the flight. But provocations still continue.

29. It was recently announced that the NATO Powers would carry out military manoeuvres in the Black Sea, near the shores and frontiers of the Soviet Union. When Marshal Malinovsky, the Minister of Defence, asked me what to do, I said to him: "You are the Minister of Defence, what do you propose?" He replied: "I propose that we should put our armed forces and missiles in combat readiness, place everything on the alert, and arm our rockets with warheads." I replied that the measures he proposed were wise, since we did not know whether the NATO Powers were engaging in military manoeuvres or in preparations for war. So here I am in the United States, and our defences have been placed in combat readiness.

30. What have our United States hosts been doing? When I was on the way to New York on the steamship "Baltika", United States aeroplanes flew over the ship. Moreover, two days out of New York, I noticed that a submarine was following in the wake of the ship. It is not difficult to guess whose submarine it was. As to whether or not we identified the submarine, I should point out that my eyesight is good; I happen to be farsighted. At first I looked through binoculars, then I laid them aside and saw the submarine. I had no difficulty in identifying it, because we are familiar with this engine of war. We also have submarines, and quite good ones.

31. Why did the United States commit this further provocation? Does it want to frighten us? We are not easily frightened. Did it mean to sink the ship on which I was travelling? But if I go to the bottom, I will drag it after me, and I hope this is clear.

32. On 1 July the RB-47 was on an espionage mission, and we brought it down. The United States representative said in his statement before the Assembly that this aeroplane was brought down some distance from our borders. It should be noted that the United States authorities have given different figures for this distance.

33. This reminds me of a story. When Shamil was captured by Russian forces, the commanding general sent the officer who had actually made the capture to the tsar to make a personal report. I might remark that some military men have been known to exaggerate their deeds of valour. That was what happened in this instance. The officer described his exploit in taking Shamil prisoner in the most glowing terms. He told the tsar how cleverly he had acted, how bravely he had attacked. But the general, knowing his weakness, had sent another officer along and had told him if the first officer got carried away to tug at his coat. Accordingly, after the first officer had told too many lies, the other officer tugged at his coat. The first officer went on lying. The other officer tugged at his coat again. The first officer then said indignantly, "What are you tugging for? You were not there, and I was!" The United States representative is in a similar position now: he is bent on telling lies and he claims he is not lying. But I too can tug at his coat and say: we brought down the United States RB-47, and our fighter aircraft brought it down into the territorial waters of the Soviet Union.

34. Now the United States wants to refer the matter to international arbitration, in other words, to an arbitral tribunal. The Security Council discussed this question twice and, figuratively speaking, it reached the conclusion that a woman who had had two children was a virgin. How could we accept the judgement of such a court?

35. The responsibility for the defence of our country's sovereignty does not rest with an international court but with our armed forces and our Minister of Defence. If an enemy invades our territory, we must defeat and repulse him. That is how a proper court—the court of the Soviet people—operates. There can be no other court for aggressors.

36. The United States representative said that I was wrong when I stated that the U-2 incident was the reason for the break-up of the four-Power Summit Conference, and that even before the Conference the newspapers *Pravda* and *Izvestia* had sharply attacked the United States of America. He said also that these newspapers did not reflect public opinion. All I can say to that is, "Look who is talking!" Our Press represents the people, whereas the United States Press represents a small group of capitalists. In the United States, those who have money own the newspapers. The editor who did not write what the monopolist wanted would be summarily dismissed. The United States representative knows this full well.

37. I should now like to answer the substance of the United States representative's statement. It is true that our newspapers were sharply critical, but not of the United States of America. They were critical of statements made by Mr. Dillon, Mr. Herter and the Vice-President of the United States. I will not call the Vice-President by name, so as not to interfere in the United States presidential election campaign. These United States leaders had made impertinent state-

ments. We rebuffed them. All this happened before the U-2 flights over the Soviet Union.

38. So that the members of the Assembly may understand more clearly what these statements were, this is how they were appraised by the President of the United States of America. At a press conference, in answer to a question from a news correspondent whether or not he knew of these statements by Mr. Dillon, Mr. Herter and the Vice-President, the President of the United States declared that he did and that he fully agreed with these statements. Consequently, they reflected not simply the viewpoint of Mr. Dillon, Mr. Herter or the Vice-President, but also the policy of the President and the Government of the United States of America.

39. Thus, the President of the United States of America, the Pentagon and the State Department laid the groundwork for the break-up of the Summit Conference. It then occurred to them that Mr. Khrushchev might not react as expected, and so they decided to resort to stronger measures. On 9 April they sent a spy aeroplane into the Soviet Union. We saw it fly over our territory, but our anti-aircraft gunners did not bring it down, and those responsible for the failure to do so were severely punished. Soldiers must always be on the alert; they must not be caught napping. We told them that if they made the same mistake again, they would be punished still more severely. The United States leaders, however, thought that since the aeroplane they sent on 9 April was not brought down they should repeat the provocation. They sent the second aeroplane on 1 May. But this time our anti-aircraft gunners, seeking to atone for their previous mistake, brought the aeroplane down. We thanked them for doing so and revoked the sentence against them. That is an account of the facts in the order in which they occurred.

40. They may criticize me in the Pentagon, but I think that the President allowed himself to be led by the military men. He himself did not want to exacerbate relations with us. Although his term of office was soon to end, I did not refuse to meet him. But I know that such a meeting would not have been very fruitful. Nevertheless, I should like to give him his due as a man...

41. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America) (from the floor): Point of order.

42. The PRESIDENT: I would ask the Chairman of the Council of Ministers to be good enough to stand aside just one moment while the Chair deals with a point of order which has been raised from the floor.

43. Mr. KHRUSHCHEV, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (translated from Russian): I will stand aside even further.

44. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of the United States on a point of order.

45. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America): I am glad that the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has stayed so close by so that he can hear what I have to say. He has, for the past ten or twelve minutes, been speaking completely out of order, as far as I can make out, but in the past several moments he has started talking in a personal vein about the Chief of my Government and

my Chief of State. I believe that to be totally out of order, and I would like to have it stopped.

46. Of course, I am going to ask for a right of reply after Mr. Khrushchev is through with his statement, but in the meantime, I sincerely trust that he will so conduct himself as to be in consonance with the dignity of the Assembly.

47. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly heard the statement made by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers. He was dealing with a controversial subject and in the course of it he referred to statements made and actions taken by the President of the United States. I must say, however, that I did not understand the Chairman of the Council of Ministers to make any remarks about the President of the United States which could be considered offensive remarks of a personal character. I would ask the Chairman to proceed.

48. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America) (from the floor): Point of order.

49. Mr. KHRUSHCHEV, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (translated from Russian): I am quite satisfied, Mr. President. I did not say anything offensive with regard to the President of the United States, nor did I intend to do so.

50. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America) (from the floor): Point of order.

51. The PRESIDENT: I am sorry to interrupt the Chairman of the Council of Ministers again, but the representative of the United States has again asked for the floor on a point of order. I would be grateful if the Chairman would kindly stand aside while I deal with it.

52. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America): Mr. President, my understanding of your remarks was that you had not heard anything that was specifically derogatory to the President of the United States. Perhaps in the translation which I heard through my earphone there was some mistake, but my impression was that the Soviet representative characterized the President of the United States as having been on a leash as far as the military circles of the United States are concerned. If that is not derogatory, I do not know what is.

53. The PRESIDENT: The Chair did not understand that remark to be intended to be offensive. I understood the remark as being intended to mean that others bore the responsibility, apart from the President of the United States, but I do not think that that remark comes within the category of what I have referred to in previous rulings as offensive remarks of a personal nature. I would ask the Chairman kindly to continue.

54. Mr. KHRUSHCHEV, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, (translated from Russian): I was just thinking that if it is considered that I said something insulting about the President perhaps I should resort to pantomime. I could make a speech without words showing the aircraft in flight and then utter some sound which would give an idea of how it was shot down.

55. I should like to tell the United States representative the following story. Two passengers were riding on a train. This was in Russia, after the revolution of 1905. The passengers were talking to each other. They were travelling in a third-class carriage and

there were people sitting opposite, listening to their conversation. One of the passengers said to the other: "The Czar is a fool!" A "gendarme" who was sitting in another part of the carriage heard the remark, came over and asked, "Who said the Czar is a fool?" The passenger answered: "I said so, sir." The "gendarme" was indignant. "How dare you say that our Czar is a fool!" "Excuse me", answered the passenger, "I said that the German Czar is a fool." "I know my own Czar", shouted the "gendarme", "if it is a fool you're talking about, then it is our Czar!" I need make no further comment on that score.

56. In my statement at the morning meeting I said that we should have done with this business and have done with it in a friendly spirit. Of course, when you have a bad thing to begin with it is hard to end it pleasantly. But what can we do—the spinster has given birth to a baby and the fact of the birth has been registered. Something has to be done. A legitimate question arises: Who is the father of this baby, and is he going to assume responsibility for it, or isn't he?

57. We want the United States of America to acknowledge that it has committed aggressive acts. Let it find the proper formula, but let it acknowledge that it has committed an act which cannot be condoned in time of peace when States maintain normal relations with each other, and let it give assurances that it will not do it again. If the United States representative would make such a statement, nothing more would have to be said. We would accept it and that would be the end of the matter.

58. But the United States insists on its right to make such flights. That being the case, we firmly insist on our right to demand that such flights should be condemned as acts of aggression. This is not just a dispute between States. This is a case where international law has been violated. If in the future United States aircraft keep on making incursions into our territory and we are obliged to shoot them down, then the tragic hour will strike when the peoples will awaken to a thermo nuclear war. Can you not see where such a policy will lead? That is why we are so passionately opposed to this brazen policy of aggression.

59. It is not for ourselves that we insist on being given satisfaction but for the sake of the peoples, which are indignant at this perfidious policy and which are demanding assurances that provocations which may lead to war will not be permitted. Only in those circumstances can measures be taken in future to exclude the possibility of war from international life.

60. How is it possible to conduct negotiations on disarmament when one of the great Powers is organizing provocative flights over the territory of another great Power? What would be the value of such negotiations?

61. I do not wish to boast of our armaments but neither do I wish to be unduly modest. We are not limited to protesting against aggression, as are certain other States which have no means of defence; we have the most powerful weapons with which to defend ourselves against aggression. If the right of the United States to carry out provocative flights is to be recognized, then our right resolutely to condemn aggression must be recognized also. Unless this is done, we ourselves shall exercise that right, for it is the right of every State to defend its territory and its sovereignty.

62. Today I am leaving for my own country. Although I am not a Negro, I sincerely rejoice with those who were once bound by the fetters of colonial slavery at our unanimous decision to discuss the question of the liquidation of the colonial system in plenary meetings of the General Assembly. I rejoice with them, and our joy is shared by all decent people throughout the world.

