

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1025th
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 4 October 1961,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
Speech by Mr. McIntosh (New Zealand) . . .	235
Speech by Mr. Bocoum (Mali)	238
Speech by Mr. Milla Bermúdez (Honduras) .	242
Speech by Mr. Krishna Menon (India)	244
Statement by the representative of Portugal	256

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued).

1. Mr. McINTOSH (New Zealand): Before beginning my statement may I extend to Mr. Slim the congratulations of the New Zealand delegation on his election to the presidency of the Assembly. We are fully confident that under his guidance, characterized by wisdom, patience and impartiality, the sixteenth session of the General Assembly will be greatly assisted in the completion of its manifold tasks in a manner which will redound to its credit and, we trust and pray, to the lasting benefit of the peoples of the world.

2. It is hardly necessary to remind ourselves that we are here primarily to preserve peace and security, threatened by the continued failure of disarmament negotiations, by the resumption of nuclear tests, by the crisis over Berlin, by the dangerous deterioration in Laos and South Viet-Nam, by the unresolved question of the representation of China, by the intractability of Middle Eastern problems, and by certain inflammatory racial and colonial questions. Now following the tragic and untimely death of the Secretary-General, these threats are compounded by intensified efforts to undermine the international character and independence of the United Nations itself. One need not catalogue the host of other unsolved problems familiar to all Assembly Members and so ably referred to by previous speakers—problems likely at any time to endanger world peace and security.

3. Even a world so inured and case-hardened to the recurrence of crises must realize with fearful anxiety that there persists the real danger of a rupture at any moment, whether through miscalculation or mischance, with fatal consequences for mankind. New Zealand shares that anxiety.

4. Like other small countries, New Zealand has long seen its best hope of security, and the best hope for peace and progress, in world-wide co-operation among nations. This lesson, first learnt in war, has been reinforced by developments since 1945. It is true that the need for common action and solidarity has received some concrete recognition especially in the economic and social fields. But there have also been disturbing tendencies in the opposite direction.

5. Chief among these is the failure of the great Powers and the world community to reach agreement on "disarmament and the regulation of armaments", as envisaged by Article 11 of the Charter. The armaments race, with a nuclear holocaust as its only prize, continues unabated. Some glimmers of hope have recently appeared: the agreement of the USSR and the United States on broad principles to govern disarmament; the publication by the United States of the most comprehensive disarmament plan yet conceived, placing the attainment of the final objective of general and complete disarmament in the framework of a continuous sequence of logical stages, each with appropriate machinery for international inspection and control. But agreement on broad principles is only a beginning; this session of the General Assembly must build upon this achievement and do all it can to ensure that some disarmament machinery is put in motion as soon as possible, and that future negotiations on this urgent and vital issue do not proceed, as they have done hitherto, in an erratic and fitful manner. This is a responsibility which is shared by all Members of this Organization, not only the great Powers. If we fail, the world will fail with us.

6. The resumption of nuclear tests has been as great a shock to New Zealand as to other Member States. This is especially so in respect of those tests which are currently being conducted in the atmosphere, with utter contempt for world opinion and with dire hazards to world health, and which, to add infamy to injury, began while negotiations on a treaty to ban such tests were still proceeding and just before a meeting of statesmen from non-aligned countries. In the opinion of my Government, a treaty to ban tests and to enforce this ban by international supervision, must be concluded without further delay. It cannot await the overlong-delayed agreement on comprehensive measures of disarmament. Co-operation in the more limited sphere should surely be more easy to achieve than co-operation in the wider, more complex one. The people of the world have a right to expect that a step such as this, which recent negotiations have demonstrated to be clearly feasible and practicable, should be taken immediately.

7. The renewal of threats and the creation of yet a further crisis over Berlin is another retrograde and dangerously reckless step. The freedom of the people of West Berlin must be respected and, in present circumstances, this freedom can have no sure guarantee without agreement among the four great Powers. Rights of free access to the city must be similarly protected if freedom is not to prove a sham. Negotiations on these matters should begin immediately and take into account the legitimate wishes of the people of Berlin and of Germany concerning their own future.

8. Small countries, confronted with problems such as these, must be dismayed at the increasing failure to respect international law and the rights of others.

Some tension, some conflict, perhaps, between universal values and the solution of immediate problems is probably in the very nature of things. But if we are to achieve a disarmed world we can do so only if there is respect for law and order, and a corresponding willingness to fulfil the obligations and responsibilities inherent in international co-operation. These were the ideals which inspired those who in 1945 founded this Organization and sought to furnish it with an international and impartial civil service.

9. Most of these founders came from small, militarily weak countries such as my own. They wished to substitute for physical power, based on brute strength and actuated by self-interest, legal and moral sanctions of universal validity. While recognizing the special interests of the great Powers, and the need for sanctions to be backed in the last resort by force, they strove to substitute for anarchy, and the rule of the physically strong, a true and lasting international order in which all sovereign States possessed equal rights.

10. Unhappily, the full realization of this ideal has so far proved impossible. The world has become polarized between two great forces. On the one hand, there is an expansionist bloc based on a totalitarian ideology. On the other is a loosely-knit group of highly developed countries, ready and willing to share their wealth and technical skills with less fortunate peoples. It is from the latter group that the United Nations has drawn its main financial support and much of its political strength. But it is on the numerous smaller, weaker nations that this Organization depends so greatly for its moral influence, and, indeed, its survival.

