

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



1012th  
PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 22 September 1961,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
<i>Speech by Mr. Thiam (Senegal) . . . . .</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Speech by Mr. Nardone (Uruguay) . . . . .</i>	<i>49</i>

**President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).**

## AGENDA ITEM 9

### General debate (continued)

1. Mr. THIAM (Senegal) (translated from French): I need scarcely say what particular joy we Senegalese feel on the occasion of Mr. Slim's illustrious election as President of the General Assembly. The friendship between Senegal and Tunisia is enhanced by a striking identity of views on great world problems and on the methods that our two States have often used to solve them. Our two Heads of State are united by a special bond of friendship. Like many others in this Assembly, I have had occasion to appreciate Mr. Slim's outstanding qualities as a patriot and a fighter for the great African cause, his devotion to the principles of the United Nations Charter and his brilliant distinction as a diplomat. His exceptional intelligence, his balanced judgement and his sense of proportion marked him out quite naturally for the responsibilities which have been entrusted to him at a particularly critical moment in the history of mankind and at the very time when our Assembly has just suffered the cruel loss of our valourous Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjöld. The death of Mr. Hammarskjöld is profoundly felt within these walls. He devoted his entire life to his noble mission. May we at least have the consolation of seeing his loss provoke a reaction and perhaps the beginning of an awakening of conscience and may our present mood of introspection promote the solution of the grave problems which we have to face at this session.
2. It would indeed be superfluous to stress the importance of the sixteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly. Many delicate questions, left in abeyance, now call for urgent solution. Since we dispersed in spring 1961, new difficulties have appeared on the international scene. Apart from the local conflicts which have important international repercussions, the problem of peace has become acute. The process of decolonization, which in 1960 appeared to be well on the way to completion, especially with the emergence of numerous independent African States, still suffering many setbacks. All these complications create a state of permanent tension, with the most unfortunate consequences for the United Nations whose authority and prestige are being progressively undermined.
3. Is it possible to find a satisfactory solution to the great problems on which the future of humanity de-

pends? That is the question with which we are confronted and to which it is the duty of our Assembly to give a reply during the present session.

4. I shall try to present to you, very briefly, Senegal's point of view on these problems. First of all, the question of peace. The basic object of any foreign policy should be the maintenance of peace on our own frontiers and in the world. That, in any event, is the objective of the under-developed countries. On the morrow of independence, faced with all the tasks our economic development demands, our common interest is obviously peace. Peace alone will enable us to avoid dissipating our efforts and to concentrate on what we consider vital for the construction of our young countries and for the improved conditions which our people so sorely need.

5. Independence is for us but a means. The objective we are pursuing is an improvement in our conditions. In view of the great gap, which is becoming even greater, between the two sections of mankind—the rich and the poor—anything that diverts the unfavoured nations from the great tasks before them is obviously to their disadvantage. If we can speak of war at all, it can only be of war against hunger, poverty and ignorance.

6. But it is equally true that even the greatest Powers would have nothing to gain, materially or morally from the outbreak of a new war. As was most aptly pointed out recently by an author who has devoted much attention to this agonizing problem, "any reflection on war is a reflection on the human condition". The magnitude and destructive power of the means that would be brought into play are such that it would be an illusion to think that there would be any victors or vanquished to survive the conflict. It is the existence of all mankind that would be at stake.

"Once", said this author, "perhaps even up to the time of the Second World War, the choice between war and peace made sense. The cost of a war could be balanced against its anticipated results. The total war of 'absolute' nuclear weapons makes nonsense of such a choice. The question of strategic objectives is now obsolete; all regions of the world have become targets.

"The distinction between military and civilian is likewise obsolete. All the people of the world have become combatants, against their wills.

"The distinction between attack and defence is obsolete: the only defence is total attack, and civil defence, even in the framework of war propaganda, is regarded as a joke.

"The distinction between strategic and tactical weapons is now obsolete: if it is still employed, it is because of ignorance of the dialectics of men at war, ignorance of the absolute nature of the new

weapons. Any purely military strategy must be expected to lead to mutual annihilation.

"The specialized knowledge of the military expert is no longer of any meaning in itself: all the problems of war and peace have become political and moral problems....

"We have reached the outermost bourne of the military roads. They no longer lead anywhere but to death. If there is a war, all the nations will collapse.... War has become absurd."

7. Despite this warning, the foreign policies of the great Powers appear to be based, whether deliberately or not, on the prospect of a new war. What seems paradoxical, however, is that we are always hearing about "peace" and "peaceful coexistence". But if we go beyond the spectacular statements, intended for propaganda, in which the word "peace" has become a slogan, the realities are entirely different. How can this need for peace, so often affirmed, be reconciled with the frantic arms race? How is the principle of peaceful coexistence to be reconciled with the persistence of the cold war? The truth is that, in spite of all the protestations of good will, we have never been as far from peace as today. The word "peace", in the minds of those who use it, covers very different realities. That, in our opinion, is the source of all the evil.

8. Seen from a certain angle, peace is simply the maintenance of a situation in which some Power or group of Powers preserves a de facto supremacy, the leading position they have acquired. From the moment that developments in the world tend to modify that de facto supremacy, peace is no longer tolerable, it becomes a danger. This static conception of relative strengths is dangerous to peace. Life is a continuous development, a transformation of the relative strengths among the Powers. This must be calmly admitted, but it need not prevent our making efforts, in a framework of peaceful competition.

9. Unfortunately this state of mind still prevails among certain Powers and it has sometimes been emphasized:

"During the period between the two wars, especially during the 1920's and the 1930's, the possessing countries were all in favour of peace, which meant, if necessary, the maintenance, by means of 'legitimate force', of the status quo, within which they were the strongest .... During the Second World War the Western conservatives, when they spoke of the coming peace, hoped to recover a society comparable to that of the pre-war period."

10. In this state of mind, it would obviously be difficult to admit the appearance of new relative strengths in the world. Any development that might change the status quo creates a situation of tension, the conditions for a new war. Unless this way of thinking is abandoned, the world will be in permanent danger.

11. As against that conception, however, there is another which is no less dangerous. This is the idea that "war is nothing more than the continuation of politics by other means".<sup>1/</sup> Chapozhnikov supplemented this notion in 1920, when he said: "If war is nothing more than the continuation of politics by other means, peace itself is nothing more than the continuation of the struggle by other means". This, as

you see, is the theory of permanent war. Today, not only are the terms "cold war" and "invisible war" in current use, but the idea of permanent war has risen to the height of a political doctrine. That is indeed a singular conception of peace.

12. There is no longer any difference, any basic difference, between peace and war. Peace is distinguishable from war only by the means employed. This definition, like the first, corresponds to a certain attitude towards the problem of relationships between the Powers, but in this case it is not a question of seeking to maintain a status quo, of defending acquired positions, but of extending ideological, political and economic influence.

13. Although these two conceptions characterize different attitudes, they are not fundamentally apart in their results. Whether it is a case of defending acquired positions or of trying to acquire new positions, the result is the same in the presence of the danger threatening us: fear and mistrust establish a policy of war, even though the word "peace" is on everyone's lips. This is reflected in the armaments race and the proliferation of military pacts and alliances. The number of military pacts that have been signed in Europe, Asia, the Middle East and every other part of the world since the end of the Second World War is impressive.