63. Today I should like to make a statement on the question of disarmament and to submit proposals relating thereto. Here are our proposals and this is our position:

"The General Assembly,

"Recognizing that, in conditions in which modern weapons are of infinite destructive power and range, the continuing arms race is fraught with tremendous danger for the peoples of all countries,

"Convinced that in the face of the danger of nuclear-rocket war the problem of general and complete disarmament is the most important question of our time and requires immediate solution.

"Reaffirming General Assembly resolution 1378 (XIV) of 20 November 1959 on general and complete disarmament,

"Noting with regret that the said resolution has not been carried out and that appropriate measures to put it into effect have not yet been taken,

"Again calls upon Governments to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament and recommends that a treaty on such disarmament should be drawn up and concluded as quickly as possible on the basis of the following principles:

"General and complete disarmament shall include the disbanding of all armed forces, the destruction of all armaments, the cessation of war production, the liquidation of all foreign bases in the territory of other States, the prohibition of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological and rocket weapons, the cessation of the manufacture of such weapons, the destruction of stockpiles of such weapons and of all means of delivering them, the abolition of agencies and institutions intended for the organization of military affairs in States, the prohibition of military training and the discontinuance of the expenditure of funds for military purposes;

"General and complete disarmament shall be carried out in an agreed sequence, by stages and within a specified period;

"The disarmament measures relating to nuclear weapons and conventional armaments shall be so balanced that no one State or group of States can obtain a military advantage and that security is ensured for all in equal measure;

"The measures provided for in the programme of general and complete disarmament shall be carried out from beginning to end under international control, the scope of which shall correspond to the scope and nature of the disarmament measures implemented at each stage. To carry out control over and inspection of disarmament an international control organization shall be established under the United Nations with all States participating;

"Under conditions of general and complete disarmament the necessary measures shall be adopted,

in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security, including an undertaking by States to make available to the Security Council, where necessary, units from the contingents of police (militia) retained by States for maintaining internal order and ensuring the personal security of citizens;

"In order to create confidence in the correct use of international armed forces of police (militia) and to preclude the possibility of their use in the interests of a particular State or group of States,

"Recognizes that it is necessary to change the structure of the United Nations Secretariat and of the Security Council so that all three groups of States—the socialist countries, the countries members of the Western Powers' blocs, and the neutralist countries—may be represented in those organs on a basis of equality;

"Transmits to the Disarmament Committee for examination the proposal of the Soviet Government concerning "Basic provisions of a treaty on general and complete disarmament" [A/4505] and other proposals on this question with a view to the drafting of a treaty on general and complete disarmament, including a system of international control and inspection which shall ensure strict compliance with the treaty." 2/

64. We are ready to stop making speeches. Our position and our proposals are clear; let us discuss them point by point. Let us draw up a resolution which will satisfy all who are concerned with the question of disarmament, but on one condition: let us disarm, rather than advocate the establishment of disarmament controls. We shall not participate in the elaboration of a system of disarmament controls without disarmament.

65. There you have our specific proposals. But if the idea embodied in these proposals is not accepted in the First Committee, or if it becomes apparent that the Western Powers are procrastinating, we shall not participate in the First Committee's deliberations on the question of disarmament. In those circumstances we shall not participate in the work of either the ten-nation committee or the fifteen-nation committee. If on the other hand the Western Powers show a spirit of good will we shall gladly study and make use of all the proposals submitted, so that a resolution aimed at ensuring general and complete disarmament under the strictest international control can be worked out.

66. Mr. ORMSBY-GORE (United Kingdom) (from the floor): A point of order.

67. The PRESIDENT: I am sorry to have to interrupt the Chairman of the Council of Ministers again, but the United Kingdom has asked for the floor on a point of order. I now call on the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

68. Mr. ORMSBY-GORE (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I thought I should raise this point of order with you. I understood that this afternoon we were discussing the allocation of agenda items and that at the present time we were deciding whether or not an item requested for inclusion by the Soviet Union should be discussed in plenary or in the First Committee.

2/ Subsequently circulated as document A/C.1/249.

69. I did not raise the point of order earlier because the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union started to read out a set of new proposals or principles with regard to disarmament, and I felt that all of us here were deeply interested in that subject and that it would be wrong to interrupt him before we had heard what those latest proposals were. But I do submit that for him further to elaborate on the question of the stand that the Soviet Union takes with regard to disarmament in the course of this debate, which is simply on the allocation of an agenda item, is totally out of order.

70. The PRESIDENT: Strictly speaking, the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom is quite right. I have allowed myself considerable latitude of judgement on this matter. As representatives will remember, however, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, at the conclusion of his remarks about the allocation of item 80, asked my permission to make a statement on the eve of his departure from New York. At that time I might have consulted the Assembly, and it would perhaps have been better if I had done so. But in the very exceptional circumstances I felt that I would be justified in proceeding on the assumption that if I did consult the Assembly it would not refuse to give the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union a hearing. On that basis I have allowed him to proceed, and I gather that he is now coming to the end of his statement. I therefore ask him to proceed.

71. Mr. KHRUSHCHEV, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (translated from Russian): You are right, Mr. President, if this gentleman had not interrupted me I should have finished my statement.

72. I should like to point out how these traffickers in human blood and lives look at the matter. They are preoccupied with the formal aspects of the question, and the fact that the threat of a catastrophic thermo-nuclear war hangs over mankind does not perturb them. That is how little conscience they have! Mankind will remember the names of these imperialists. It is true that they will not be called to account for it, since if war does break out they will most certainly cease to exist—England, which in the West is often called an unsinkable aircraft carrier, will cease to exist on the very first day of such a war. One need only visualize what a nuclear war would be like to realize that everything possible must be done to ensure that it does not take place.

73. The gentleman who represents the United Kingdom here apparently has no understanding of that problem. Presumably experience will teach its lesson, if not to him, then to someone else. He will be replaced by others, who will understand the necessity of securing lasting peace and of disarmament, for peace can be secured only by means of disarmament. There can be no lasting peace if armaments are retained, if they are merely controlled, for in that case any country can, if it wishes, make use of its armaments, no matter what kind of control has been imposed. I think that should be clear to everyone.

74. I should like to ask the Assembly to bear with me a little longer so that I may revert once again to the question of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. I am not making war on Mr. Hammarskjöld personally. I have met him and we have had very

pleasant conversations. I consider that Mr. Hammarskjöld is in my debt, because he exploited me, when he was our guest on the Black Sea. I took him around in a row-boat and he has not paid off that debt; he has not done the same for me.

75. This is not a question of personalities. The point is that I am a Communist and he is a representative of big capital. What capital he actually has in his pocket is immaterial, for it is a well-known fact that it is often easier to come to terms with a capitalist than with his servant. Mr. Hammarskjöld represents the interests of a certain group of States and he is serving them well, as is demonstrated by his actions in the Congo. He acted there in the interests of those who assigned him that task. They will reward him for it in the way in which they are so well able to reward those who work for the colonialists.

76. Let us suppose that we reach an agreement on disarmament and establish an international armed force. Can we really allow that force to be under the control of a single person, who represents the interests of a group of imperialistic States? No, certainly not. I should like to be understood correctly—I am not asking for privileges for the socialist countries, but I do not want the group of States comprising the imperialist camp, the camp of big monopoly capital, to have privileges, for they are using the machinery of the United Nations Secretariat in their own interests. They have used it against the Congo. They may try to use it against us. In the case of the Congo they were able to do so, for that young State is weak. But in our case they cannot, for we are strong.

77. The neutralist countries constitute a group of States with a very high population total. At present they are economically weak, but men are men and their worth is measured not by how many millions of dollars they have but by the fact that they are men. Above all, their dignity as human beings must be respected. That is why all three groups of States should be represented in United Nations organs, on equal terms and on an equal footing. Only then will it be possible to have confidence that we can disarm and establish an international armed force in the certainty that it will not be used against any single State or group of States.

78. Others may interpret my statement as they will, but I have striven honestly to explain our position. We are ready to sit down and enter into serious negotiations, but only on the condition that a proposal along the lines which I have indicated is adopted.

79. I ask everyone's indulgence if I have said anything out of turn. I rather attacked the Philippine representative, but he attacked me. He is a fighter. I am a young parliamentarian, he is an old one. Let us learn from each other.

80. The representative of Nepal also gave me a good lesson in parliamentary behaviour. Of course I don't know whether they have a parliament in Nepal or not. When I get home, I shall look in a reference book to make sure.

81. I wish the Assembly the greatest success; success can be achieved. That is demonstrated by the fact that we were able to adopt a unanimous resolution on the colonial question. We, the Soviet people, would sincerely rejoice if success was achieved in connexion with those vitally important questions which confront the United Nations, the questions of strengthening

peace and creating an atmosphere of friendship among peoples.

82. The **PRESIDENT**: I now call on the Secretary-General.

83. The **SECRETARY-GENERAL**: I ask the indulgence of the General Assembly in order to say just a few words to the spokesman of the Soviet Union. I do so because he addressed me so personally.

84. I was very happy to hear that Mr. Khrushchev has good memories of the time when I had the honour to be rowed by him on the Black Sea. I have not, as he said, been able to reply in kind. But my promise to do so stands, and I hope the day will come when he can avail himself of this offer. For if he did I am sure that he would discover that I know how to row—following only my own compass.

85. The **PRESIDENT**: I call on the representative of the United States in exercise of the right of reply.

86. Mr. **WADSWORTH** (United States of America): From what we heard last from the representative of the Soviet Union, perhaps the thunder will go away and perhaps the General Assembly can get down to work. It was really a masterful performance and, as one who understands and appreciates a good performance, I want to admit it. After all the charges, attacks and use of certainly questionable phrases, the representative of the Soviet Union gives us a benediction as he goes away, with a very quiet and benign smile.

87. I must confess that I did not catch all that he said during the last few moments of his intervention. But I might paraphrase a very well known saying by asking: How can we listen to what he says, when what he does sounds so loudly in our ears?

88. Once again, the leader of the Soviet delegation has thrown down the gauntlet and has said to the ninety-eight other nations here: "You should do it my way—or you shouldn't ever do it at all." Once again, he has said: "Well, perhaps we will participate in the debate on disarmament in the First Committee—if you accept the way that we want to do it. Otherwise—the United Nations means nothing."

89. I quite realize that appearing on this rostrum as often as I have today makes me decidedly suspect as far as partiality is concerned. But, whether Mr. Khrushchev will believe it or not, my main concern at this moment is not for the United States, is not for the position of the United States in the United Nations, but is for the United Nations itself.