11. Today, fifteen years after the Charter was written, we still find States and political groups based on force, or organized according to false concepts of racial, cultural or ideological superiority. Those colonial systems, traditional or otherwise, which are not already in the process of dissolution, have become anachronistic. If the ideals of the United Nations are right, the days of such systems are numbered. More and more are being steadily transformed, as is apparent from a glance round the Assembly. Where dangerous impediments still exist, it is our responsibility to do what we can, within the limits of our powers under the Charter, to see that political development is peaceful and rapid and that it takes place, in Africa and elsewhere, in the conditions most likely to advance the welfare of the peoples concerned and the international community as a whole.

12. In the midst of political turmoil, the strength and authority of the United Nations are of paramount importance. The more the sense of community among Member States is strained, the more important it is to safeguard the machinery of international co-operation. The Organization can, however, only be as strong as its executive arm. New Zealand firmly opposes any weakening of that executive. This is one reason why we must reject the paralyzing device of the "troika" and its variants. But such an idea is also unacceptable in principle, because it is the repudiation of the whole concept of an international impartial authority for which we have worked so long. Small countries, in particular, cannot and must not allow such an authority to be destroyed, impaired or even called into question; nor, in this nuclear age, can great Powers—although some in their pride appear at times to forget this basic truth.

13. I would emphasize that this is an urgent and crucial matter, not only for the small Powers themselves, but also for the proper functioning of the United Nations. Nor is it a new problem. Those of us who were at the San Francisco Conference in 1945 well remember the long and acrimonious discussions on the Soviet proposals, supported by the other sponsoring Powers, for the provision of four or five Deputy Secretaries-General appointed by the Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council. This was stoutly resisted by the smaller Powers because they believed that these Deputies, having received their mandate like the Secretary-General himself from the Assembly and Security Council, would have constituted a kind of "corps diplomatique" at the head of the Secretariat. To have such a group was not, it was felt, the way to secure an efficient and loyal administration. The disastrous experience of the League of Nations in its latter years was ample proof of this. Repeated votes were taken on these amendments at San Francisco, and, although the sponsoring Powers succeeded in obtaining majorities, they failed, thanks to the solid opposition put up by the smaller Powers, to obtain the necessary two thirds and the proposals were rejected. It is to be hoped that small Power solidarity can be maintained to ensure the preservation of a principle which is as valid today as it was in 1945.

14. The late Secretary-General, to whose memory and immense services to mankind the Government and people of New Zealand join in paying their solemn tribute, pointed out in the introduction [A/4800/Add.1] to his last annual report on the work of the Organization that:

"... there is no contradiction at all between a demand for a truly international Secretariat and a demand, found in the Charter itself, for as wide a 'geographical' distribution of posts within the Secretariat as possible".

Wider geographical distribution of staff is essential and can, in fact, enhance the impartiality of the Secretariat. But this, as Mr. Hammarskjöld pointed out, is something entirely different from an equal representation of ideologies or arbitrarily defined political trends. Article 100 of the Charter—included, I would repeat, at the insistence of small countries like New Zealand, against great Power opposition—clearly provides for the protection and maintenance of the international character of the Secretariat and expressly prohibits Governments from seeking to influence staff members. The high principles set forth in this Article, which have been observed so faithfully by members of the Secretariat, must not be sacrificed to the untenable proposition that there is no such thing as a neutral man.

15. It has been observed many times in this hall, and as recently as on Monday [1020th meeting] by the representative of Ethiopia, that the United Nations exists essentially for the protection of the smaller nations. But what happens when the United Nations itself is threatened? At this critical moment the smaller Member States must ask, not what the United Nations can do for them, but what they can do for the United Nations. While the small countries can act as conciliators and catalysts, they must take care that they do not conciliate at the expense of the United Nations itself. Nevertheless, they can do much to introduce a hopeful element of tolerance and flexibility in the conduct of international affairs. In their own way, they can sometimes set a good example by showing re-

straint and by scrupulously discharging their duties under the Charter. This New Zealand has tried to do, by paying its dues; by contributing to programmes of relief, welfare and development outside the regular budget; by contributing its share, in sadly limited company, to "peace-keeping" operations; and by bringing its Trust Territory of Western Samoa to independence this year.

16. Smaller States can also play a major role in easing the tension which sometimes arises between the principle of universality embodied in the United Nations and the inclination to seek the closer comfort of a regional grouping. This problem, exacerbated by the political divisions which have been imported into this Organization, has become especially significant for many newly independent and less developed States.

17. New Zealand has consistently upheld a universal approach to world problems. We too have urged, as President Frondizi so eloquently argued before the Assembly [1018th meeting], that regionalism should promote universal ends of human security and well-being. We have, it is true, been a party to a number of important and, we believe, beneficent regional organizations. We have accepted participation in them and have loyally endeavoured to carry out the obligations they impose in the wider context of our belief in Charter principles. We have done so in the hope that regional approaches to problems of security and economic development might prove to be stepping stones to a universal approach.