14. And what is peaceful coexistence worth in this context of fear and mistrust? In itself, it is an excellent thing. The question is whether it is not likely to prove illusory or precarious in the presence of the frantic armaments race. The balance between the two blocs may be upset at any moment because of the mass accumulation of means of destruction. The mounting tension and the localized wars that break out here and there in different parts of the world demonstrate the fragile nature of peaceful coexistence. There is no doubt that this tension and these localized wars constitute a constant danger to world peace. Some theorists have already drawn attention to this but they have also discovered what is known as "the deterrent policy", which apparently consists in confronting the aggressor with the threat of his own destruction in order to discourage him to deter him from attacking.

15. We do not think that this policy is enough to create a lasting peace on earth. The possibility of a miscalculation of the adversary's resources can never be ruled out. Furthermore, granting that the deterrent policy may prevent the enemy from embarking upon a generalized war, he will still be able to start local wars with increasing frequency, in order to penetrate the positions at which he is aiming. These localized wars, too, destroy peaceful coexistence. We therefore think that if we really want peaceful coexistence to become a reality we must renounce armaments. That is why our country is interested in any efforts to obtain agreement on disarmament.

16. Obviously, if this is to be done, there must be no more trickery or evasion and this important problem will have to be tackled frankly, without any reservations on either side. We shall, however, revert to this matter on a later occasion during this session.

17. The finding of a solution to the problem of disarmament, however, will not in itself ensure peaceful coexistence. There must also be a radical change of heart.

<sup>1/</sup> Clausewitz, *On War*, 1833.



18. In 1957 Shepilov, who was then Minister for Foreign Affairs and a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, said: "Peaceful co-existence is not a carefree life; it is a struggle—a political, economic, and ideological struggle". The question is whether peaceful coexistence, as thus defined, is such as to do away with the present lamentable world tension. In our view, peaceful coexistence should be free of any taint of cold war, even if the cold war was to be limited to ideological conflicts.

19. Some pertinent remarks were made on the subject by a Yugoslav Ambassador to France in a communication to the International Academy of Diplomacy: "Peaceful and lasting coexistence between States of different political systems implies an atmosphere of mutual tolerance and understanding. The justification for the internal policy of any country is usually to be found in the economic and social structure, the historic traditions and the special conceptions that have taken shape in the course of its gradual development.

20. "History", said the Ambassador, "provided numerous examples of countries whose attempts to copy the political or economic systems of other nations have been doomed to failure. It seems to us that every country must seek its own way of development, the way which will best ensure its prosperity and help it to solve the problems that beset every society. In a world as complex as the one we are living in, with such marked differences in political, social and economic conditions, we must expect to find an ever greater variety in the forms of political and economic organization. If mankind comes to understand the need for these differences, if every country is left to seek its own way untrammelled, this variety may become an element of stability which does not preclude useful and fruitful collaboration in international relations".

21. Coming from a representative of a socialist country, these words are of great significance. They will spare me having to explain at length what our country has always laid down as its permanent line of conduct. After a study of socialism, Senegal has retained the spirit and the methods of socialism. There is no stereotyped solution that is applicable to all socialist countries. Each country must analyse its own situation and using socialist methods find appropriate answers to its own peculiar problems.

22. Thus, as you see, peaceful coexistence presupposes not only complete disarmament but also the renunciation of ideological conflict. Understanding and tolerance are not mere moral concepts; they are positive factors for peace.

23. It is true that quite recently Mr. Khrushchev himself drew a very idyllic picture of peaceful coexistence. "What is peaceful coexistence?" he asked. "In its simplest form it means the renunciation of war as a means for settling matters in dispute. But that", he added, "is by no means all that is implicit in the idea of peaceful coexistence. Apart from commitment to non-aggression, it also means that every State undertakes not to violate the territorial integrity and sovereignty of any other, on any pretext or in any form. The principle of peaceful coexistence means renouncing interference in the internal affairs of other countries for the purpose of changing their regime or mode of life or for any other motive whatsoever. ... In order better to satisfy the needs of

mankind, peaceful coexistence can and must be transformed into peaceful rivalry.... The principle of peaceful existence in no wise required that any State shall renounce the system or ideology it has chosen."

24. What could be fairer and more reassuring? We should, however, have liked this statement to go into the facts. We see world tension mounting dangerously. We see local conflicts, that are further manifestations of the cold war breaking out. The Berlin question has recently taken a turn for the worse and mankind finds itself on the brink of war. We see internal risings in some countries where the two blocs are confronting one another—in Cuba, Korea and Laos, for instance. Arms are being liberally supplied to the opposition movements in some countries—surely a strange way of applying the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. In such a situation, what are we to do?

25. We think that the newly independent States can make a real contribution to the cause of peace, provided that they combine their efforts to that end.

26. The problem is whether, in view of the existing blocs and the persistent danger of world war, the new States can undertake concerted action which might have a decisive effect on the problem of peace. At first sight, such an attempt might seem difficult, but there is no possible alternative. After all, material power is not the only kind that counts. The underdeveloped countries comprise two thirds of mankind and represent an important stake for the imperialist régimes that are appearing here and there. But precisely because they represent such a stake they can, if they wish, bring great weight to bear in world affairs.

27. Viewed in that light, the prospects are not altogether discouraging. It can already be clearly seen that efforts are being made to find a new approach which would be better suited to our circumstances. It happens, very fortunately, that our desire for peace is shared by all the peoples of the earth. And this is a force; it is even, in the last analysis, the only force. We must simply avoid being sidetracked or being deluded. We must judge the great Powers by their deeds and not by their words.

28. Our desire to be independent of the two blocs is expressed by the different countries in formulas which must be carefully scrutinized. Some speak of "positive neutralism", others of "non-commitment" and still others of "non-alignment". What is important, of course, is not the formula but the reality of our independence; we must therefore avoid using ambiguous terms which are open to criticism. When we speak of positive neutralism, we must first remember that it is impossible to be neutral. The course which we have chosen is not a neutral one; it is a political attitude, a specific and positive action, in regard to the problem of peace. We must define our policies not in terms of blocs, for that would be superficial, but in terms of the fundamental problem of peace. We say that we are fierce and stubborn champions of peace and we decide to take action on its behalf. By that very fact we are committed, and that is why the term "non-commitment" is not appropriate either. We are just as committed as the East or the West, but we are committed to objective action for peace, in the universal meaning of that term. Some countries have laid themselves open to criticism because they have not made the meaning of that policy perfectly clear in correct terms. They

are told, if you are neutral and uncommitted, why have you taken a position in such and such a matter? Why have you voted in such and such a way?

29. In reality, the policy which is described by the terms "neutralism" or "non-commitment" is a policy of non-alignment, or rather a policy of non-dependence, since independence is never a final achievement but something that has to be won daily. Before it can become a political reality, independence must first of all be a state of mind.