90. I wish I could refer to the offensive language used by the Head of the Soviet delegation as effectively as was done this morning by the representative of the Philippines. I will not do that on a personal basis, nor will I do it on the basis of objecting to his characterization of the President of my country, to which I have already raised a point of order from this rostrum. But I will recall to the Assembly that he called the Security Council a spittoon—in which, supposedly, he has been wallowing quite happily for some years. But I do not understand why one would wish to destroy with opprobrium of this type one of the major bodies of the United Nations, which, because it has rarely agreed with the Soviet Union, is therefore obviously no good at all—to the Head of the Soviet delegation.

91. Enough has been said about whether certain remarks were in order or out of order. I thoroughly

agree with the representative of the United Kingdom that to bring up the subject of disarmament at the end of a speech having to do with a procedural matter on the allocation of an item having nothing to do with disarmament is a little bit surprising. Perhaps we who have been in the United Nations for some time have become used to the idea that there should be some order in our proceedings. Perhaps we have been wrong. Perhaps we who have been here in the United Nations for several years feel that there is a certain dignity to this body. Have we been wrong? I leave it completely to the judgement of the Members of the Assembly.

92. I will close with only a very few remarks about the subject on the agenda of our meeting this afternoon. As to the complaint of the Soviet Union of aggression on the part of the United States against the Soviet Union, I want to leave you with just two or three basic ideas—apart, of course, from completely denying the charges which the Head of the Soviet delegation has repeated. We are willing to have our evidence tested in an impartial investigation. The Soviet Union is not. I think Mr. Khrushchev is afraid of investigation: I think he has made that clear. We are also willing to test our case before public opinion. The whole United States is going to be in on this debate, and I am glad that that is so—and the people of the USSR cannot be in on it. But I challenge the Head of the Soviet delegation to allow the entire debate on this subject to be broadcast, live, to the USSR, instead of being jammed, as almost every United Nations broadcast has been for the past fifteen years.

93. I apologize for having perhaps brought back a little of the acerbity which has characterized our meetings in the last two days. It would have been nice, I think, had we been able to leave things as Mr. Khrushchev was apparently anxious to leave them—all smiles, "Bon voyage" and "good luck". I would say to him "Bon voyage". I hope that nothing will happen which can possibly harm him on his way home. And I hope that, when he feels it necessary to do so or desirable to do so, he will come back to the United Nations. But I hope he will bring a better attitude with him.

94. The **PRESIDENT**: There being no more speakers, the Assembly will now proceed to take a decision. The recommendation of the General Committee is that this item, agenda item 80, should be referred to the First Committee. To this recommendation there is an amendment submitted by the Soviet Union [A/L.313/Rev.1], the purpose of which is to allocate this item to plenary instead of to the First Committee. In accordance with rule 92, I put this amendment of the Soviet Union to the Assembly. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The United Arab Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroun, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville),

Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa.

Abstaining: United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Austria, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia.

The amendment was rejected by 54 votes to 10, with 33 abstentions.

95. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly now has to deal with the recommendation of the General Committee that item 80 should be dealt with in the First Committee. In the absence of any comments or objections, I shall take it that this recommendation has been approved.

It was so decided.

96. The PRESIDENT: I would draw the Assembly's attention to the list of items recommended by the General Committee in its first report [A/4520] as amended in accordance with the vote this morning, for consideration by the First Committee. Item 10 in that list has been referred to plenary. If there are no objections, I shall take it that the Assembly approves the allocation of the remaining items in the list to the First Committee?

It was so decided.

97. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now give its attention to the allocation of the items recommended for consideration by the Special Political Committee. If there are no objections to the recommendation of the General Committee, I shall consider it adopted.

It was so decided.

98. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has now completed its consideration of the adoption of the agenda and the allocation of items. The First Committee and the Special Political Committee will be informed accordingly.

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)*

99. Mr. SOUVANLASY (Laos) (translated from French): The Lao delegation is happy to join with other Member States in congratulating you most warmly and sincerely, Mr. President, on your election as President of the General Assembly. We feel that in your high position you will, if anything, be even better able to defend the cause of peace, to which all nations, both great and small, are devoting their most determined efforts here.

100. The Lao delegation is also happy to extend a warm welcome to the newly independent African States and to Cyprus as they take their place among our great family of nations, and it wishes, on behalf of the Lao people and Government, to express to them

its cordial and sincere congratulations. This historic event marks a big step by the United Nations in its steady and sure progress towards the achievement of one of its fundamental purposes, namely, universality. We are convinced that these new Member States will make a valuable contribution to the work of our Organization.

101. Although since the end of the last session of the General Assembly, we have been happy to see new States freed from their former subjection and promoted to independence and international equality, the fact remains that in many parts of the world peace is still threatened. The fear which has plagued us in both ancient and modern times has not yet vanished from our hearts despite the terrible and needless suffering that has been imposed on mankind by the love of domination and force, which some men still wish to exercise over their fellow men and which we are determined to banish from international relations.

102. We realize only too well what this means, for Laos has not known real peace for nearly twenty years, although it has ardently been longing for peace all that time. We won our independence by our own efforts, but this did not deliver us completely from new pressures which, for all their unobtrusiveness and subtlety, are none the less all-pervading. The result is that we have now been brought face to face with a peril which we wish to bring to the attention of the Assembly, for it is the fruit of a policy that still aims at involving weak, under-developed and under-armed nations in dangerous ideological crusades which cannot but weaken the cause of peace and must inevitably create tension between States.

103. It may seem impertinent for a small kingdom with a population of three million, and with more hopes than wealth, to appear to be making any suggestion whatever to the big Powers. We feel, however, that the world is so varied that all peoples have the right to choose, according to their special temperament and character, the social system which suits them, the religion which best expresses their philosophy of life, and the friends in whom they have confidence. Liberty and dignity, for peoples as well as individuals, must be freely chosen without any outside interference.

104. That is how our delegation understands the policy which States should adopt towards one another and the policy which the new Royal Government intends to make its own in the light of the experiences that have given rise to the present difficulties which are a cruel threat to its future. It has accordingly taken the deliberate decision to reject any undertaking which would bind it to any bloc. It wishes to remain neutral, to keep aloof from ideological squabbles and to continue on its way in accordance with its own wishes and its ancient traditions as a peaceful people, which, through history, has encroached the least upon its neighbours, shed the least blood in battle and been the least desirous of imposing its will on weaker peoples. Its moral law is peace, as its religion teaches.

105. The delegation of Laos would be very happy if this philosophy of neutrality could be accepted in this hall without our Kingdom being regarded by some as a disturber of the peace. It would particularly like the obvious conclusions to be drawn by those who want to help Laos to strengthen its independence. In this respect, the United Nations has pointed the way. The

* Resumed from the 901st meeting.

Lao delegation is deeply grateful for the assistance received from the United Nations during the serious disturbances which shook the entire Kingdom last year and which bore the stamp of foreign interference in our internal affairs. This interference is still going on; we want it to stop completely so that our part of South-East Asia can finally live in peace. Laos must cease to be a prize for one bloc or another, for a conflagration might start there which would soon spread to enormous areas and could not be put out.

106. You have been more or less aware of the present difficulties in Laos, which have been fostered from the outside by rival political interests. We realize the gravity of the situation in our country, which we hope is only temporary, but we are deliberately refraining from giving details here, as we do not wish to provide another subject for sterile and negative propaganda. However, a methodical and patient inquiry, carried out impartially by an accredited body, could not fail to uncover traces of interference by certain Powers that is becoming increasingly flagrant despite the ingenious attempts to camouflage it.

107. The geographical position of Laos in the heart of a critical area which is the battle-ground of two opposing ideologies is a terrible handicap in its efforts to strengthen its independence and territorial integrity. The most reasonable attitude seems to be to keep out of the raging storms of the cold war. By doing so, we feel we are helping to reduce friction, but in the world in which we live such a position can be effective only if it is accepted and supported by our neighbours and the big Powers.

108. We therefore welcomed with a great deal of sympathy the idea of a neutral Cambodia and Laos that was put forward from this rostrum on 29 September 1960 by His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the Chief of State of Cambodia [877th meeting]. We feel that this would be the best guarantee of our independence and territorial integrity. We urge the United Nations and the Powers that are desirous of maintaining stability and peace in that area to give the Cambodian delegation's proposal serious study.

109. I should like to say a few words about the problem which is of primary concern to the whole of mankind, that is to say, disarmament. The resounding failure of the Summit Conference in Paris, followed shortly by that of the ten-Power negotiations on disarmament at Geneva, has plunged the world into anxiety and anguish, producing breeding-grounds of crisis and of a fear which now lies heavy on the hearts of men in all continents. The Kingdom of Laos feels helpless in this raging torrent of the cold war. An atmosphere charged with threats of reprisals and nuclear destruction has greatly increased the responsibilities of the United Nations with regard to disarmament. My delegation has no intention of dwelling on this problem, but it feels that in view of the rising tide of danger, there should be no more procrastination. The dominant factor in the disarmament debate is obviously the fear of being taken in. Each party suspects the other of setting a trap for it and is afraid of paying a high price for its good faith, for there are still many unknown factors in the international situation. As long as distrust and suspicion persist, the success of even the most determined efforts to negotiate and arrive at some agreement on disarmament remains problematical.

110. That is why we beg those who hold the future of mankind in their hands to apply themselves to dissipating this distrust and to re-establishing confidence between peoples and Governments. Confidence must be born and grow strong before it is possible to disarm and free mankind from the nightmare of catastrophic war. Every opportunity that arises and every means at our disposal must be fully utilized in order to break the present deadlock as soon as possible. Consequently, the Kingdom of Laos cannot but address the most urgent plea to those who have the technical mastery and the monopoly of these new weapons that, on behalf of spiritual and moral values and on behalf of civilization, they will be wise enough and bold enough to take the path which will deliver mankind from all fear of self-destruction.

111. My delegation was much upset by the attacks made by some countries on the authority of the Secretary-General, to whom we wish to pay a tribute of thanks and deep gratitude. His great statesmanlike qualities, his competence, his selflessness and his unceasing efforts on behalf of peace must command the respect and gratitude of everyone. To attack the position of the Secretary-General is, in our opinion, to undermine the very foundations of the United Nations and to deprive the small nations of the bastion which defends and protects them. At a time when many African countries are entering the great international family full of hope and confidence, we find this offensive by certain Powers against the highest authority of the Organization very puzzling. We have placed our faith and confidence in the United Nations, but now we are afraid that the attacks and abuse by those who wish to make it their tool will cause it to sink even deeper into the ruts of the less fortunate aspects of its past. That is why the Lao delegation sincerely welcomes the Secretary-General's courageous decision to stay at his post in spite of attacks which would have shaken many other men. It regards that decision as motivated solely by the interests of peace and the interests of all countries which need the protection of the United Nations.