18. Whatever high hopes are proclaimed for regionalism, unless they are inspired by still higher purposes of a universal character they may all too readily be turned to restrictive and even injurious ends. Regional sentiment has, for instance, resulted in proposals now engaging the attention of the Assembly for decentralizing certain economic and social activities of the United Nations. These may be commendable in principle, but if carried to excess they could rob the Secretariat of effective influence and undermine the powers and functions of this Organization.

19. We would reaffirm that the smaller or less developed countries have a special stake in the United Nations. As one such country, New Zealand has reason to apprehend the undermining of the real principles of United Nations membership. Our doubts and misgivings about the effects of regional consolidation, especially in the economic field, have recently been reinforced.

20. We have, of course, belonged, and still belong, to a preferential system which, though more liberal than some newer economic groupings, has favoured the economic growth of its members. In company with many others represented here today, we have, however, observed with mounting concern that developments within some economic blocs have not always shown that regard for universalism which is implicit and, indeed, explicit in the United Nations Charter.

21. World trade, including our trade, has for many years been confronted with the threats and consequences of inward-looking policies of countries whose social systems do not encourage free or fruitful external relationships. But if friendly countries, with whose political aims we sympathize, should threaten the future well-being of countries such as ours by the adoption of policies leading to exclusiveness, our concern would become a desperate one. Applied without qualification, economic regionalism could have on

other countries a cumulative effect similar to that of severe economic sanctions, such as used to be applied to a country defeated in war.

22. This is not the platform on which to discuss in detail New Zealand's particular problems, but the concern felt by my Government will, we know, be shared by other Member States. The question of general interest to the United Nations is the extent to which groups of Members can consistently, within the spirit of the Charter, pursue what may appear to be legitimate mutual interests to the serious damage of third parties. It is therefore with some sympathy that we read of the reservations made by President Tito at the recent Belgrade Conference^{1/} in regard to economic developments both in Eastern and in Western Europe.

23. New Zealand approaches measures for regional economic co-operation, which are increasingly encouraged and assisted by the United Nations, with sympathy and understanding, especially where such measures extend technical knowledge, promote co-operation and enhance the living standards of the less developed countries. We are more than happy to endorse with our voices and our resources United Nations action to this end, for we see nothing there which conflicts with the universal aims set forth in the Charter.

24. But we are concerned lest the formation of an economic union among the industrial countries, which together are responsible for a large part of world trade and production, should seriously weaken the relative economic bargaining power of smaller countries outside the group. The wider and more powerful such regional groups, the more important it is for their members to adjust their policies in order to minimize the adverse effects which the creation of their union may have on outside countries, especially those which are small and economically weak, in the process of development, or dependent on the export of a few primary commodities or raw materials.

25. Is the moral to be drawn from current trends that small countries can look forward to no future unless they merge their economic identities in large continental blocs—those countries, that is, which have a continent available? This would be a strange conclusion to reach in the United Nations, an Organization based on the sovereignty and equality of rights of all Members, large and small. If this equality does not mean that a country which efficiently produces goods needed by mankind should be able to live and prosper without being squeezed out of existence by monster continental organizations, it is hard to see how the Charter's concern for nations large and small has any reality.

26. My Government firmly believes that the only hope for effective and world-wide international co-operation in the political, as in the economic, field lies in the United Nations. By co-operation I mean a positive working together for the good of mankind.

27. Peaceful coexistence, even if interpreted generously, is far from enough; politically motivated competition between strongly armed and mutually suspicious great Power groups all too easily increases fear and insecurity. The only hope for the United Nations is for all Members to reinvigorate the universal principles set forth in the Charter. However much

^{1/} Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, held 1-6 September 1961.

more alluring other aims may momentarily appear, it is a fact that the United Nations is a world Organization and stands for the maintenance of world principles.

28. This is the challenge which the sixteenth session of the General Assembly must face. It will be clear from what I have said that New Zealand endorses the dynamic concept of the United Nations so brilliantly outlined in what has been described as the "political testament" of our late Secretary-General. I can do no better than conclude by recalling Mr. Hammarskjöld's words, when he wrote, in the introduction [A/4800/Add.1] to his annual report on the work of the Organization:

"The effort through the Organization to find a way by which the world community might, step by step, grow into organized international co-operation within the Charter, must either progress or recede. Those whose reactions to the work of the Organization hamper its development or reduce its possibilities of effective action, may have to shoulder the responsibility for a return to a state of affairs which Governments had already found too dangerous after the First World War."

If we ignore this grave warning we shall be judged, not by this generation alone, but by such generations as may survive nuclear warfare and have painfully to strive to build a new world from the ashes of the old.

29. Mr. BOCOUM (Mali) (translated from French): On behalf of my delegation and the Government of the Republic of Mali, I would like to congratulate Mr. Slim on his brilliant election to the high office of President of our Assembly. This unanimous tribute by the Assembly is a recognition of his dedication to the United Nations and a tribute not only to his person and his country, but to the whole of Africa. We are convinced that his high competence and his spirit of justice will make a precious contribution to the Assembly at its sixteenth session.

30. We are happy to congratulate the Government of Sierra Leone, a sister country, on its unanimous admission as the 100th member of our Organization. But our joy is overshadowed by the tragic death of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld. The Government of Mali bows to the memory of Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld and the officers of the United Nations who died with him, and asks you to convey its heartfelt condolences to the Swedish Government and the families of the deceased.