30. What does this policy of non-alignment or non-dependence amount to in practice? It is a matter of considering each problem that arises independently of the blocs and of adopting an attitude which is consistent with our chosen political system and our commitment to peace. In practice, it may happen that, for this or that problem, our attitude may be the same as that taken by the East or by the West. This is only natural. But in any case, there can be no question of being systematically for one or the other. To take the particular case of Senegal, for example, we voted in favour of including the question of the representation of China in the agenda and we are in favour of admitting mainland China because we still think its admission to the United Nations is a necessity. We shall continue to support the admission of China, which, incidentally, we recognized a few months after we attained independence. On this problem we find ourselves in disagreement with the majority of the Western countries, but on other problems our vote has been completely different from that of the communist bloc, on the problem of Mauritania, for example; we consider that there can be no discrimination in the application of the principle of independence and self-determination.

31. That is what true non-alignment is. By not keeping in close touch with reality, some countries, even among those for which we have the highest esteem, made the mistake during a recent conference of defining what they call "non-commitment" in what we think is a very unobjective way. After laborious discussions, they apparently decided to consider a country "uncommitted" if it had no military bases and was not a member of a pact or a military alliance with either of the two blocs. The weakness of such an argument is obvious. I do not wish to mention any country in particular, for this international rostrum should be the rostrum of peace, but I cannot help thinking that some so-called uncommitted countries which are members of the Balkan Pact,<sup>2/</sup> for example, have military links with other countries which are members of the North Atlantic Treaty.<sup>3/</sup> But, as I said, I do not wish to raise any inflammatory questions here. If we want our policy of peace to be a true policy we must avoid indulging in baseless recriminations. We must cast off resentments and consider nothing but our objectives, which must be resolutely directed towards peace. We must also, of course, ensure that the policy of so-called non-commitment is not simply a mask behind which satellites may hide. The road to peace is a difficult one and requires great courage and loyalty, especially loyalty to oneself.

32. As far as we are concerned, we wish to cooperate in the building of peace with all countries—and there are many of them—which share our anxiety

over the fate of the world and our views on the method of attaining that goal.

33. The method that Senegal believes in was described by its Prime Minister in his statement to the United Nations General Assembly on 8 December 1960 [A/PV.940]. That method consists in the exchange of ideas as a means for settling international problems. It is the patient and persistent search for a just, that is an acceptable, solution. It precludes war and violence. It is the condemnation of the theory that might is right in order to ensure that right alone will prevail.

34. The problem of Berlin, for example, cannot be satisfactorily—which means peacefully—solved without patient negotiations conducted with intelligence and composure. We are in favour of the self-determination of peoples. The ideal solution would have been to permit the whole of the German people freely to determine their future. One day perhaps they may be able to do so. But today the partition of Germany is a fact. We may deplore that fact, but unfortunately that will not change matters. We can trace the course of the events which since 1945 have gradually brought about this state of tension. We can try to allot the blame for the situation, beginning with those who signed the Potsdam Agreement, but that will not change the problem in any way. What we must do is to deal with the situation as it is today, namely the existence of two Germanies. We must recognize the existence of two States and, for the specific problem of Berlin, find a solution which will give that city a status that will allow the Western Powers, and particularly the West Germans, free access to it.

35. That is the course which we think any action for peace should take. I repeat, the maintenance of peace is the fundamental problem of our age. But if we are to establish peace on a lasting basis, we must change our ideas, combat certain habits of thought and place the question of the relations among nations in a new setting which takes account first and foremost, of man's higher interests and his destiny.

36. We must now turn to another problem, that of decolonization. This is a burning question and one connected with the problem of peace, of which it is only one aspect. In our opinion there will be no true peace on earth as long as there are dependent countries and as long as there are peoples who are still under the domination of other peoples by reason of the law of the strong.

37. I shall begin with an affirmation that is also a solemn warning: since decolonization is the great phenomenon of our time, no great Power can hope to retain the friendship of the peoples of the non-aligned world for long or to obtain their co-operation unless it embarks resolutely upon a systematic policy of decolonization. Whether we like it or not, the strength will lie with those of the great Powers who have unequivocally upheld the necessity of decolonization. The people yearn for independence and freedom and will instinctively place themselves on the side of the anti-colonialist Powers or of those who seem to them to be such. In that regard we cannot but regret the attitude taken by some of the greatest Powers during the General Assembly's debate on 14 December 1960 [947th meeting] on the elimination of colonialism. The African and Asian countries had drawn up a draft resolution which was very moderate in wording and realistic in content. Some Powers chose to abstain

<sup>2/</sup> Balkan Pact, signed at Belgrade on 9 August 1954.

<sup>3/</sup> North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Washington on 4 April 1949.



or even to vote against it. That is their business, of course, but they should not be surprised if tomorrow there is a radical change in their relations with the countries of the non-aligned world. We must live with the realities of our time. Colonialism is dead and buried. It is a waste of time to try to resuscitate a corpse.

38. We shall also, of course, be obliged to restrain the fervour of those who wish at all costs to be accounted our best friends. They must come to realize that anti-colonialism must not be merely a slogan or a weapon for use by one bloc against another. Anti-colonialism must not be a mere matter of tactics; it is a profound reality based on respect for certain fundamental values. It transcends the rivalries among certain great Powers.

39. Moreover, decolonization must not be unilateral; it is imperative upon all who hold peoples under their domination. It will serve no purpose to point an accusing finger at others and forget what one should do oneself. That is why we must be very prudent and circumspect, especially in regard to those who wish to gain a certificate of anti-colonialism simply by bandying slogans. A denunciation of colonialism or neo-colonialism implies pure intentions and disinterested action. It is not a matter of saying to one's adversary: "Get out of there so that I can come in". We shall oppose all forms of imperialism, no matter who practises them.

40. Having given this solemn warning, I shall now rapidly refer to a few aspects of decolonization which are of particular moment today.

41. The course of decolonization concerns three interrelated fields: the political, the military and the economic. Political decolonization means the recognition of the right of peoples still under colonial domination to independence and self-determination. This principle has today become a rule of international law which is binding on all. We find it regrettable that some Powers deliberately close their eyes to this obligation. We are thinking in particular of Portugal, whose Government continues to commit revolting crimes in the various Territories placed under its administration. To say that Angola or Guinea are Portuguese provinces is simply naïveté, or more likely stupidity, if not outright cynicism. On the basis of that monstrous idea, the Portuguese Government, in defiance of all the resolutions adopted by the United Nations, is engaged in an unprecedented repression of the peoples of those Territories, with a hysteria which verges on bestiality. Senegal has decided to break off diplomatic relations with Portugal and to grant asylum to the nationalists of so-called Portuguese Guinea who are prevented by this cruel oppression from campaigning in their own country, by normal democratic means, for the attainment of independence and dignity. I think it is high time that States which, like Portugal, refuse to recognize this elementary principle of self-determination should be invited to leave the United Nations, where they are out of place. I explicitly propose that the United Nations should expel Portugal and South Africa.

42. The Charter of the United Nations is based on respect of the human person and the dignity of peoples. I am therefore surprised that a Government such as that of South Africa should be sitting here in our midst. The problem of "apartheid" is an urgent and acute challenge to our consciences. It is truly singular that a State which claims to be modern

should raise racialism to the level of a dogma, in the very middle of the twentieth century. Yet that is what we find in South Africa. In our opinion, the measures adopted so far are inadequate. We should have recourse not only to a general economic and diplomatic boycott but also to more direct measures, in particular, expulsion from the United Nations.