112. The Lao delegation apologizes for having spoken at such length of its anxieties and political ideals. It would have liked to deal exclusively with the problems that are of interest to what is now called the "third world", the world to which the Kingdom of Laos belongs. A human more than a political solution is also needed for these problems. Millions of persons are living at a subsistence level and are in danger of being swamped by despair. They must be given the hope of better days in the near future. As mankind has made unequal progress in comfort and wealth, the great crusade of this century should be to smooth out such inequalities. The nations represented here are, we are sure, acutely aware of this. The under-developed peoples lack the technical knowledge which has made the great Powers pre-eminent. It would thus be well for that knowledge to be shared with everyone, for we are all members of a world in full development, where those who are now more fortunate must pay more attention to the less favoured. The Kingdom of Laos has been lucky enough to receive an initial part of its share of this technical and economic assistance from States which it can never adequately thank for their generosity. The United Nations in particular—after the visit by the Secretary-General and the United Nations mission—drew up a programme of assistance which is now being put into effect. The Special Fund

has made us substantial allocations for the Committee for Co-ordination of Investigation of the Lower Mekong Basin. The assistance from the United Nations, together with bilateral aid from friendly nations, has already proved to us that there is a great movement of solidarity between great and small States. May the work continue in our country and elsewhere, without any political strings attached and with a purely humanitarian aim. That is the great hope of the "third world", for nothing can resist an altruistic and disinterested gesture.

113. I do not wish to take up too much of your time. However, before leaving this rostrum, I should like to tell you how my delegation feels about our work at the fifteenth session. The sad spectacle of discord, ideological struggle and unbridled propaganda which the General Assembly has provided since 20 September is not likely to inspire confidence or remove anxiety or, in a word, to reduce international tension. In our view, the sessions of the United Nations seem to have become routine for the big Powers of this world, but for the small nations, particularly for those which are regaining their independence, these sessions are a source of hope. Between the routine of the great Powers and the hope of the small nations, all efforts must now be directed towards the single purpose of safeguarding peace in order to achieve real international co-operation. The fifteenth session is a difficult test for the United Nations, and it will show whether the same words have the same meaning in relations between nations as in relations between men and whether goodwill, honesty and good faith can become part of a common language.

Mr. Illueca (Panama), Vice-President, took the Chair.

114. Mr. OKALA (Cameroun) (translated from French): On coming to this rostrum for the first time in the general debate to add my country's voice to those of all the speakers preceding me, I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to discharge first of all a sacred duty entrusted to me by Mr. Ahmadou Ahidjo, the President of the Republic—whom so many of you heard in certain Committees of this Assembly in 1958 and 1959, when the future of my country was under discussion—and by the Camerounian Government under the leadership of Mr. Charles Assalé. The object of my statement will be to tell you, in simple terms but as fully as possible, the manner in which Cameroun entered upon its independence on 1 January 1960.

115. I said that it was a sacred duty for me to discharge this moral debt, for you are fully aware that my country, placed under French administration by virtue of a trusteeship agreement drawn up in accordance with the United Nations Charter, owes you, more than any other body, an account of the way in which both independence and democracy are functioning in Cameroun.

116. In March 1959, at the conclusion of lengthy discussions here on the question of giving my country democratic institutions, the General Assembly adopted resolution 1349 (XIII), the tenor of which may be summed up as follows: (a) The holding of free elections by universal suffrage as soon as possible after the proclamation of independence; (b) The exertion of sincere efforts towards national reconciliation.

117. All supporters of democratic institutions in our country therefore felt that an account should be given

so that you might all know what is happening and feel easy in your conscience with regard to the manner in which my country has observed the directives given in the resolution I have just mentioned. For us Camerounians it is both a moral duty and a duty of political integrity, to which we attach great importance. I therefore feel that I may request your attention and indulgence: your attention because, as in any business concern, there must be a balance-sheet to show whether the enterprise is making a profit or a loss, and you owe it to yourselves to know all that is happening; your indulgence because I feel that, at a time when so many important problems are under discussion here in an endeavour to clear the world horizon of all the clouds which darken it, it may seem conceited for a newcomer, whose first and only duty should be to listen to you, to mount this rostrum and not expect to seem tiresome to those who are accustomed to listening to great things said by great men.

118. My country attained independence on 1 January 1960. The Government, in agreement with parliament, established a time-table which has been closely followed. The main aim of people of all opinions was to endow the country as rapidly as possible with democratic institutions which would enable it to tackle the work of decolonization with the greatest chance of success so as to give the country's administration, economy and social system a new aspect. A committee of forty-two members, half of them members of parliament and half representing public bodies, was set up in order to prepare the advance draft of a constitution, which was to be adopted by the Council of Ministers. This draft was later to be submitted to a referendum for popular approval. The draft constitution, incorporating all the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the principles of the United Nations Charter, established the State of Cameroun as a republic. The indivisibility of the Republic and the sovereignty of the people were proclaimed. All the freedoms were recognized and guaranteed by the constitution which, after submission to a popular referendum, was adopted on 21 February 1960 with a majority of more than 250,000 votes, despite a violent and bitter campaign by the opposition. In one aspect there was great progress: the referendum campaign took place in an atmosphere of dignity, seriousness and calm, despite the feverish activity of both sides, which demonstrated a perfect consciousness of their duty on the part of the citizens of my country.

119. After the adoption of the constitution, and still within the framework of the reconciliation of all Camerounians, the decree of 13 July 1955 dissolving the Union des populations du Cameroun (UPC) was rescinded. The Union des populations du Cameroun, the Jeunesse démocratique du Cameroun (JDC) and the Union démocratique des femmes camerounaises (UDEFEF) were re-established. A *de facto* amnesty was granted on the sole condition that a declaration renouncing and condemning violence was made. All these steps were taken in order to enable those Camerounians who had gone into voluntary exile abroad to take part in the elections which were to take place two months later. It might have been thought that these steps alone would have been enough to convince those who were preaching violence of the desire of all Camerounians to be reconciled and to meet at the ballot-box in order to build the country

together on the firm and secure foundations of renewed fraternity and harmony.

120. Although our people living in Cameroun approved these measures, those living abroad, on the other hand, demonstrating the truth of the saying, valid for all times and all countries, that exiles learn nothing and forget nothing, ordered their followers to boycott the elections. There were two exceptions: one, André-Marie Mbida, the former Prime Minister, and until then a refugee abroad, who returned to Cameroun to prepare his election campaign; the other, Mr. Owono Mimbo, an associate of Mr. Moumié, who became a candidate. Both were elected. Mr. Mimbo returned to Cameroun after confirmation of his election.

121. The elections were democratic and free. The best proof of this is the fact that, as in all democratic countries where voting is free, several ministers were defeated, one of them by a woman. Out of 1,940,438 registered electors, 1,349,739 voted. Votes cast totalled 69.55 per cent of the electorate. This figure is distinctly higher than the proportion of votes cast in previous consultations organized under the trusteeship administration, which had been 42 per cent in 1946, 45 per cent in 1952 and 54 per cent in 1956. The proportion was less than 50 per cent in only one department, Wouri, the chief town of which is Douala, where the order to boycott the elections, given from abroad, was followed, thereby lowering the proportion to 30.37 per cent in that department. In the other departments the proportion of voters varied between 50 and 87 per cent of the electorate. In the troubled Bamiléké department, 101,049 electors cast their vote, representing a proportion of 50.33 per cent.

122. The balance of forces emerging from these elections gives the following pattern of distribution in the new Assembly. Out of 100 seats to be filled, fifty-three went to the Union camerounaise, eighteen to the Parti de la réconciliation, eleven to the Démocrates camerounais, eight to the Groupe des progressistes, eight to the Union des populations du Cameroun and two to independent candidates.

123. That result is more eloquent than all the speeches that have been made here telling you of the myth of the forces represented by Mr. Moumié. It is now easy to understand why the latter is reluctant to adopt and use democratic means for obtaining power. The only course left to him is to maintain a state of continuous tension in Cameroun in order to take power by force. This is something outside the honourable struggle which was the right of all Camerounian patriots when they were fighting for independence and it is a good indication of the intentions of a handful of individuals who wish to seize power for themselves and impose on the people a régime which it has always rejected in all the elections through which it has been able to demonstrate its sovereign will.

124. It was the duty of my delegation to make the situation clear, so that all those who thought to serve democracy by giving help and assistance to the Camerounian exiles may know that their struggle is no longer a national struggle but, in fact, a trial of strength which is being imposed upon a young State; because of this, the latter is obliged to use every effort to maintain public order instead of concentrating on the implementation of programmes designed to

strengthen the independence so dearly acquired and to promote public welfare, the concern of all the new States.

125. After the April elections the Assembly met in May to ratify the credentials of the newly elected members, appoint its officers and elect the first President of the Republic. His Excellency Ahmadou Ahidjo was elected to the highest office in the State, by 89 votes out of 99. To celebrate the inauguration of his office, the President of the Republic of Cameroun proclaimed a general, total and unconditional amnesty. This was the last of the measures of general reconciliation urged by the United Nations and, at the same time, it revealed the liberal outlook of the President and his team.

126. My Government considered that a man's past should not stand in the way of his redemption; but the redemption of the offender must not help to diminish or even to suppress the gravity of the offence. For that reason, by decreeing a general, total and unconditional amnesty we wished to pardon even those individuals who, through a nationalism which is now confused with mere chauvinism, have continued to maintain a situation of tension, forgetting the evil that has been done to our country by a fratricidal struggle for which there is no longer any purpose and conceals its real motives.

127. The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated in this Assembly on Friday, 23 September 1960: "...we have no liking for capitalism. But we do not want to impose our system on other peoples..." [869th meeting, para. 258]. But that is where the shoe pinches because, in fact, the continuing armed struggle in Cameroun in a part of its independent territory, not against colonialism but against the democratic institutions which emerged from popular consultations based on universal, direct and secret suffrage, is no longer a struggle for freedom but a struggle with the aim of imposing an ideology imported and maintained from abroad, in order to subject the people of my country to a political system which it does not want.

128. After the amnesty, as was to be expected, President Ahidjo resigned, along with his Government, in order to make way for a Government of national unity in which all political parties, including the UPC, were invited to co-operate in the great work of national unity. The amnesty led to the liberation of several hundred persons who had been sentenced for serious crimes against individuals. A number of people who had been condemned to death were released and there is no longer a single man in prison for any crime or offence of a political character committed before 8 May 1960. This measure, as broad and as unconditional as the United Nations General Assembly had wished it to be, should logically have removed any reason for those who claim to be political exiles to remain abroad.