31. This sixteenth session of the General Assembly is of considerable interest on more than one score. The Republic of Mali, which entered this great international family a year ago together with other young African States, values highly the role of guardian of the peace and the universalist vocation which the Organization set itself in its Charter.

32. It is in the light of these facts and the hopes which we place in the United Nations that we shall now turn to the great problems which concern us.

33. In the first place, we have noted during our first year of international life that the tragic events in the Congo show the necessity to reform the structure of the United Nations. If we broach this problem it is because we are profoundly attached to the principles of the Charter, that we are convinced of the necessity to do everything possible to ensure the survival of the United Nations and because we think it vitally im-

portant that every nation should have confidence in the Organization's decisions, and above all in the way in which these decisions are carried out.

34. These facts take on a particular urgency by reason of the death of the Secretary-General of the Organization, who, like Patrice Lumumba, was also a victim of the clash of selfish imperialist interests in the Congo.

35. In our opinion the problem deserves our full attention, and a reform of the structure of the international organization is plainly necessary if we are to attain our objectives. The composition of the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council, as well as that of the administrative organs, must be reconsidered in the light of the great number of States newly admitted to the United Nations. Besides, it is unthinkable, in a world where confidence between the great Powers seems out of the question, that it should be left to one man to carry out the decisions reached. It is therefore indispensable, both for the sake of his own authority and as a guarantee, that the Secretary-General should have assistants jointly responsible with him for the execution and supervision of decisions.

36. This is the price we must pay for the authority of the United Nations. This is the prerequisite if it is to have a hearing among the young States who cannot shelter behind military power. The strength of the United Nations will lie in defining a doctrine and having it respected, not in the formulation of accidental and circumstantial solutions. The United Nations, an association of a universalist character, must not appear as an instrument at the service of any given bloc or ideology, but as an effective instrument in the service of the ideals of justice and peace proclaimed by the Charter. Unfortunately—we must have the courage to say it and the frankness to admit it—the unhappy experience of the Congo has helped to shake the confidence which the young States were entitled to place in the United Nations.

37. For all these reasons and because of our common desire to make our Organization an international arbiter, a vigilant guardian of the peace and a tireless defender of justice between great and small, between strong and weak, the Republic of Mali urges the representatives of other Member States to weigh the problem of the structure of the United Nations and its subsidiary organs at this sixteenth session.

38. I cannot conclude these remarks about the working of the United Nations and the structural reform of which it is in need without again referring to the drama of the Congo. Whatever anyone says or thinks, the truth is that through defective functioning of the organs of the United Nations and inadequate execution of its decisions, one of the best sons of Africa, the much-mourned Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba, died at the hands of assassins with the full knowledge of representatives of the United Nations entrusted with the mission of helping to restore order in his country.

39. This Congolese national hero had appealed to the United Nations to help him maintain the independence and territorial integrity of his country. It is an incontrovertible fact that the result of our Organization's intervention in the Congo is far from doing us credit, for it is difficult to show that United Nations officers were not implicated in the murder of Prime Minister Lumumba. But this tragedy did not dampen the ardent patriotism of the Congolese nationalists and today

there is a new Government in the Congo. Like that of Lumumba, it desires to be unitary and has decided to practise a policy of popular emancipation. United Nations troops are still in the Congo. It is our hope that the presence of the United Nations in the Congo should this time effectively help to consolidate the unity of the country. But we have reason to be alarmed at the present course of the Katangese secession, incited and maintained by certain Members of our Organization.

40. My delegation disapproves of any kind of agreement between the United Nations and a separatist Government such as that of the puppet Tshombé. It continues to demand the prompt and strict application of the Security Council resolution on the Congo of 21 February 1961.^{2/} Katanga is an integral part of the Republic of the Congo and consequently any agreement concerning this province of the Congo can come only from the Central Congolese Government. The representatives of the United Nations must avoid provoking new dissension between the members of the present Government and thus unleashing a second crisis. We express this desire with deep conviction, and for the sake of the very future of the United Nations we hope it will be taken into account. If we have insisted on the Congolese question, it is because we want the United Nations in the light of this unhappy experience, to be equipped with efficient and democratic executive organs so as to avoid the recurrence of events which we deeply deplore.

41. I spoke a moment ago of the universalist character of the United Nations. In this respect the sixteenth session must make good the past. I say "make good", for it is abnormal and unjust that an international Organization like ours which, as its Charter affirms, is open to all peace-loving nations and which undertakes as its basic mission the maintenance of peace, should shut its doors to a powerful nation which alone accounts for a quarter of the world's population. I refer to the People's Republic of China with its 700 million inhabitants.

42. We must face facts. Let us see to it that this sixteenth session of the United Nations is a session of objectivity and realism, for we cannot go on escaping from logic year after year. We must, without further delay, restore to the People's Republic of China its rightful place in the United Nations. In so doing we shall respect the universalist intent of the Charter and we shall demonstrate that no one bloc holds the magic key to the United Nations.

43. Examination of the great international problems and objective efforts to seek their solution show once again, if that were necessary, the absurdity of further opposition to the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations. For how can a definitive solution be found to the problems of peace and disarmament in bodies which do not include a nation which alone accounts for over a quarter of the world's population and which moreover is every day making more impressive advances in the field of science and technology?