43. The colonial problem is so complex, however, that even if the right to self-determination has been recognized, difficulties may often remain in respect of its implementation and the means of exercising it. The most typical example of this is the deplorable Algerian affair. Although the Algerian people's right to self-determination has been recognized, there have for the last year or more been numerous difficulties in the way of putting this principle into effect. The main problems are the future of the minorities and of the Sahara, both of which directly affect the unity of the Algerian nation and the integrity of its territory. The position adopted by the Government of Senegal and reaffirmed at the recent Conference at Monrovia,<sup>4/</sup> is that the unity and integrity of Algeria must be maintained. The unity of the Algerian nation implies that if this Territory chooses independence—and in my view there is no doubt that it will choose independence—those members of its population who have not acquired Algerian nationality will be aliens. Consequently, they will be unable to claim any political representation unless the Algerian Government grants it to them, which is its own specific right; legally they will not be able to claim it. With regard to personal status, which is of an essentially private character, it will of course be only natural that the aliens—and a fortiori the population of European stock who have acquired Algerian nationality—should have all the necessary safeguards, particularly in respect of freedom of religion, the education of their children, and all questions relating to marriage, divorce and so on. Apart from this reservation, however, the concept of an "organic community" must not imply the guarantee of political rights to an ethnic minority. In any case, it must be recognized that, in view of the present situation in Algeria, the relations existing between the various communities will make the recognition of political rights of minorities an impossibility. To resort to partition as a solution would be to prolong the Algerian conflict indefinitely. The only solution would be that any minority wishing to remain in Algeria should become truly integrated in the national community and take part in the development of the new Algeria, accepting all the ensuing obligations and consequently enjoying all the rights granted to Algerian citizens, including political rights. In Senegal we have followed no other procedure; we have not created a privileged minority. If the Algerian problem is to be solved honestly, to our mind there is no other solution.

44. As regards the integrity of Algerian territory, here also we fail to see what difficulties could arise. In this matter we have an established doctrine, which we expounded in the First Committee [1111th meeting] of the United Nations General Assembly during the debate on Mauritania. From the moment that a colonized territory accedes to independence, its new sovereignty must extend to the boundaries of the former colonial sovereignty. Thus, when we speak of the integrity of Algerian territory, the reference is

<sup>4/</sup> Conference of the Heads of African and Malagasy States, 8-12 May 1961.

obviously to the territory defined and delimited by the administering Power. If we do not give this problem our attention and adopt a uniform doctrine, the apple of discord will be thrown among us young independent States. We think it would be unwise to allow secondary conflicts, particularly territorial claims among ourselves, to distract our attention from the important tasks that await us.

45. The fact that part of the Sahara belongs to Algeria cannot be seriously contested. It matters little whether, at the beginning of the colonial era, Algeria did or did not possess part of the Sahara. We do not wish to enter here into the well-known controversies. The fact is that today Algeria comprises, within its geographical and administrative limits, a part of the Sahara. France has politically established that fact. The Governor-General of Algeria administered as a single entity the departments in the north and the Saharan territories in the south.

46. Furthermore, it is established that, both in the elections to the Algerian Assembly and in the election to the French National Assembly, northern and southern Algeria were represented. As regards representation in the Algerian Assembly, a decree dated 11 March 1948, notifying the electorate included the Saharan territories of the south in the local representation. As to the elections to the National Assembly, an ordinance dated 17 August 1945 and a decree issued on the same day included the Saharan territories of Aïn Sefra, Ghardaïa and the Oases in the parliamentary representation of Algeria. Lastly, it has not been contested that, even in the present conflict, referendums organized in Algeria included consultation of the aforesaid Saharan territories. There is therefore no doubt that the political unity of Algeria should comprise the whole of Algerian territory as administratively delimited and politically established by elections. As regards any possible disputes between Algeria and its immediate neighbours, the parties concerned have decided to settle that problem when the Franco-Algerian conflict is over. We need not therefore speak of them here.

47. Negotiations on the subject of this Saharan part of Algeria should deal only with economic exploitation. Capital has been invested there. There are interests involved which affect both Algeria and France. It should be possible to reach agreement on the methods of exploitation, taking into account all the interests at stake. That, in our view, is the way to a wise and reasonable solution.

48. Thus we have outlined the principle which we think should serve as a basis for any negotiations: no political rights for ethnic minorities, but respect for the personal status of the people belonging to such minorities; and guarantee of fundamental human rights to all aliens living in Algeria. As regards the question of territory, the necessity of respecting the boundaries of Algeria as defined by France—which includes the Saharan territories in the south—must be affirmed. It seems to us that negotiations on these basis should succeed. The only remaining problem would then be that of guaranteeing self-determination. Senegal has always been and still is in favour of direct negotiations for determining such guarantees. This is a position of doctrine and not an attitude dictated by circumstances.

49. Our international policy is based on an ardent desire for peace, and, as I said a moment ago, we consider that discussion is more fruitful than the

language of weapons. And the parties must go to the negotiating table without any kind of preliminary conditions.

50. In the specific case of Algeria, whatever the outcome of the fighting it will be necessary at some stage to come to the negotiating table. Wisdom dictates that a start should be made there, if we wish to put an end to this painful tragedy which has lasted all too long. We have indicated our position clearly on the problems that provoked the breakdown—which we hope is only temporary—of the negotiations at Evian<sup>5/</sup> and Lugrin<sup>6/</sup>; the question of the Sahara and the question of minorities. In reality, these are artificial problems to anyone who cares to examine them objectively. We should like to add one other thing; our Government considers that it would not be advisable to set up a provisional executive in Algeria unless it were accepted by the Algerian people themselves and they took part in its organization and installation. In the present state of affairs, any unilateral action can only prolong a difficult situation and, moreover, would be contrary to the principle of self-determination. A provisional executive can be accepted only if it is the result of free negotiations by the parties to the dispute.

51. As regards the guarantees of self-determination, it is for the parties themselves to reach agreement by means of direct negotiations on those guarantees and the appropriate procedure. We hope that this will be achieved rapidly, for the Algerian affair is truly the most painful episode of colonial history. In any case, we shall give every possible assistance, but if we want to help our Algerian brothers, sincerely and effectively, we must keep a cool head. The Algerian problem is too serious to be used as a pretext for demagoguery. For seven years lives have been sacrificed, numbers of human beings have been wiped out. Unfortunately, it must be said that far too many people have seen in this situation an opportunity to settle accounts with France or an opportunity to give themselves a falsely "leftist" label. This drama, which is causing bloodshed throughout the Maghreb, is not merely a Franco-Algerian drama. It lies on the conscience of each one of us. It involves values and principles of such universality that all mankind is concerned in them. That is why, once again, we appeal to all men of good will, and in particular to those directly concerned, to master their passions and to turn with serenity to the path of peace. Once again, decolonization is the great phenomenon of our time. If we are really convinced of this basic truth, I may even say this obvious truth, no colonial problem should be difficult to resolve. But let us pursue these general considerations on decolonization.