129. Despite this liberal measure by the Chief of State, the UPC rejected the offer thus made to it to participate in the Government and thereby rejected the invitation to co-operate harmoniously with all the living forces of the nation. From that time it became clear that these voluntary exiles were seeking power for themselves and cared little for the most elementary forms of democracy. Thus from last July murderous orders again appeared in Cameroun, launched from abroad with a view to disrupting

public order and the fragile economy of our young republic once again.

130. I should like to believe, and so would my delegation and the whole of Cameroun, that the Governments from whose soil those orders are sent with the object of destroying our young State in its infancy are unaware of all these facts; I should like to believe that their good faith is being abused, as is the hospitality they are giving to those whom they think of as pitiable exiles. But, in fact, there is every indication that, if such activities continue, we shall not fail to accuse those States of active and aggressive complicity in actions against our State. This is all the more serious in that everyone here talks about African solidarity. One is sometimes tempted to ask where that solidarity begins and where it ends.

131. As far as my country is concerned, I solemnly declare in this Assembly that, according to African tradition, to tolerate such activities on the part of those whom you are harbouring amounts to a hostile act. Cameroun had no dispute in the past with any African State; since attaining independence it has had no dispute with any State; its only wish is to maintain the best relations with all States.

132. The Government of the Republic of Cameroun was born from universal suffrage. We have kept our promises, as you have just seen. Mr. Ahidjo himself told you that elections would be held after the attainment of independence. We have worked at a rapid rate. Our constitution was drawn up and adopted a month after independence. The UPC was immediately re-established and a first amnesty was promulgated almost simultaneously. Three months after independence the people were summoned to vote in order to elect the first National Assembly of independent Cameroun. After that election Cameroun elected its first President of the Republic; almost immediately afterwards, he formed his first Government of national unity under the leadership of Mr. Charles Assalé, in which the members of the UPC refused to take part. A general, total and unconditional amnesty was promulgated which nullified the effect of all sentences pronounced between May 1955 and 8 May 1960.

133. Thus we have done all in our power to demonstrate our good will and our desire to resume contact with all Camerounians, whatever their views, in order to build a better country. Unfortunately, our example has not been followed; but we affirm that we shall meet all our responsibilities, making use of all the means which democracy gives to every legal and constitutional Government; for, as we understand it, democracy has never been synonymous with anarchy.

134. Now that I have given this account, allow me to say a few words on my country's position with regard to the problems before us.

135. As a good self-respecting African, I am naturally drawn to speak of my African brothers on whom, alas, the sun of liberty and independence has not yet risen. In any event, we have no doubt that the days of foreign occupation are numbered.

136. I should not like my words to be misunderstood by anyone and I shall accordingly revert to a theme which is dear to me: let those who are in the habit of publishing "extracts" do so honestly, and above all let them not, for propaganda or publicity reasons,

give only truncated and distorted fragments of my statement.

137. May we, as a country which has adopted the language of France, be permitted to refer, first of all, to the Algerian tragedy. For a long time now we have cherished the hope, from year to year, of an honourable, happy, even fraternal end to the conflict—an end in the true French way, full of heroism, dignity, generosity and justice. France has, indeed, given much to the world, in qualities of heart and of mind. The coming to power of General de Gaulle, a man who is universally recognized as having a sense of history and an enlightened view of the development of the world, offered, at one moment, the prospect of a solution. The failure of the Melun talks, together with the collapse of the Summit Conference in Paris, plunged us once again into doubt and anguish. As a result, the Algerian tragedy is such that we cannot see the wood for the trees.

138. Who among us could have thought that France would ever have appeared as a defendant in the international community? For someone nurtured in the spirit of 1789 it is impossible to understand how, after giving the full meaning of the word freedom to the world, the French themselves are now incurring the reproach of wishing to deny it to others. At this time of rejoicing, when we are happy to make our entry into the international family, we should have preferred to speak only words of joy, but we are compelled to allude to the anguish which the French feel as much as we, the friends of France, when we consider that the more this conflict is prolonged the more it raises a question of conscience for each and every person. And, to borrow the words of La Fontaine in his fable about the animals who were ill with the plague, we note with bitterness that this attitude on the part of France enables "all these great quarrellers, even the simple dog, to claim to be little saints", which leads some speakers to cry in chorus today, after making a plea *pro domo*: "Let's condemn the donkey."

139. What is becoming of France? And why is this so? Because this matter, which from the beginning could have found a normal solution in a fraternal atmosphere, has been purposely exploited because of the tergiversations of certain French governing circles which have made the problem worse. It is shocking for us who know what France has done over the centuries for the freedom of peoples throughout the world to see today that, because of the Algerian tragedy which, as I said earlier, hides other things from view, all those countries with systems similar to the French now hold up their heads and set themselves up as censors of France. Certain acts of racial discrimination, acts of brazen and outright oppression, the herding of human beings reduced to the level of animals, confiscation of land, which deprived some indigenous inhabitants of their livelihood when they had to abandon their land to foreigners, arbitrary and indefinite detention of political leaders whose names are not spoken here and whom nobody thinks of mentioning—these things are all forgotten straight away.

140. Since we must speak of colonialism and colonialists, we wonder, deep down in our hearts: are these things really forgotten, or are we trying to foster a certain complex here? We should not wish to use the exaggerated language of the wolf in the fable

who, in order to divert attention from his own thefts and flatter the lion, said:

To eat sheep, those dense beasts, is a sin? That's absurd!

No, a favour you do them by eating them, Sire.

*And shame on the shepherd who rules o'er the herd
And would spread o'er all beasts his imagined empire.*

141. This is the tragedy. France, today, is the shepherd who is blamed for everything. I myself should have hoped that certain parties would not come here to incite the Africans to hatred of the white man, forgetting that they themselves are friendly to other whites. Colonizers are everywhere the same. When we criticize France in connexion with the Algerian affair, it should be remembered that we also criticize others for the atrocities, humiliations, harassment and injustices which are being committed in Africa under flags other than that of France. That is why I say that we Africans who have just achieved independence are in a better position to speak on this problem. We speak about it because we think that the time has come for the entire African family to celebrate independence and we speak about it all the more freely because Cameroun's statute does not make it the adherent of any particular group. It does not belong to the French Community, to the British Commonwealth, to the American bloc, or to the Soviet bloc. It disgusts my delegation to see other delegations, according to the bloc they belong to, come here and wax indignant about the attitude of France, as if that country were the only one in Africa which was devouring the African "sheep". They forget that, in addition, there are other "lions" who are devouring them with equal greed.

142. It is obviously for sentimental reasons that—as in the biblical story of the beam and the mote—one stresses the fault of a neighbour in order to hide those of one's own partner. I must say, with all due respect, that my delegation would have liked to hear some of the Chiefs of State who spoke before me comment on the sufferings of Africa and of humanity as a whole. When we demand independence for Algeria, we should like to see them demand that Jomo Kenyatta be freed, denounce the repression of the Mau Mau, demand the return of the rich land stolen from the Wameru and, finally, demand also immediate independence for all territories still under foreign rule.

143. I realize that my views will not be supported by all the representatives present here. Each one of us acts on his own responsibility. My own delegation, for its part, would not like to see accepted here the conclusion of the fable I have quoted, where La Fontaine ended with the words:

*Depending on your weakness or on your might,
The court will rule you either black or white.*

For that reason, my delegation, considering the era of colonialism to be past, would have liked to see the General Assembly deal with the entire colonial question, wherever it arises.

144. It is because we are convinced that Africa will be free that we tell France how much we should prefer not to have to choose between friendship with France, our former guardian, and our fraternal ties with Algeria. We appeal to France to spare us the cruelty of this choice. How glad we should be to greet both

Algeria and France in the same friendly embrace! Yet a solution exists, already drawn up and accepted by both parties: self-determination, and Algeria for the Algerians—two French concepts whose meaning is perfectly clear. What has been conceived by the mind should be susceptible of implementation.

145. As so many have said, this war has lasted far too long. Unfortunately, with the blood and tears that have been shed, it is making an ever-widening rift between two communities which a memorable past has doomed to coexistence. That past includes the time when Algerians fought on French soil, for France, and in defence of the freedoms which a certain group of Frenchmen would now deny them. This war, as has been emphasized, is decimating the youth of both France and Algeria, two groups nurtured together in the same culture, from which they derive the same reasons for fighting each other. If there is no difference between the French mother who weeps for her son killed in ambush and the Algerian mother who weeps for her son—often of the same age—hit by a French bullet, then reason must find a way to overcome this painful tragedy.

146. We want to believe in France, for we remember that it was with that country's help, support and friendship that we were admitted to the United Nations. We hope that it will do all it can, before it is too late, so that it may at the earliest possible opportunity lead Algeria, in turn, to its seat in the General Assembly, while still preserving its friendship. We trust that our appeal may be heeded and that this question of Algeria, which divides so many French and Algerian families, may find a solution that will guarantee respect for the rights of individuals and ethnic minorities and, at the same time, fulfil the desire of the Algerians to know in their turn, after black Africa, the joys of freedom. By taking such a course, France will spare us the tragedy of being compelled to take the drastic step of choosing between the friendship to which I have just referred and solidarity.

147. Another, no less painful, tragedy is that of the Congo—capital, Leopoldville. In accordance with the official attitude taken by the Government of the Republic of Cameroun, my delegation formally declares that the question of the Congo's independence has been settled and cannot be reopened. It declares, with equal firmness, that it regards the integrity of the Congo as sacred and indivisible. May I be permitted to express the view that the reason why nothing had been done to temper or put an end to the secession of Katanga is because certain great Powers, instead of offering to mediate between all the parties involved, have seen fit to support a certain display of intransigence, which was also exhibited by the other side, thus crystallizing the positions of both parties. We consider that before talking of giving armed assistance to the Central Government of the Congo, an effort should have been made to make use of the influence which we know certain African leaders enjoy and to try to bring about a "rapprochement" between the parties concerned. This, I believe, would have avoided adding fuel to the flames.

148. However that might be, we do not wish to turn this Assembly into a meeting to bewail lost opportunities and we feel that it is not too late to place the Congolese problem in its true perspective.

149. In the first place, we have heard, both here and elsewhere, a great variety of opinions concerning this tragedy. We have listened to vehement protestations by Belgium. Statistics have been quoted here in an effort to prove that the intellectual capital which Belgium left in the Congo was such as to cause envy in other formerly colonized countries. In the light of the events which have taken place, and without wishing to question the statements made by the Belgian representative, I should like to say, in passing, that the statistics provided for our consideration, while indicating a satisfactory level of school attendance, relate to schooling which can only be at the primary or elementary levels. What the Belgian representative forgot to supply us with was statistics of secondary and higher education. Hence I say that the question remains unanswered, because what would be of interest now would be a statement concerning the number of trained persons ready to take over the administration of the Congo's affairs, rather than the number of those attending primary school—the figures for which are admittedly praiseworthy—who will become available in the future.