44. The Republic of Mali, firmly resolved to practise a policy of genuine independence and non-alignment on the international level, a policy of peace and justice, is strongly in favour of admitting the People's Republic of China to the United Nations at the present session and demands that it be reinstated in its legiti-

mate rights. We appeal to the conscience of all nations concerned to uphold peace and justice to help in the task of righting this wrong.

45. If we insist, as we have just done, on the problem of a structural reform of the United Nations and on the admission of the People's Republic of China, it is because we are firmly convinced that the Organization can only intervene in great international problems or disputes between nations to the degree that it can resolve its own internal contradictions.

46. In 1960 and 1961, our Organization was faced with hard realities and its authority has emerged seriously impaired. It will again have to face severe tests, for nobody can deny that international tension has reached an unprecedented height at this time and that the cold war has assumed an alarming intensity attended with grave threats to mankind. Yes, we are now living in fear and insecurity because of the position adopted by certain great Powers who have learned nothing from the lessons of history. In order to maintain their privileges, their outdated notions of grandeur and prestige, the colonialist Governments are imposing an absurd and criminal war on African peoples. Thus it is that the Algerian people, mobilized, as one man, has struggled heroically for seven years to reconquer its national independence. This savage war, forced on a peaceful people whose only claim is the right to dispose of themselves and their heritage, must prick the conscience of every Member State.

47. The French Government itself, convinced of the justice of the Algerian revolution, has been obliged to recognize the right of the Algerian people to self-determination. The Algerian war has been discussed often enough within these walls and I shall not expatiate on its various aspects, with which you are all perfectly familiar. I would however stress the fact that the French Government, relying on powerful economic, financial and military resources, means to go on imposing its domination on the Algerian people in order to exploit its riches, both agricultural and mineral. We cannot remain indifferent to the genocide of a people struggling for legitimate aspirations of which we approve.

48. We believe that the United Nations can no longer remain indifferent to the Algerian war. This sixteenth session must no longer content itself with abstract recommendations or the simple expression of wishes, whilst every day in Algeria women, children and old people are falling under the bullets of an army of foreign domination. Our Organization has a duty to help the provisional Government of the Algerian Republic and the French Government to find a solution in conformity with the direction of history, a peaceful solution culminating in the independence and territorial integrity of the Algerian Republic, including the Sahara. Negotiations have taken place; they came to nothing because one of the parties wanted to impose its solution on the other.

49. The United Nations must present the French Government with a just and equitable solution. France is a Member of the United Nations and must accept its discipline and ideals. The Algerian people must recover its independence and freely decide its destiny and its relations with other nations. Let us hope that France will at last understand that it can only safeguard its genuine prestige by recognizing once for all the independence of Algeria, without any neo-colonialist reservations.

^{2/} Official Records of the Security Council, Sixteenth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1961, document S/4741.

50. A moment ago I said that we were living in a time of fear and insecurity. Indeed, the Tunisian people have just been the victims of a bloody aggression which has cost many Tunisian patriots their lives. Why the aggression? Merely because a stronger Government, the French Government, wishes to maintain, against the will of the Tunisian people, a military base on Tunisian territory. Unless our Organization, whose basic purpose is the maintenance of international peace and security, takes strong measures against such acts, the small nations will live in a perpetual nightmare, with their security and territorial integrity open to violation at any time.

51. In Africa martyred peoples, without arms or resources, are fighting in difficult conditions for their dignity. Women are being raped and villages burned in the name of I know not what civilization. These deeds are a disgrace for the whole of mankind. The colonialist Governments which are perpetrating them deserve our censure. But we must not stop there. We must halt their criminal hands; if we do not do so, we shall be guilty of criminal inaction. It is the duty of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly to fix an irrevocable and immediate date for the end of colonialism, which must be enforced on all Powers still having territories under their domination. By that date all peoples must be independent and no ties must remain between them and their former metropolitan countries other than those of co-operation based on mutual respect for the sovereignty of the other. A great deal has been said about colonialism, its misdeeds and its immorality. It is time that our Organization took an unequivocal position on the subject and on that of the colonialist Powers. At this session we must sound the knell of colonialism; in doing so we shall have achieved one of the Organization's great ideals, namely the equality of peoples and nations.

52. Nor must we forget to denounce the new face of colonialism as encountered in several countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, that neo-colonialism which is as harmful as the old style colonialism.

53. In his conference on 20 August 1961 President Modibo Keita gave a precise definition of this new version of colonialism in the modern world when he said:

"Neo-colonialism is when an independent country finds itself being administered indirectly by its ex-colonial Power through traitors whom the latter has helped to climb to power and who thereafter form a rampart between that country and the outside world."

54. This neo-colonialism of which I speak appears in various forms, which are the source of troubles and tension in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

55. For the neo-colonialists are working unceasingly to achieve regroupings under the effective domination of foreign Powers and, when such regroupings slip from their hands, they resort to Balkanization. The most recent and most striking example of this policy of "divide and rule" is that of Katanga.

56. The agents of neo-colonialism also resort to many other base practices which we cannot pass over in silence, such as the provoking of national conflicts that destroy national unity, the establishment of military bases, often camouflaged as research stations or training schools, economic blackmail, oppression and the murder of patriots fighting for the true independence of their countries.