52. As I have said, apart from the political aspect of decolonization there is a military aspect, more specifically the problem of the bases. There again the question is liable to be complicated by East-West antagonism. A particularly vigorous campaign against military bases in foreign countries has been going on for some time. Of course, we must take all the facts into account. This campaign is not free of ulterior motives, especially on the part of those who see in it an opportunity to damage the position of their opponents. We must therefore look at the problem objectively.

<sup>5/</sup> From 20 May to 13 June 1961.

<sup>6/</sup> From 20 to 28 July 1961.

53. The existence of military bases is directly linked to the sovereignty of the State in which they are established. If a State decides, in the full exercise of its sovereignty, to allow military bases to be installed on its territory, that is its own affair; that does not impair its independence in any way. If, on the contrary, the bases are installed in a State against its will, that is obviously an infringement of its sovereignty. The principle is therefore simple. It is in the light of this fundamental rule that all the problems connected with military bases should be solved.

54. In my opinion the question of Bizerta should not have led to a conflict. From the time the Tunisian Government clearly expressed its desire to have the Bizerta base evacuated, there should have been no difficulties in respect of the principle of its evacuation.

55. That is why the Government of Senegal, at the very outset, stated its position on the matter in an official communiqué couched in the following terms:

"The Council of Ministers respectfully salutes the memory of all the civilian and military victims of this terrible tragedy.

"It reaffirms the principle of Tunisian sovereignty over the national territory, including Bizerta.

"It urges the parties to open immediate negotiations, with a view to:

"(1) Proclaiming a cease-fire;

"(2) Proceeding to the evacuation of Bizerta by France, in conformity with the will of the Tunisian people."

56. If the French Government had admitted the principle of evacuation, in conformity with the will of the Tunisian Government, I do not think that the problem of the arrangements for the evacuation would have given rise to major difficulties. Did not President Bourguiba himself speak of establishing a "timetable for evacuation"? But it is clear that there have been delays, to say the least, on the one side, and, as a result, nervous exasperation on the other. What is required for the solution of this problem, the basic features of which are in our opinion, very simple, is strict compliance with the Security Council resolution of 22 July 1961<sup>7</sup> and the opening of negotiations for the evacuation of the base. It is most regrettable that the relations between France and Tunisia should have so deteriorated at the very moment when General de Gaulle and President Bourguiba were making every effort, as we all know, to reach a solution of the Algerian conflict in particularly difficult circumstances.

57. The question of military bases, however, should be considered at a more general level. It is directly linked to the problem of peace and of East-West rivalry. The campaign unleashed by certain Powers against the existence of military bases in foreign countries is not, as I have said, a disinterested endeavour, an action for peace. It is in the nature of a tactical operation, the purpose of which is to dismantle the enemy's positions. Considered in this light, the question should obviously inspire more caution in us.

58. A few years ago a celebrated politician said: "The road to Paris passes through Peking"; later on somebody added that it also passed through Dakar. In other words, all means, even the most indirect, should be used to strike at the opposing bloc. This explains the psychological action that has been going on for some time directed towards the foreign countries in which military bases are established. We are not sure that this action can lead to the desired goal. Only a general agreement on disarmament would make it possible to establish the conditions for lasting peace, and hence to solve the problem of military bases. As things are, all that can be said is that this problem is one of sovereignty. An independent country has the right to authorize or refuse to authorize the existence of foreign bases on its territory. In this respect, no one can dispute the absolute justice, in principle, of Tunisia's position on Bizerta.

59. We must now say a few words on the final aspect of decolonization, namely, its economic aspect. It is superfluous to say that the new States would not be content with a purely formal independence. Yet such would be the case if independence were not very soon followed by profound changes in the economic structure. Here, it is true, we are in a domain where dependence is often less apparent. But let us make no mistake: from the moment that all the formal criteria of independence are present, the new States find themselves at grips with the burning problems of economic development. It is only by revising the economic relations that once bound them to their former metropolitan country that they can cope with those problems.

60. Today, however, the aspects of the problem are changing considerably. The growth of the under-developed countries falls within a context far broader than that of the relations between colonizers and colonized. It is a world problem, of so broad a scope that it concerns not merely the colonizers, or former colonizers, but all the countries which are well ahead in economic development. It would be hard for the cold war to find favourable ground here. East and West assume equal responsibility before the disinherited peoples. In forty years, the earth will be populated by 6,000 million people. Population growth is proceeding at a dizzying pace. It took many centuries to reach the 2,500 million level; it will take less than 50 years more to reach 6,000 million. Unless there is a change in the present situation, three quarters of mankind will be living in poverty, while the other quarter, mostly of the white race—and I emphasize this—will be living in opulence. Thus East and West have a common responsibility in this matter. They can meet it only by agreeing to disarm and to place at the disposal of mankind the capital and the work which today is devoted to the manufacture of atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs. Whether we like it or not, the dispute between West and East is obsolete, or in any case it will very soon be obsolete, probably by the end of the twentieth century.

61. The Marxist theory of the class struggle within a given society will soon be replaced by the conflict between the rich countries and the poor countries. A specialist who has made a particular study of this question said to us: "Make no mistake about it: to an undernourished Indian there is no difference between a French proletarian and a rich Frenchman. The struggle between social classes in the West is fading out. The difference between the level of living of an English bourgeois and that of an English workman is

<sup>7</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Sixteenth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1961, document S/4882.



far less than the gulf that separates the English workman from his Indian counterpart. The starving countries will pass from the status of sub-proletariat to the consciousness of their solidarity in poverty." The clash of ideologies and the conflicts between differing political and economic systems will very soon be a thing of the past. Our salvation lies in the combined efforts of all countries, whether they belong to one bloc or the other, in fighting the battle against hunger.

62. This is the price that must be paid for the peace and stability of the world. Unless this collaboration is established, we must expect to see the present conflicts between different ideologies and different political or economic systems replaced by new conflicts between the rich countries and the poor ones. The principles of Marxist theory would then be very much changed. That is why, in our opinion, a crusade should be undertaken forthwith which, eliminating the cold war, the ideological battles and the conflict of interests, would place itself in the perspective of tomorrow and would begin at once to try to solve this agonizing problem.

63. There can of course be no denying the efforts that have been made during the last few years, especially by the United Nations, to provide assistance to the under-developed countries on an ever-increasing scale. It has been strongly emphasized that such aid must be free from every trace of political interest. Obviously there would be no point in condemning colonialism if assistance to the under-developed countries were to serve as an indirect means for the introduction of a new colonialism, more hateful than its prototype. That is why we whole-heartedly support the idea of multilateral aid. We shall revert to this important problem during the economic discussions. There are a number of measures that we consider essential, not only in relation to aid, but also in relation to guarantees for investments and the necessary stabilization of commodity prices.

64. Under-development is the most agonizing problem of our day. If we wish to resolve it, we must undertake an immediate crusade, placing the problem in its true context, which is not exclusively colonial, at least in the classical sense of the word. The true problem is increasingly becoming that of hunger. Once again, confronted by this problem, the whole of mankind is equally involved. No one can evade it, neither East nor West, neither the colonialists nor the anti-colonialists. What is involved here, beyond all the transitory conflicts, is the permanent interest of mankind.