150. In any event, we are pleased to pay a tribute to the prompt intervention by the United Nations in the Congo, action which immediately eliminated any justification for intervention by any foreign force on Congolese national soil. The presence of the United Nations contingents has served to calm the fears which have been voiced here for the safety of persons and property.

151. Some of those here have sought to place on the Secretary-General the responsibility for the present complex and increasingly confused situation. If it is human to err, let us readily concede that mistakes may well have been made in implementing the resolutions adopted by the Security Council, but let us also recall other cases in which United Nations action, undertaken with equal vigour, was accused of partiality by a different party. In medio stat veritas.

152. What we do denounce in the strongest terms is the passionate way in which each one selects his own man to support in the Congo, as if the affairs of that country were no longer a matter for the Congolese themselves. No, we cannot agree to our States becoming stakes in the competition between the great Powers. We Africans reserve the absolute right to choose our own men. No one has any right to complain of confusion after having added to it, and out of resentment at not having been able to impose the individual of his choice. The United Nations went to the Congo to assist the Congolese State through the legitimate Government. It did not go there to strengthen the prestige of a particular individual. Who constitutes the legitimate Government? That is for the Congolese people to say.

153. My delegation considers that the Secretary-General of the United Nations has displayed complete impartiality and I am pleased to stress that fact.

154. Mr. Lumumba's dismissal was an independent act taken by the Congolese Chief of State under article 22 of the Fundamental Law. I have the dubious pleasure of having in my files a document containing all the resolutions of the Brussels "round-table conferences", as well as every possible and conceivable commentary, and the complete text of the Fundamental Law, article 22 of which reads: "The Chief of State appoints and revokes the Prime Minister and the Ministers." The

decision of the Chief of State is now a legal decision since it has been formalized in accordance with article 20, which provides that "No act of the Chief of State can have any effect unless it is countersigned by a Minister, who by this very action assumes responsibility for such act".

155. Consequently, it is legally impossible for the United Nations or its Secretary-General to invalidate or modify such a constitutionally legal measure as the deposition of Mr. Lumumba. The stubborn refusal of certain parties to acknowledge or recognize the neutral position taken by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in connexion with this decision by the Chief of State is due to the fact that they wish to substitute themselves for the Congolese people and to choose those who are to govern the Congo, giving their preference to an individual rather than to a régime. From a strictly legal point of view, the United Nations cannot invalidate the internal laws of a country. The Secretary-General's task was to assist the Central Government, but the United Nations is not entitled to decide who is the head of that Central Government.

156. You may say that, Mr. Lumumba having been deposed, his successor too would have to be approved by the Congolese Parliament, I agree. Nevertheless, pending such approval, there can no longer be any question of Lumumba holding office, since the instrument removing him from office was countersigned by two members of the Government. Until such time as the Fundamental Law is altered, that instrument is in itself sufficiently complete for the "Lumumba claim" to be definitively rejected.

157. The Chief of State has appointed Mr. Ileo as Mr. Lumumba's successor. The next step was for Mr. Ileo to comply with the provisions of article 37 of the Fundamental Law, which reads as follows:

"Within forty-eight hours of the appointment of its members, the Government presents itself before the Chambers in order to obtain a vote of confidence. Such vote requires an absolute majority of the votes of all the members composing the two Chambers."

It was for the Congolese Parliament to approve or disapprove Mr. Ileo's appointment. Under the Fundamental Law, it did not even possess the right to discuss the decision of the Chief of State.

158. The President of the Republic of Guinea speaking from this rostrum [896th meeting], referred to the provisions of the preamble of the Fundamental Law and told us that the Chief of State was without responsibility and therefore had no right whatsoever to dismiss the Prime Minister. I should not like it to be said that I reject that interpretation. I should like it to be stated and recognized that I supplement it, and I leave it to you to say whether the addition which I submit for your consideration is such as to give rise to an interpretation differing from that contained in the provisions of the Fundamental Law. Although the preamble states that the Chief of State is without responsibility, that does not mean that the Fundamental Law gives him no responsibility. It merely means that, as Chief of State, he cannot be responsible to Parliament and we all know what that signifies in constitutional law. How can it be conceded for a single moment that a Chief of State is not responsible before his nation? The idea is so absurd that I shall not insult anyone by thinking that it can gain acceptance here.

159. May I be allowed to read you a passage from the brochure entitled "Les institutions politiques du Congo indépendant au 30 juin 1960", by François Perrin (I have already mentioned this pamphlet which I had the misfortune to come across and which I now take the opportunity of quoting). The following is a quotation from chapter III which deals with the political system of the Congolese State:

"The system of the Chief of State without responsibility has both advantages and disadvantages. The main advantage is that it gives the Chief of State considerable moral prestige among the people. In fact, owing to his status, the Chief of State appears as a symbol of the nation, above quarrels and political debates, in which he takes no public part. Responsibility for mistakes made is necessarily shouldered by the Ministers concerned."

I did not write this myself. The authors of the Fundamental Law stated it in the preamble, some extracts from which have been quoted here.

160. In the present instance, the fact that the Chief of State is without responsibility cannot be invoked if he dismisses the Prime Minister under article 22, which I have just read out. There is no need for me to stress the point for you to understand that the situation has been correctly interpreted by the United Nations representatives in the Congo, in accordance with the provisions of the Fundamental Law. Had they acted otherwise, they would have contravened the provisions of that Fundamental Law.

161. It only remains, as the representative of Nigeria has suggested, for the United Nations to allow the Congolese Parliament to convene as soon as possible in order to give Mr. Lumumba's successor either a vote of confidence or one of no-confidence. Furthermore, if, as a compromise measure, the Chief of State were to call on Mr. Lumumba to succeed Mr. Lumumba, that too would be a lawful act which would enable Mr. Lumumba to have recourse to the formula in article 37 of the Fundamental Law and seek a vote of confidence from the Parliament. But in any case the Lumumba Government of 30 June 1960 no longer has any legal existence and, if it were to return to power, that could only be through a new appointment by the Chief of State, followed by a new approval by the Chambers, under article 37.

162. That is how the United Nations should deal with the Congolese problem. We should have refrained from giving all these explanations if some speakers had not adopted positions which obliged us to give this information to the Assembly in order that it may take a final decision in full knowledge of the facts. We have no interest in the Congo and we do not wish to impose any individual there. Our position is simply that of a delegation whose sole desire is to inform the Assembly and to appeal to it to give up the unfortunate habit of discussing personalities instead of principles. The Congolese have not been fighting among themselves in order that others may impose leaders upon them. The quarrel between individuals in the Congo has no place in the United Nations.

163. The debate on this question has now begun and my delegation reserves the right to explain its position in more detail in due course. In our opinion the present chaotic situation is of a transitory nature and will soon find a solution. The Congo and the cause of peace owe much to the United Nations and to its

Secretary-General for, without them, a new Korea would have arisen in the very heart of Africa. The United Nations has played its full part in guaranteeing the independence of the Congo and preserving peace.

164. May we therefore be allowed to express our reservations with respect to the feverish flood of proposals for modification of the structure of our Organization, some of which are indeed surprising. In fact, the Press in a certain country has actually gone so far as to suggest the possibility of establishing weighted voting. Can it be that our appearance in substantial numbers in the concert of nations and the prospect of seeing our participation increase is suddenly causing fear? We, who yesterday were ignored, are now taking our rightful place in history. Yet we thirst for peace, because we enjoy a lesser degree of security. We are not likely to cause concern to anyone. It is we, on the contrary, who may have cause for concern. We, who were ignored at the time when the balance of power in the United Nations was established, now demand representation in the specialized organs: the Security Council, permanent seats, etc. We categorically reject the triumvirate structure which has been proposed. That system has been famous since the days of ancient Rome. In our own day, we recall a famous duumvirate which was unable to survive, even in a collectivist country.

165. As we have already stated, the United Nations is our last recourse and the safeguard of our frail sovereignties. As Mr. Hammarskjöld so admirably put it, it is our own Organization, the Organization of the small nations, and we cannot allow paralyzing discussion—which would be inevitable under a collective leadership—to be introduced into the supreme executive organ from which we expect prompt and rapid action if we are to survive in the event of aggression. We cling to the United Nations and its survival guarantees our own.

166. I should not wish to leave this rostrum without presenting the humble views of the delegation of the Republic of Cameroun on the grave problem of disarmament. Like all peoples, we had great hopes for the success of the Paris Summit Conference. We were disappointed when at that moment world tension mounted, reaching a peak following the resounding failure of that conference. The great world Powers, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which pooled their resources to free the world from Hitler's grip, now find themselves antagonists and their mutual misunderstanding causes concern to all nations. The accumulation of destructive weapons by each one is capable of bringing about the destruction of mankind. Our anxiety, which was not justified initially since there was still hope of a "rapprochement" between these two giants, became real fear when we saw the two great Powers refuse even a mere invitation to talk. We have reason to fear the worst.

167. Never have armaments been of such magnitude or so highly developed. While the initial statements made by the leaders of the atomic Powers aroused some hope, their most recent speeches fill us with concern.

168. History always repeats itself and the atmosphere prevailing today is exactly the same as that of 1938. At that time, too, disarmament was being discussed in the ante-chambers of the late lamented League

of Nations. That girl of Geneva, who had a passion for excitement, also had some fearsome lovers to whom she was always saying: "Frighten me, dear." Among those fearsome lovers there was one who really frightened her, so much so that one day she died. Her New York daughter, the present United Nations, who was born of the anguish of the great 1939-1945 conflagration, is acquiring, on Manhattan Island, the curious tastes of her late mother and disarmament is again being discussed, just as it was in the past. Although her mother had but one fearsome lover, she has two mighty ones. The third, whose shadow hovers over all our deliberations, is sighing in the wings, awaiting his turn to take the stage. This frightens not only the United Nations but also the entire world and we may well wonder whether we are not on the verge of another coup which this time will sweep away not only the Organization but the entire planet.

169. Our countries are small ones and do not manufacture any armaments. We refuse to serve as a testing ground for verifying, with a pitying air, the obsolescence of the now archaic "toys" which the so-called "conventional" weapons now represent for the great Powers. Those "toys" cause Africa great concern. Thus the future of mankind depends on what the great Powers are going to do. We therefore appeal to them to cease quarrelling and to agree that the time when disputes were settled by force of arms has now passed. It is time they understood that by continuing to disagree they are endangering the future of mankind.