57. The criminal policy of apartheid which flourishes in South Africa in the name of Christian civilization needs no further condemnation. In our view the United Nations should impose exemplary sanctions against the acts of barbarism which Dr. Malan's heirs daily commit against peaceful and defenceless peoples.

58. The fact that apartheid has been written with the constitution in South Africa is a challenge to world morality. Only recently Mr. Verwoerd, Prime Minister of the Republic of South Africa, declared cynically at a political meeting in Pretoria:

"The establishment of the Republic has already led to a change. We have become nationalists, not in the political sense of the term [*sic*] but as a people belonging to a single nation. The South African nation means the whites of South Africa."

Mr. Verwoerd went on to say:

"In the future the National Party should not be the party of the citizens who speak Afrikaans, but the party that is working for the preservation of the whites in South Africa."

59. What is clear and unmistakable is that Mr. Verwoerd's Machiavellism is now quite unambiguous; genocide has been officially announced as the programme of the South African National Party.

60. We may wager that the Republic of South Africa would now be out of the United Nations, under the provisions of Article 6 of the Charter, but for the unavowed sympathy of certain major Powers.

61. When the drama of the Arab refugees from Palestine arose in April 1947, the General Assembly, at its first special session, set up a Commission to deal with this distressing problem; but no effective solution has yet been found. Funds have been provided to assist the refugees, but the problem as a whole remains untouched. Meanwhile men, women and children are living far from their homes and their property. Our Assembly must take up the Palestinian problem again and must find a solution that will enable all the Arab refugees to return to their homeland.

62. I spoke earlier of the cold war and the international tension. The international tension has, in fact, in recent months assumed unprecedented proportions. The frontiers resulting from the last war are again being disputed by some European countries. The German problem and the problem of Berlin in particular are again in the foreground of the international scene. I have no intention of inflicting upon you an historical survey of the German problem, with which you are all thoroughly familiar. What we do see is that peoples—the people of Germany, the people of Korea, the people of Viet-Nam, etc.—have been divided by war and the divisions are being maintained by the policy of the blocs. As a result of the battle for influence and the ideological struggle the different parts of these divided countries are now hostile states armed and supported against each other by the two opposing blocs. The Government of the Republic of Mali regards such a policy as dangerous and as a threat to world peace, since a simple mistake could at any time lead to a war whose consequences would be unpredictable. As the President of the Republic of Mali stated at the Belgrade Conference,^{3/} foreign Powers should abstain from any interference in the

^{3/} Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, held from 1-6 December 1961.

internal affairs of those divided countries and their peoples should regain their national unity by way of negotiation. The Government of the Republic of Mali is convinced that the practice of dividing peoples who have always formed a single national entity represents a permanent threat to peace. The predominant fact about those countries is that today there are two German States, two German Governments, two Viet-Nameese States, two Viet-Nameese Governments, two Korean States and two Korean Governments. That fact must be recognized and the representatives of those different Governments must be invited to discuss objectively the conditions for the reunification of their peoples. In our view only a negotiated solution can finally resolve these problems and so reduce some of the causes of international tension.

63. With regard to the German problem the question of self-determination raised by certain countries is an irrelevant issue, introduced in order to sow confusion. For there are, in fact, two German States, each with its lawful Government and sovereign parliament, which can decide the fate of the German people at any time. In our view this unquestionable fact rules out any idea of self-determination, which to our mind can be applied only to peoples fighting for their independence and sovereignty.

64. Apart from the question of the peaceful reunification of the countries of which I have just spoken, the dominant factors in the international situation are the arms race and the nuclear tests. Indeed, we cannot conceal our concern at the renewal of nuclear testing and the further development of weapons of mass destruction. Whatever the form of the nuclear tests or the reasons for them we condemn them unreservedly, wherever they take place. We have already condemned and we still condemn the nuclear tests carried out in the Sahara, particularly in view of the fact that when the question of conducting those tests on French soil arose, the people of Corsica reacted violently. The French Government, while retreating in the face of this popular pressure, none the less decided to pursue its experiments in the Sahara, in the very heart of Africa, in the teeth of the strongest opposition from the African peoples directly threatened by the radioactive fall-out.

65. The Government of the Republic of Mali will very shortly be submitting to the relevant United Nations bodies evidence of some unusual sicknesses and teratological phenomena which have appeared among the peoples and cattle in the Republic's Saharan areas.

66. We are aware of the fact that an error of judgement could at any time lead to catastrophe and the wiping out of the whole of the civilization built up through long and patient effort. The problem of peace and disarmament is of concern to the whole of mankind. It cannot therefore be left to the nuclear powers alone to discuss, particularly since the latter, for reasons of prestige and mistrust, are quite unable to trust each other and to reach a solution acceptable to all, as our experience of the long and difficult negotiations which have been under way for years goes to show. The non-aligned countries must be associated with the negotiations on the problem of general and complete disarmament and the solutions decided upon at that level must be enforced on all Powers by the United Nations with the aid, if necessary, of appropriate sanctions.