65. In this immense effort, the United Nations has a primary role to play. In spite of its weaknesses and its inadequacies, no one can gainsay the great contribution the United Nations has made to the progress of mankind since the end of the Second World War. Whether in the matter of peace, of decolonization or of economic development, the United Nations has marked out new roads and worked out principles whose human and universal value no longer requires emphasis.

66. That is why, as we have already said from this rostrum on a different occasion, we are particularly interested in any effort to strengthen the United Nations, to endow it with more authority and more resources, to correct its weaknesses—which, it must be admitted, are our own weaknesses. In that same

spirit, we oppose any action designed to jeopardize its existence or to impair its authority.

67. Various trends are becoming manifest in this respect and they merit our most careful attention. While the non-aligned countries, as a whole, favour the maintenance and strengthening of the United Nations, others, for reasons we cannot fathom, are adopting a highly disturbing attitude. Some absent themselves from our proceedings; others attend, but in a negative or hostile spirit, while yet others are perfectly willing for the United Nations to continue so long as it becomes or remains a tool of their policy.

68. Mr. Khrushchev, the Head of the USSR Government, admitted, in a major speech made before the General Assembly at its fourteenth session:

"... not all the States Members of the United Nations have the necessary respect for that body, in which mankind places so many hopes. Instead of consistently supporting the authority of the United Nations, so that it will really be the most authoritative international organ and the Governments of all countries will always come to it when they have to solve vitally important problems, some States try to exploit it in their own narrow interests. An international organization cannot, of course, act effectively on behalf of peace if within it there is a group of countries whose policy is to impose the will of certain States upon others. A policy of this kind will undermine the foundations of the United Nations. If matters continue to develop in this direction—in the direction of what might be called factionalism—the result will be to make relations between States worse rather than better. The United Nations will be transformed from a body expressing the interests of all its Members into an organ of a group of States, pursuing the policy of that group rather than the policy of ensuring peace throughout the world. The first result of this will be to engender a lack of respect for the United Nations; but subsequently it may lead to the disintegration of the Organization, as happened in the earlier case of the League of Nations." [799th meeting, para. 98.]

69. While we are in agreement with these remarks, we have reservations about the proposals of the Soviet Union for the reorganization of the United Nations, and especially those relating to the powers of the Secretary-General. Reasons of principle play as important a part in our attitude as do practical considerations. To ask for the executive organ of the Secretariat to be composed of officials representing the countries of the East and the West and the neutral countries is to overlook the fact that representation in the United Nations is based on States, not on ideological groups. Moreover, while it would be relatively easy for both the East and the West to find a common representative for their group, would it be the same for those customarily termed neutrals? And, even assuming that were possible, would not such neutrals run the risk of very soon ceasing to be neutral? Would they not be accused of having become partisans? In practice, moreover, such a solution would be likely to paralyse the action of the United Nations, for it would be a source of delay in the implementation of decisions and a source of disputes.

70. As things are today, the General Assembly has the right of control over the actions of the Secretary-General. If this right has not always been exercised, it is the Assembly's own fault, let us admit it frankly. If the Secretariat has gradually encroached on the



powers of the Assembly, it has been because the Assembly has allowed itself to be dispossessed. Instead of keeping to its purely administrative role, the Secretariat has progressively become a political organ. But that is the fault of the Assembly, which has not always effectively assumed its political responsibilities. The example of the Congo is very illuminating in this respect. It has never been possible to reach a general agreement on the meaning of the United Nations mission in the Congo and on the precise nature and limits of its action. So true is this that some countries have refused to share in financing the United Nations operation in the Congo and the question will arise again, even more acutely, when it comes to the Katanga expedition. The Secretary-General has been the scapegoat blamed for action that was merely the consequence of our own dereliction. He has been left to act as he thought fit, because our discussions rarely ended in definite actions; because sniping between the great Powers—and, I must admit, between the small ones like ourselves—over the question of the Congo consistently prevented agreement on any specific point. For want of clear-cut decisions, the Secretary-General was very often compelled to fill our place. We sincerely think that this evil will not be remedied simply by installing a three-headed Secretariat. The reform should be designed to separate the administrative functions very clearly from the political functions. The Secretariat must become a strictly administrative organ, whose duty it is to ensure the internal operation—I repeat, internal—of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. The political responsibility must be assumed by the General Assembly or by the Security Council.

71. We think that this procedure will make it possible to avoid leaving everything in the hands of a single all-powerful personage, while the General Assembly continues to be a precinct where, for the most part, only verbal furies are unleashed. If the Assembly really assumed its responsibilities, and if its officers took the implementation of its decisions in hand, we think everyone would be satisfied and above all, the advocates of the "troika". What they really want is to prevent one single person from taking over all the responsibilities of the executive. If a special committee were set up to attend to the implementation of the Assembly's decisions, we think their demands would be satisfied.

72. Of course all these are merely suggestions. A more detailed technical study would certainly be necessary. In any case, it seems to us that if the Secretariat were deprived of all political functions, there would no longer be any reason to oppose the idea of a single Secretary-General.

73. We also feel, but in a different context, that the right of veto should be abolished. I understand the reasons advanced by certain States for its retention. They fear that a group of Powers, having a majority, might utilize that majority to obtain decisions to their own advantage. But it must be said that the United Nations is no longer what it was when it was founded and will become less and less so—i.e., it is no longer an Assembly in which, in practice, two great opposing blocs confront each other. The presence of the non-aligned world in this Assembly has brought about a great change in the facts of the problem. We must not allow the fear of doing an injustice to lead us to commit even greater injustices. The veto is responsible for the non-admission of continental China and of

Mauritania. It is coming more and more to be a weapon of the cold war, and this makes it dangerous. Although the unanimity rule does allow of the effective solution of some problems once general agreement has been reached, in most cases it paralyzes the Assembly. It allows disputes to drag on unsettled, becoming worse, and consequently to develop into threats to peace.

74. Finally, there is one more problem which it is the imperative duty of the Assembly to resolve during the present session. I refer to the enlargement of the Security Council and of the Economic and Social Council. As we have already said, these two organs should reflect the new composition of the Assembly by including representatives of the Asian and African continents. This question, which was skilfully evaded last year, should be solved before the end of the sixteenth session. This is a test. One cannot claim to be the friend of the small Powers and yet act against their most obvious interests. When all is said and done, our membership in the Security Council is not only in our own interest but also, and above all, in the general interest. The cold war paralyzes everything, prevents the United Nations from functioning normally, reduces the debates in the Security Council to a dialogue of the deaf. The great ones of this world are most decidedly not the wise men of this world. If they fail to understand the role that the small Powers can play in the world balance of power, and if they persist in their formidable obstinacy, the world will be heading in a dangerous direction that may be fatal to the human race. A well-informed journalist wrote, a few days ago:

"If the great Powers were to persist in their refusal to respond to the vague longings of all peoples for an organization capable of laying down the law, defending their independence and promoting their welfare, the United Nations would sink into incoherence and impotence. In that event international relations would be based on force alone, through the fault of those great Powers that are called reasonable; and human society, assuming it escaped a war of annihilation between East and West, would be doomed to anarchy and to the most varied forms of economic or ideological slavery."