170. Although it welcomes the offers of assistance which some Chiefs of State have made, both here and elsewhere, to the under-developed countries, my delegation, for its part, would like to see that assistance shorn of all appearance of alms or charity, which is incompatible with our dignity as human beings who, although poor, are nevertheless free. In our view, such assistance will be of value only if granted through international co-operation between States for the purpose of strengthening our national independence and eliminating any possible causes of discontent which may disturb the peace of our nations. The United Nations must endeavour to make those countries which are prosperous enough to join in giving such aid, understand that the latter will achieve its objective only when all the new under-developed States can accept it without relinquishing any sovereignty and when there are no political conditions attached to it. Otherwise, the Republic of Cameroun would rather see its sons die poor but on their feet than see them live, but on their knees.

171. My delegation welcomed the appeal made by the Prime Minister of Nigeria for aid to the former Belgian Congo. It is prepared to propose to its Government urgent measures to enable the schools in my country to receive, within the near future, young Congolese who are ready for a full secondary education. In order to ensure that such technical assistance to the Congolese State may prove effective, it would like a meeting of the African officials concerned to be held in Africa in the near future, to draw up an inventory of the urgent needs which have to be met.

172. While it recognizes the sacrifices made by the Soviet and Western blocs in the struggle against Hitler's totalitarianism, as also the active role played by the socialist countries in publicizing and promoting the colonial peoples' struggle for freedom, my dele-

gation nevertheless wishes to warn against the danger of importing into Africa—where we wish to avoid any conflict between East and West—an ideology which would appear to side with either one of the two opposing blocs.

173. We denounce with equal force any effort to promote, in the newly independent States, subversion, whose sole aim is to supplant in those countries everything that is Western in character and to replace it by a new way of life which is simply Leninist Marxism. Africa must be allowed to develop outside ideological competition, for it will no longer be Africa if we empty it of all the substance of its own philosophy. Negritude is both a philosophy and a way of life which we wish to preserve; in our opinion it would be sheer madness to destroy it in order to replace it by a Europeanism which would only turn us into rootless people who have destroyed their past and have no possibility of a glorious future. It is clear that we must enhance Africa's stature and development if we are not to be accused by future generations of having cheapened our continent in disregard of its geographic, physiological and physical structure.

174. Others have already given their views on that concept of the world which approves the domination of certain peoples by other peoples through force, self-interest and racism. We who are emerging from colonialism will obviously be the last to tolerate any form of foreign constraint, imposed either on peoples or on individuals, and anything which hampers the right of peoples to self-determination. How is it possible—except for the fact that human life is a tissue of paradoxes and amazing contradictions—that those nations which claim to be civilized, which can point to the most sensational achievements of human genius, that those intelligent nations which gave us the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and similar outstanding examples of the defence of freedom, which speak of the "liberation of mankind", which exalt their national pride, how is it that such intellects are unable to understand that we share the same thirst for freedom and the same yearning for national pride?

175. At the risk of repeating ourselves, we again denounce, firmly and categorically, all forms of colonization, whether political or ideological. Ideological imperialism is as harmful and odious as the imperialism of self-interest. Let me make myself clear: the beauty of the world lies in its diversity. We should be most ill at ease here if we all had similar faces and were of the same colour. Might we not begin to doubt our own individuality? Let those take warning, therefore, who, in one way or another, wish to shape us in their image against God and against nature. Those who wish to turn parts of Africa into parts of Europe or of other continents are indulging in fantasy. God and nature made the seas, the oceans and the mountains in order to separate mankind. Even when we succeed in flying over obstacles, they still serve as landmarks for our guidance on this planet.

176. Again, it is pure fantasy on the part of those who think they can shape our minds. The stubborn, obstinate facts of history must be recognized. Africa has survived one of the most vile degradations in the history of humanity: the ebony market or the black slave trade. Yet tomorrow it will emerge victorious and with greater vitality than ever; in fact, it is already fighting the final battle for its liberation.

Colonialism and imperialism will be blown away like the morning mist, dispersed by that irresistible wind of which Africa alone knows the secret, which is the thrust and the unshakable aspiration of all our peoples to freedom.

177. That is all I have to say. In discussing all these problems I have sought to avoid acrimony or harshness. We believe that all questions among human beings can be settled if we are all in good faith. The United Nations itself was established on a basis of good faith and it is that faith which we place in each one of you that will give greatness to peoples and ensure friendship and brotherhood among men, so that democracy may survive in a free world.

178. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I call upon the representative of Cuba, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

179. Mr. BISBE (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): During the general debate at the 897th meeting of the General Assembly on 10 October 1960, Mr. Coronado Lira, speaking for the delegation of Guatemala, made a lengthy and abusive complaint in reply to the charges formulated against the Guatemalan Government by Dr. Raúl Roa, our Minister for Foreign Affairs [892nd meeting]. Members of the General Assembly will no doubt have noticed that, in the three verbal exchanges which we have had with the Guatemalan delegation, my delegation has confined itself to exercising its right of reply. Obviously, there is more in these exchanges than meets the eye.

180. What ails the Government of Guatemala? What is it that troubles its conscience and arouses its fears? What is it that makes it see ghosts everywhere and robs it of slumber, producing instead a delirious waking state, in which it sees the vengeance of the people in the phantom figure of Jacobo Arbenz, and expeditions leaving Cuba which never materialize and which, of course, never reach their destination? First, at the 874th meeting on 27 September last, the representative of Guatemala spoke of 2,000 soldiers who were being trained in the Province of Camagüey with a view to invading Guatemala. I denied the fantastic statement, and repeated to this Assembly that the Revolutionary Government of Cuba has said again and again that it is unshakably attached to the principle of non-intervention. I added, without ironical intention: "The representative of Guatemala may rest assured—there are no 2,000 soldiers being trained in Camagüey for an invasion of Guatemala."

181. There was no more talk by the delegation of Guatemala about the 2,000 soldiers in training in Camagüey, and we were happy to have been able to calm the Guatemalan delegation. But The New York Times of 4 October last carried a report that a schooner, flying no flag, and named "La Cubana", had been sighted in Guatemalan territorial waters off the Atlantic coast. According to the report in The New York Times—and the information of the Guatemalan Government goes no further than what is contained in that report—the air force obliged the schooner to withdraw from territorial waters, and it was seen on the following day near the island of Cotzumel, listing to port. We are not surprised that this incident inflamed the sensitive Guatemalan imagination. It was immediately said that the schooner was carrying arms and that its arrival was being awaited by the communists. Another version by the Guatemalan

Government was that the schooner constituted the vanguard of a fleet organized for the purpose of invading Guatemala and overthrowing its Government. We are truly sorry to have to trouble the General Assembly in connexion with this further complaint by Guatemala, but it is necessary to inquire seriously into the substance of this episode. If the schooner was carrying arms, where are the arms? If the schooner was the vanguard of a fleet, where are the other units of the fleet? A quantity of contraband heroin can be hidden in a few suitcases, as was done recently by a Guatemalan diplomat and as was discovered in this city, but a shipment of contraband arms cannot be so easily concealed. As for the fleet, we must suppose that it was swallowed up by the Caribbean, in a spirit of righteous indignation.

182. But it is now no longer a question of the 2,000 soldiers being trained in Camagüey, nor of the schooner and the invasion fleet; now Mr. Coronado Lira tells us of the existence in the Sierra Maestra and the Sierra del Escambray of jet aircraft, manufactured behind the iron curtain and manned by Chinese airmen and Cubans trained by them, of light and heavy tanks and thousands of weapons just received from the USSR, to be used in a war of aggression in the mountains. Is there no limit to the feverish Guatemalan imagination? The Guatemalan representative is not obliged to know our geography, as he claimed that Mr. Roa should know the geography of his country; but if he did know the geography of Cuba, he would not choose our main mountain regions as bases for jet aircraft,

183. It is obvious that all this reflects a state of fear and a fully worked out plan. The present Government of Guatemala, made to the measure of the United States State Department and for its use and convenience, is reduced to the wretched role of a tool of United States policy. Guatemala is afraid, but that is not all. The Guatemalan manoeuvre is a smoke-screen to cover the intention of attacking the Revolutionary Government of Cuba. The ridiculous Guatemalan accusations against our Government are meant to serve as a bridge for the State Department in an attempt to crush the Cuban Revolution. That intention was denounced by Mr. Roa in his reply on 7 October, which I now confirm in full. It is said that there will be an attack from Cuba, because what is really being planned is an attack on Cuba. The expedition which landed near Baracoa and was destroyed a few days ago and the counter-revolutionary force which was defeated in the region of Escambray confirm our assertion. But the attempts will not stop there, as future events will show. Cuba will be not the attacker, but the attacked. We are well aware of that, but unlike Guatemala, we do not lose any sleep over it. We calmly await the enemies within and without who intend to destroy us, secure in the knowledge that we shall triumph.

184. Mr. Coronado Lira is pained that we are always talking about the case of Guatemala. We refer to the overthrow of the democratic government of Jacobo Arbenz in 1954 by the express will, not of the Guatemalan people, but of the United States State Department. These were his words: "We Guatemalans are tired of hearing so much talk about the case of Guatemala, by which it is meant that our country was a victim of aggression on the part of an inter-continental Power" [897th meeting, para. 188]. On that point, I humbly confess, I do nothing for Mr. Coronado Lira and those Guatemalans who think as

he does. Whether they like it nor not, they will have to hear the case of Guatemala mentioned, because that case is already part of the history of Latin America. It is not a matter which will be judged by history, but on which history has already pronounced its final verdict.

185. Shall I recall Guillermo Toriello's powerful book *La Batalla de Guatemala* and trace in its indignant pages, filled with facts and reasoning, the story of the intervention of the United Fruit Company and the United States State Department in the fate of democracy in that sister country; the master plan for crushing a revolution which had dared, like the Cuban revolution, to carry out an agrarian reform and to clash with United States monopolies; the diplomatic manoeuvres of United States imperialism, culminating, at the Tenth Inter-American Conference, in the approval of resolution 93, which, under the pretext of safeguarding the American continent from the intervention of international communism, in fact represented a return to the policy of the big stick on the part of the United States State Department, and was a dangerous manifestation of collective interventionism; the charges made in the Security Council and the non-compliance with Article 53 of the United Nations Charter; and lastly, the armed invasion, prepared and directed by the United States State Department, the treachery of the Guatemalan army officers and the direct participation of Mr. Peurifoy, the Ambassador of the United States, who was seen in battle dress with a .45 revolver under his arm, more actively engaged than Colonel Castillo Armas himself?