75. It is in the consciousness of that danger that we are making tremendous efforts to prevent the United Nations from foundering in the storm unleashed by the powerful ones of this world. The future of the United Nations is the future of mankind. That is why, more than ever before, we shall fight to the limit of our strength, for we know that our own fate is linked to that of this great Organization of peoples.

76. These are the reflexions that my delegation wanted to present at the opening of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly, a session which is proving to be of particular importance. I said at the beginning of this statement that since we dispersed in the spring of 1961 a number of difficult and alarming questions have appeared on the international scene. Peace itself is at stake and without peace none of the dreams of the twentieth century can be realized. Yet despite the difficulties, the perils and the dangers, we are still confident of the final triumph of man and of the values he represents.

77. Mr. NARDONE (Uruguay) (translated from Spanish): The delegation of Uruguay shares the feeling of satisfaction with which the unanimous election of the President of this Assembly was received. His

many personal virtues, which have already been justly praised, permit us to hope that under his wise direction the discussions initiated here will lead to positive results. It is the fervent hope of my delegation that this may be so.

78. The President is assuming this office—which is both an honour and a burden—at a time when to the anxiety caused in the world by international tensions has been added the grief felt at the tragic loss of the Secretary-General, Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, and some of the United Nations most loyal workers. The delegation of Uruguay wishes to associate itself with the tributes which have been paid to them and bows in reverent memory of these people and of all the others who have given their lives, and who until a few hours ago were still giving their lives, to the service of the lofty ideals of the United Nations.

79. The uppermost concern in our minds today is peace—not that there has ever been any time when peace was not the ultimate objective of this community of nations. The United Nations was created in order to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind. Its paramount objective is peace and its working principle is the creation of the necessary conditions for the maintenance of international security. If carefully considered, the other activities carried out by the Organization, in the exercise of a competence which is today considerably broader than it was in its early days, are, despite all their importance, nothing but tools or means the better to further this supreme cause of peace.

80. Today, here and now, this peace is in peril. The United Nations is at a difficult—we might almost say crucial—moment of its history. A challenge has been issued and this challenge affects us all, because in the last analysis we are all united in the same destiny, tragic as that destiny may be.

81. Even less can those fail to recognize this, who represent nations whose greatness is not measured by the number of army divisions, but by the strength of their spirit, the wisdom of their institutions and the exercise of the civil virtues of tolerance and concord. For small nations, indeed, world peace is a singularly precious thing. Other nations may, with more or less success, venture forth on the stormy seas of war. For small nations there is no choice. Peace is a precondition of their survival, since only in conditions of genuine peace can they fulfil their ineluctable mission of ensuring the happiness of their citizens.

82. For that reason, the small countries have a special right to make their voices heard and their will felt in the decisions of the Assembly. If those who talk about a family of nations and a universal community of peoples are sincere, they must recognize that the clamour of those nations, regardless of the military power behind them, is the expression of the general will, the will of the peoples, which—as the wise saying has it—is the will of God.

83. I have not said these things on the spur of the moment. My country, Uruguay, is small if it is measured in terms of military or economic power, but as it happens, its spirit, the spirit of its people, is one of total dedication to the cause of peace and justice. Perhaps its Spanish heritage gave our people a special feeling for great universal causes, a sense of

mission—and by definition a mission must be carried out for the general benefit—like that which at one time was the glory and splendour of the mother country; perhaps as a result of its painful struggle for independence, which was prolonged beyond the date of its formal recognition, it came to feel more than others the need for a world governed by rules of peaceful coexistence. Be that as it may, it reaffirms today its faith in the principles which it has always professed: pacific settlement of disputes, the virtues of arbitration, respect for the rules of international law and ethics.

84. It would take too long to list the series of real difficulties which today oppose this universal cry for peace and keep the world in that intermediate stage, the cold war, with its consequences of distrust, fear and suspicion; it would take too long and it would really be pointless, if you stop to think that conflict, as expression of opposition of interests, seems to be the very essence of international life, just as occurs within a national society in encounters between individuals. The greatest difficulty is not the existence of the conflict itself, however serious that might appear to be. The greatest difficulty is the fact that, in spite of the tremendous progress made during the last decade, international society has not yet found the proper tools for its solution. The reason for this is basically simple: the international community lacks any deep awareness of its unity, even as its members lack awareness of their condition as such, that is to say, of being parts of a whole; it lacks the unconditional acceptance of the idea of the common weal, common to all mankind, on which the welfare of each of its members ultimately depends. The dissolution of the Christian community, which occurred several centuries ago, caused the West to lose that awareness of its fundamental unity and as a result we have lost the only common ground in which discussion and argument could take place. Every nation began to consider itself an end in itself, to practise an egoism it regarded as sacred, and to accept reasons of State as a rule and standard for its actions. With the disappearance of the common ground of beliefs and values which constituted the bulwark of our civilization, there was no longer anything to stop the enslaving development of a policy of force, which, based on the idea of unlimited sovereignty bound by no ethical rule, was to lead mankind to the serious catastrophes of the present century.

85. The physical traces of those ravages had been gradually erased, but their spiritual effects remain. In these vast regions of the globe, the values of Christian civilization, which in the last analysis are the values of man, whatever the civilization to which he belongs, are in danger. In these conditions, it must be admitted, the gulf has widened and it has become more difficult for nations to talk to one another. For it is obvious that the goal of peace cannot be attained at the cost of those very values which give peace its meaning.

86. If we work hard for peace, if we are willing to spare no effort to achieve it, it is because peace is the prerequisite for a life that can be led in dignity and freedom. There can be no peace at the cost of human dignity. Peace, it must be remembered, is not an end in itself: it is only a means to the ultimate end, which is human happiness, the fullness of a free life. For this reason, we could never morally agree to a so-called peaceful coexistence which meant the acceptance or recognition of the slavery of peoples



and nations. Such make-believe peaceful coexistence is not peace; it is a tragic counterfeit of peace. For if peace presupposes order, that order must be one of liberty and justice. Justice and peace are inseparable. Peace is the handiwork of justice.

87. Therefore, the contribution of our peoples to the cause of peace will be judged by the extent to which we are able to establish the prerequisites for justice in the world. Since justice still consists essentially in the old idea of giving to each his own, it presupposes, in the international order, the recognition of two fundamental principles.

88. The first is that every nation, as well as every individual in every nation, must have opportunities for free self-determination. This is the principle of self-determination which, in reference to citizens, means simply the enjoyment, by each of them, of their natural rights, inherent in their condition as human beings, and which, with reference to nations, means that each of them must be assured of independence, sovereignty and equality.

89. My country has been particularly aware of these problems. At conferences, in assemblies, and through various proposals, we have tirelessly endeavoured to work out an effective system for protecting human rights which, without undermining the sovereignty of States, would bring about conditions ensuring the full exercise of those rights.

90. Much ground still remains to be covered. If we recall that the United Nations receives thousands of petitions every year denouncing the violation of rights in every part of the world, and that the United Nations can do nothing more than place them in its files, it is obvious that what we have been doing until now is far from satisfying the deeply felt, although possibly premature, hopes of the world's oppressed. Nevertheless, as stated in the Preamble of the Paris Declaration,<sup>8/</sup> recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace.

91. Where nations are concerned, I wish to recall here that Uruguay, like its sister republics in the Americas, was born under the sign of self-determination. For that reason, we have joyfully welcomed in recent years the accession to independence of the subjugated peoples of Africa and Asia. For us, self-determination is a part of our very being, and we can no more renounce it than we can renounce ourselves.

92. In our inter-American commitments we have emphatically affirmed the absolute right of peoples to be masters of their own destinies, freely to choose their own political institutions, to achieve economic independence, and to live their own social and cultural life without any direct or indirect interference by any State or group of States, and more particularly without the intrusion of any form of totalitarianism. My country will remain true to that principle, whatever difficulties its application may involve in specific circumstances.

93. Secondly, as a logical corollary—since after all this is no more than a means for the effective exercise of self-determination—my country once again reaffirms from this high rostrum the principle of non-intervention, which is the keystone of the Charter

and of our inter-American system, and a safeguard of the sovereignty and integrity of peoples. Perhaps the reaffirmation of the unconditional validity of that principle is more necessary than ever today, when the classic forms of violence have given way to the underhanded methods of revolutionary war, fomented from abroad, and aimed at dominating countries by weakening their moral fibre, destroying their religion and traditional beliefs, undermining their economies, disorganizing their production and subverting their internal systems.

94. But justice, the very core and foundation of peace, is not confined to the defence of individual and collective freedoms. Although freedom is indispensable for the full development of the human personality, the human condition requires primary attention to physical needs. Without the life of the body, there can be no life of the spirit, of which the former is a vehicle and instrument. It is there that freedom must begin, in freedom from want, from ignorance, and from the despair which follows in the wake of want and ignorance. If democracy is to triumph and endure, it must be complete and genuine, and it must be a social democracy, for its purpose—and therein lies its greatness—is nothing less than the complete happiness of mankind.

95. Today we are experiencing the last effects of the great industrial revolution which, by increasing the productivity of labour and hence the total output, enabled the broad masses to enjoy the material and cultural benefits of civilization which had hitherto been reserved for a very small minority. The accession of the "fourth estate" to levels of living which had formerly been reserved for the élite, the demand of these broad masses for a more equitable distribution of wealth among all classes of society, their logical claim to participation in government, all these are, fortunately, irrevocable facts which no reactionary political or social philosophy could, at this stage, fail to take into account.

96. But the satisfaction of these minimum requirements of social justice, the participation of all members of society in the enjoyment of the material and cultural benefits of civilization, which has been made possible today by the mechanical revolution of our time, cannot be brought about in isolation by each one of our political communities, and particularly by the great majority which belongs to the so-called underdeveloped world. The close inter-dependence in which nations must live today; the inadequacy of natural resources or of the capital needed to exploit them; the economic colonialism under which many countries are still merely the bread-baskets, the producers of raw materials of the industrial Powers; the enormous difficulties encountered by these countries in promoting their industrial development, except at the cost of sacrificing the present generations; the low productivity of labour in vast areas of the world, which makes it impossible for those areas to compete in the world price market, except through expensive subsidies which are paid for, in the last analysis, by the working classes: all these and other factors make greater and closer co-operation among nations absolutely essential. For, just as within each society the callous concentration of wealth in the hands of a few has deprived the masses of their natural right to use and enjoy goods which exist for the use and enjoyment of all, a similar process has been taking place within the international society itself, which has thus been divided into prosperous and

<sup>8/</sup> See Universal Declaration of Human Rights, first paragraph of the Preamble.



powerful nations and nations that are weak and poor. The problem of the equitable distribution of wealth, the problem of the social function of property, now arises at the world level; and the same reasons which justify those who are fighting for equitable distribution within their own nations also justify the demand of the under-developed countries for broad and comprehensive assistance from the industrialized countries. It must be understood once and for all, if disaster is not to befall all of us, that such co-operation is not a generous donation, nor is requesting it the act of a beggar. If we are truly members of an international community, if there is a basic solidarity among all human beings by reason of their origin, nature and destiny, then the highly developed nations have a natural legal duty to come to the aid of their brothers who are fighting against the handicaps of poverty, disease and ignorance. It would be an irreparable mistake for the Western world to which we belong to allow this revolutionary process, which is inexorably advancing in all parts of the world to go on being exploited, as it has been up to now, by other blocs which, having nothing to lose, play it as their trump card. Our duty as Westerners—and in the final analysis the idea of social justice is a Western idea—is to identify ourselves with this great revolution of our time, to encourage it and to place ourselves at its head.

97. Today we can note with satisfaction that the first steps towards that great goal have already been taken. In my own country, at the historic conference of Punta del Este, the American republics, in an example of co-operation without parallel in history, agreed to form an Alliance for Progress, with a view to securing for their peoples, in freedom and within the framework of democratic institutions, better and fairer levels of living, accelerating their economic and social development, ensuring adequate remuneration for labour, and eradicating poverty, illiteracy and disease once and for all.

98. The struggle for justice, which is the struggle for peace, has its appropriate place within this Organization. Even to the most skeptical mind, the results achieved during these past fifteen years cannot but be regarded as furthering the cause of peace. What the United Nations had done during this period and, what is perhaps even more important, what it

has succeeded in preventing from being done—a role none the less vital because negative—justifies in good measure, together with the advances made in the economic, social and humanitarian fields, the hopes which the world has placed in it.

99. It is true that the United Nations has neither changed the basic elements in the conflict between the two blocs into which the world is today divided, nor altered the essential pattern of international politics in our time. Perhaps so ambitious a project was not part of the original plan for its creation. But it has helped those two blocs to communicate with each other, it has thrown a bridge across the gap which, however fragile it may appear at this moment, is still a bridge, a possibility and a hope.

100. Our primary task is precisely to avoid the continuation of the policy of blocs within the United Nations, our task is to foster a kind of "esprit de corps" in all its Members, and more especially among the great Powers. For to admit that the division of the United Nations into rigid blocs is something which cannot be helped would be to admit that the United Nations, which proclaims itself to be united, is disunited, and that would be the height of absurdity. We must at least exhaust the rich possibilities which the United Nations offers as a means for the pacific settlement of disputes on a basis of rectitude and loyalty in our intentions and proceedings, and in full awareness of belonging to an Organization which is an entity having its own purposes, and the preservation of which is a matter of interest and concern to us all. In this domain, the small and medium-sized nations are in a position to play an important role. If, as I said, we could never agree that the so-called "peaceful co-existence" as it has been proclaimed in actions and intentions is morally defensible, we can, nevertheless, take it as a point of departure and a reality on which we can begin to build a genuine policy of peace. When the only alternative to negotiations, talks and meetings is total war, the choice does not appear difficult. In any case, to succeed in delaying a conflict is, to a certain extent, to help to solve it. For the future no longer belongs to man: it belongs only to God.

*The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.*