186. That history cannot be wiped out, and like it or not, the present delegation of Guatemala must continue to hear it told. What is most annoying to the Ydígoras Government is the fact that the Revolutionary Government of Cuba has given asylum to Jacobo Arbenz, the deposed President of Guatemala. But did not Uruguay first offer him such asylum? Such hospitality is not contrary to, nor does it weaken, Cuba's adherence to the principle of non-intervention. That is clear, positive and final. How is it possible for our Government to participate in expeditionary plans, or in interference in other countries, at the very time when intervention in our own country is tragically imminent? Revolutions, we repeat, are not for export. Their moral repercussions, their example, are another matter—the example of a generation which grew beards in sign of responsibility in beardless times of conformity and petty interests. It is that example which, from the Sierra Maestra, is bound to shake the mighty Andes.

187. I shall not refer to the Guatemala of Mr. Ydígoras, because I do not wish to be called to order, and rightly, by the Chair. I feel, however, that the Chair—and I mean Mr. Boland—was extremely indulgent at the meeting on 10 October last towards the Guatemalan representative, who was called to order only after spending thirty minutes meddling in the affairs of our country. We also, of course, could have much to say about current Guatemalan affairs, but we shall not commit the very fault which we are condemning.

188. The Castro régime has no need to defend or justify itself in the face of the false and ridiculous allegations of the representative of Guatemala. But to contend cynically that the Castro Government originated from a lucky military operation and is maintained

by bayonets is to strain the limits of our patience and good humour. The Castro Government is the product of a revolutionary movement which has succeeded and could only have succeeded because it could rely on the absolute support of the people. It was said that no insurrectionary movement could prevail against a professional army, but Castro destroyed that myth because he had the support of the people. It was also said that no Latin American Government could exist which opposed the designs and dictates of the United States Government; Fidel Castro is destroying that myth also. All this is possible because Fidel Castro has the people behind him. How can it be said that a government which is transforming barracks into schools is maintained by bayonets? Its essentially democratic nature is confirmed by its frequent consultations of the people. Never before has the Cuban people participated so directly in the decisions of the Government. It is no longer an indifferent spectator, but an enthusiastic actor. To the terms of the Declaration of Havana and to Lincoln's definition of democracy—government of the people, by the people and for the people—nothing remains to be added. For a better understanding of the present revolutionary process in Cuba we must make a retrospective analysis, in as short a form as possible, and give a panorama of the international political situation in our country during the past century.

189. From the beginning of the nineteenth century when the first separatist movement appeared, Cuba was a victim of the ambitions of the United States, Britain and France. The European designs for a time frustrated the plans of the United States, which then preferred to maintain the status quo of a Spanish Cuba. From 1809 for almost a century, Cubans struggled by means of plots, rebellions and wars. It eventually became the policy of the United States to obtain Cuba by purchase or annexation. While the other Spanish colonies in America were becoming independent, our independence was delayed as a consequence of foreign ambitions which prevented Cuba from achieving its destiny. Pro-slavery interests and empty hopes of palliative reforms by the absolutist Spanish colonial régime also retarded our independence movement. The Cubans finally came to their great wars of independence, those of 1868-1878 and 1895-1898. When the first war, the so-called ten years war, ended, as our Enrique José Varona observes, "the Cuban had lost economic supremacy and had not attained political power". It is true that this phrase refers especially to the slave-holding land-owners, but it admirably expresses the fundamental difference between the revolutions of 1868 and 1895. In 1895, the Cubans were fighting to obtain political independence, but they had already lost economic control. The revolution preached and directed by José Martí came from the masses, from the humble people, and its main resources were the modest contributions of the Cuban tobacco growers of Tampa and Key West, and of the lower classes, rather than the Cuban aristocracy, which had been for the most part ruined by the previous war.

190. But the will of the Cuban people to win its independence was indomitable. Although the first war of independence ended in the treaty of Zanjón, which was nothing more, and could be nothing more, than a truce between Cuba and Spain, the great General Antonio Maceo reaffirmed in the Mangos de Baraguá

protest that between Cuba and Spain there could be no conciliation or compromise, but only one answer, national independence. During that period there was no change in the trend of United States policy towards Cuba. The United States still preferred a North American Cuba and failing that, a Spanish Cuba, but never a European Cuba, having earlier, for its own purposes and convenience, produced the so-called Monroe Doctrine, which, by the way, had been proposed in August 1823 by Lord Canning, the British Prime Minister. The Monroe Doctrine is a unilateral declaration establishing a form of protectionism which encroaches on the sovereignty of the Latin American Republics, which have never given their consent to it, and it is today without effect and serves no purpose.

191. When victory for the Cuban forces in the last war of independence was already in sight, the Government of the United States, which no longer saw the possibility of purchase or annexation, took advantage of the controversial incident of the sinking of the "Maine" to obtain from Congress the joint resolution of 19 April 1898, to proclaim that Cuba was, and by right should be, free and independent, and to intervene in the war between Cuba and Spain. The Cuban people has always recognized the generous sentiments of the people of the United States, which must not be confused with the intentions and aims of their Government. But that is one thing, and it would be quite a different thing to concede that one of the peoples which have fought hardest for independence owes its independence entirely to the assistance of a third party. What is unacceptable to Cuban sentiment is that the noble purposes proclaimed in the joint resolution were followed by the refusal to allow the Cuban troops of General Calixto Garcia to make a victorious entry into Santiago de Cuba or to give Cuba a place at the Paris Conference where the treaty of peace with Spain was discussed, and, above all, by the imposition of the Platt amendment, which limited our independence.

192. This entire historical process sheds much light on what Cuba is today. We attained political independence on obviously limited terms. Since we did not have economic power, we ceased to be a colony of Spain only to become a colony of the United States. Until the time of the revolution against the tyranny of Machado, apart from a few prophetic voices of illustrious compatriots, the atmosphere we lived in was one of corruption and intrigue. The revolutionary struggle against that tyranny started us on the road to our goals. We had to obtain control of the economy to win full enjoyment of political independence, to attain historical independence in the fullest sense. Many of these ideas and aspirations were incorporated in the Constitution of 1940, but many were left unfulfilled. In fact, more was promised than given. The new generation—the generation of Moncada—was faced not only with the task of overthrowing the tyranny of Batista—that was the easiest task, in spite of its heroic dimensions—but also with that of changing historical reality, and of transforming a colony into a republic. To complete that historic undertaking, to make the leap over half a century of almost sterile republican existence, is the purpose of the revolutionary operation which is now being carried out.

193. That operation was described to this Assembly by our Prime Minister, Fidel Castro [872nd meeting],

in his powerful and comprehensive statement. We believe that we are now in the truly revolutionary phase, in which one historical reality is replaced by another. Our revolutionary process has deep democratic and nationalistic roots. We support socialization and State intervention as methods of erecting a new structure on the old social and economic forms. But we are acting independently. We are not taking shelter behind foreign ideologies or foreign flags. We are our own men. For the first time, we are moving in our own orbit. Those who slander us and misrepresent our revolutionary process are concerned only with their own interests which are affected. But there is no true revolutionary process which does not affect some interests; that is the price which must be paid to achieve the transition from one historical reality to another. The spokesmen of the United States monopolies concerned and their lackeys on the Continent, as well as those Cubans whose interests have also been affected, resort to the worn-out expedient of trying to present us as communists. To those who speak thus, we reaffirm our independence in all spheres. Those who abuse us may be sure of one thing: we have escaped from the orbit of the United States, and we are not going to be drawn into the orbit of any other Power.

194. Without meddling in the problems of the Guatemala of Ydígoras, I have reaffirmed, in reply to the false accusations of the Guatemalan representative, the Cuba of Fidel Castro. That is the positive fact with which we are concerned. Attempts have been made to isolate us politically, and they have not succeeded. Attempts have been made to defeat us through hunger, and they have failed.

195. How can anyone claim that there is intervention by an extra-continental Power when the only real intervention and the only actual aggression come from a continental Power? Do they believe that Latin America is blind? We are not going to allow the corpse of the Monroe Doctrine to stand in our way. We are, first and foremost, men of America. But we live today in a period of close interdependence, of physical, political and moral chain reactions, and neither nations nor continents can remain isolated, because international problems and frictions, wherever they arise, affect us all.

196. Can anyone be unaware of the economic aggression which is expressly condemned by article 16 of the Charter of the Organization of American States? I think it would be appropriate to recall the text of that article: "No State may use or encourage the use of coercive measures of an economic or political character in order to force the sovereign will of another State and obtain from it advantages of any kind." Now what is the reduction of the quota of sugar which the United States had contracted to purchase from us but a typical act of economic aggression, a blow to our most important economic product? Or the ban on the export of United States products to Cuba, which is announced today on the front page of The New York Times, what is it, if not a blatant return to the policy of economic aggression pursued by the colossus of the North to deflect our will and our determination, which nothing can deflect?

197. Cuba's case is laid before the conscience of America and the world. Our faith as Americans is not weakened by the cunning manoeuvres of some

Governments, nor by the injustices and unfair blows which we may suffer. There are some who persist in their refusal to see that the day of the peoples has dawned. "We the peoples of the United Nations", proclaims our Charter. The aspirations of the peoples will one day become those of Governments.

198. The name of José Martí—we care not for the irreverence of the Guatemalan representative—is on our lips and in our hearts. We have modelled ourselves on his words and his example. We know what our national hero thought of the expansion of United States imperialism, which he knew well, because, as he said in his immortal letter to Manuel Mercado, "I lived in the monster and I know its entrails; and David's sling is mine". Martí's thinking permeates the Cuban revolution from its inception to its present manifestations. We proclaim this by stating that for the first time in our history we have a Government which is honouring José Martí by its every action.

199. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The representative of Nepal has indicated that he wishes to make a brief statement in exercise of his right of reply before we conclude our meeting this evening, and I call upon him now.

200. Mr. THAPA (Nepal): I am sorry to intervene at this late hour, but I assure the Assembly that I shall not take more than two minutes.

201. Since Mr. Khrushchev, in his earlier statement, expressed doubt whether we had a parliament in Nepal I have asked to be allowed to speak merely in order to dispel his doubt. I am a member of Parliament myself, so that I think that I am in a position to tell the Assembly that we have a Parliament in Nepal which is elected on the basis of universal adult suffrage. More than one political party is represented there. We have free discussions, and there are four communist members in our House of 109. We follow rules of procedure which apply equally to all members.

202. We were really surprised at what has been going on in this world Assembly for the past two days. We are sorry if we have offended the distinguished Chairman of the Soviet delegation by freely expressing our genuine feeling at what we witnessed. We are a small country and we have no intention of teaching a lesson to anyone. But we have our own conscience and we feel that we are entitled to express what we feel in our judgement freely in this Assembly.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.