67. The Republic of Mali, which regained its independence on 22 September 1960 in circumstances

which have already been described here, is a convinced supporter of the policy of non-alignment and positive neutralism. The wish of the Government of Mali is to live in peace and to co-operate with all Governments which show a desire to do so on the basis of mutual respect and non-interference in the internal affairs of others. That fundamental choice was the reason why the Republic of Mali demanded the evacuation of all French military bases established on its own territory, since the maintenance of those bases was incompatible with our policy of remaining out of any military blocs or coalitions. In any case, we are glad to say that the evacuation of the French military bases has been accomplished satisfactorily, which augurs well for our future relations with the French Republic.

68. In the international political field the Republic of Mali cannot be equated with any of the blocs. We shall judge the latter by their deeds, by their behaviour on the problems of concern to us, by their manner of supporting the oppressed peoples who are fighting for their independence, by their manner of assisting the younger nations suffering from under-development, by their support for or hostility towards those nations which are oppressing others, and by their unequivocal devotion to the maintenance of peace and the defence of justice throughout the world. Those are the bases of our non-alignment.

69. Nor does our neutralism mean that we try to follow the middle path between West and East or that we shall remain passive spectators in the case of problems not of direct concern to us. As a member of the international community, we shall take a stand on every issue that arises. In doing so we shall not look to the position taken by East or West. Our attitude will be that dictated by dignity and justice. We condemn bargaining and economic blackmail as means of persuasion. We prefer frank and open discussion to such methods. This position may offend some countries, but we accept the risk.

70. Our non-alignment and our positive neutralism may be summarized as follows.

71. We are for peace, because we need peace in order to build up our youthful nation. Therefore, whenever peace is at issue, we shall be with those who labour effectively for its maintenance, regardless of their relationship to any bloc.

72. We are for general and complete disarmament, and whenever this problem comes up for discussion we shall be found on the side of those who put forward constructive proposals.

73. We are for justice and respect for the dignity of peoples. Therefore, we are with those people who are fighting for their independence and against those who try to keep them under their domination.

74. It was on the basis of these considerations that the Republic of Mali took part in the Belgrade Conference and gave its unreserved support to the decisions reached at that important meeting.

75. Before ending, I should like to say a few words on the questions of technical assistance to Africa. This agenda item interests my delegation to the highest degree. I should say immediately that if technical co-operation is to be understood as a "transfer of the knowledge, skill and experience acquired by the more technically advanced nations or groups of nations to the less developed countries", it is imper-

tant to establish as a basic principle that technical co-operation must be stripped of political or other conditions which make it humiliating and reduce its effectiveness. For otherwise it could only too easily be turned into an instrument for the domination of the less developed countries by the more technically advanced countries; in other words, into a tool of that neo-colonialism of which some are dreaming. In contrast, technical co-operation, when properly understood, can be an important instrument of peace.

76. To sum up, the Government of Mali has endeavoured to pick out of the jumble of ideas on international technical co-operation, and with due regard for the experience already acquired in that field, those basic principles which must be established as fundamental conditions and without which there can be no really effective co-operation. These are:

(1) The liquidation of colonialism, as a prerequisite for the establishment of any technical co-operation machinery to promote the economic growth of the countries to be developed.

(2) A large increase in assistance to those countries of Africa which have acceded to independence and which have received little or no international technical assistance because of their previous colonial status.

(3) Technical co-operation not based on any standard formulae or universal pattern.

(4) The necessary co-ordination of efforts and promotion of technical assistance to be based on a plan or on a thorough preliminary study of the country's resources and the aims of the development.

(5) A major factor in the effectiveness of co-operation is an increase in and the general adoption of pre-investment measures.

77. Those are the basic ideas by which the delegation of the Republic of Mali will be guided during this sixteenth session of the General Assembly. As I said at the beginning, the delegation of Mali has come here with the firm intention of helping to find just solutions to all the major problems with which mankind is pre-occupied. We hope that the United Nations will emerge rejuvenated and with the prestige and the authority that will enable it to justify the reasons for which it was created.

78. Mr. MILLA BERMUDEZ (Honduras) (translated from Spanish): Dag Hammarskjöld is still among us and will live eternally in the memory of humanity as long as humanity continues to exist and possess moral sensibility. Hammarskjöld was fully conscious of the tragedy of our times, of the violence of the conflicts raging around us, of the dark threats overshadowing this planet and also of the dazzling possibilities which might be open to us at the end of the road if we are able to find "the bridge toward a synthesis", as he said on United Nations Day in October last year.

79. At the entrance of the meditation room, in the vestibule of the Assembly Building, appear the illustrious names of those who have died for peace. On the arduous and heroic path of international conciliation, marked with the blood of Folke Bernadotte, many martyrs have laid down their lives, among whom the Secretary-General of the United Nations stands out today as the supreme martyr, the propitiatory victim and tragic example. His name should appear prominently, together with the names of those who died with

him, beside the meditation room, as it already stands in the heart of all those who really desire peace and conciliation between human beings.

80. The Government of my country has declared three days of national mourning as a posthumous homage to the martyr of peace. In the name of the Government and people of Honduras I offer to the States Members of the United Nations—and especially to the small Powers, for which this irreparable loss is particularly serious—to Sweden and to the family of the deceased heartfelt condolences on the death of Dag Hammarskjöld.

81. My delegation associates itself with the wish expressed by other Powers that an official investigation should be carried out into the strange circumstances which preceded the accident in which the United Nations Secretary-General lost his life.

82. Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you on your unanimous election by the General Assembly to this high position, which reaffirms Africa's new historic role and its place in world history. The admission of Sierra Leone, which we welcome to the United Nations, is a further manifestation of the same fact and brings the number of Member States to one hundred.

83. The sixteenth session of the General Assembly is opening under sombre auspices. Anxiety has increased and hope has diminished since the last session. The world has undergone its most serious crisis and as time goes by the tragic alternative appears ever more grievous: either the outbreak of a thermonuclear war which will destroy immense historic treasures, countless riches and millions of human lives and imperil the future of the whole human race, or what we might call the outbreak of peace with its innumerable benefits for all.

84. Our era faces great and serious problems whose solutions are far from easy, outstanding among them the necessary disappearance of colonialism in all forms and on all continents; the economic development of technologically backward countries and, first and foremost, the achievement of world peace, which is a necessary prerequisite to the solution of most of the problems of the day.

85. With regard to the question of colonialism, I should like to point out that last year my delegation submitted a draft resolution which was misinterpreted both by the main ideological groups into which the Assembly is divided and by the countries which have recently achieved independence. My proposal provided for the establishment of a five-member committee to visit the colonial possessions which do not as yet enjoy independence and make recommendations to the present session of the General Assembly concerning the most appropriate, rapid and effective way of bringing about the complete abolition of the colonial system all over the world. Some countries considered that my proposal might delay the emancipation of the remaining colonies, whereas in reality it was designed to secure the implementation of the resolution submitted by the African-Asian group, which was adopted.

86. It is natural and a sign of the times in which we live that mistrust should have prevailed; in the certainty that time would lighten the atmosphere and allay suspicion, I did not ask that my draft resolution should be put to the vote at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly but decided to wait until the need was felt for a practical and effective means of putting into

practice the resolution of the African-Asian group. When circumstances are more propitious I intend to ask for a vote on the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Honduras as a reaffirmation of my Government's anti-colonialist principles.

87. The value of my proposal would have been demonstrated in cases of which we are all aware, inasmuch as the United Nations would have had at its disposal information which would facilitate the peaceful transformation of the existing colonies into independent sovereign States without their passing through the furnace of war or revolution.

88. In fact, we have been unable to develop effective methods to ensure that the necessary change should be a peaceful process. That fact is proved by the events in the Congo, Algeria, Angola and other places.

89. With regard to the economic development of the technologically backward countries, I should like to stress the radical reorientation of the policy of the great Powers which has occurred in our century. For the first time in history it is realized that the function of the strong is not to exploit the weak but to help them to become stronger and to make progress, since that is in the general interest. There is no doubt that substantial vestiges of the past remain and that to the east and to the west, to the north and to the south there are strong imperialist interests of every political hue clinging to outdated conceptions which are largely responsible for the present tension. Nevertheless, it is also true that the more highly industrialized Powers are beginning to be aware of their obligations towards the world as a whole. Proof of that is the technical assistance given through the United Nations and the direct aid—not always disinterested—being granted by the great Powers, however different their ideologies.

90. In this connexion we must draw attention to the programme of the Alliance for Progress in the American continent, which we welcome hopefully as a manifestation of this new spirit.

Mr. Nosek (Czechoslovakia) took the Chair.

91. Going more deeply into the analysis of the problem, we are faced with one of the basic questions of our time: what is really the ultimate objective of this assistance? What we might call the old imperialist school—of white imperialism and red imperialism—sought to use assistance as a bait to attract the uncommitted countries and later to absorb them economically and politically, transforming them into satellites. What we may call the new school of the second half of the twentieth century endeavours to promote the economic progress of the under-developed countries so as to give them a decent life, avoid the international friction resulting from economic inequality, increase the total wealth of the world and, in the last analysis, create a rich, stable and pacific world. The former thesis is that of selfish, grasping old-type nationalism based on the brute force of arms. The latter thesis is that of the integration of nationalism and internationalism, based on the supreme interests of mankind and the rule of law.

92. This brings us logically to the very serious political problem of Berlin. If the law were to be fully applied, if the United Nations Charter were respected, if Germany could decide freely and democratically and as a whole on the problem of Berlin and the final destiny of that city, if the principle of the self-determination of peoples were put into practice, as prom-

ised by the Powers which were victorious in the Second World War, with regard to Germany, there would be no problem. As we all know, however, the political situation is very different and in view of the gravity of the present situation we hope that an honourable solution, as just as possible, may be found without delay in order to avoid the outbreak of an absurd and monstrous conflict which would multiply the present problems and solve none.

93. Berlin, Germany, Laos, Viet-Nam and various other divided countries bring us face to face with the most important question of all those which trouble the world today: the choice between a devastating war and peace.

94. Perhaps it may be said that there is little that the small countries can do, but we believe, as President Frondizi, of the Argentine Republic, said recently, that the peoples of Latin America, although they may not carry much weight in the business of war, count for much in the enterprises of peace. Spanish America and Indian America have a long tradition of international peace which we might describe as truly exemplary. In this respect they have fulfilled the hopes expressed by Volney when he dedicated his work *The Ruins of Palmyra* to the new peoples of the Spanish Indies and to the noble leaders who were guiding them towards freedom, and expressed the desire that the errors and misfortunes of the old world would teach wisdom and happiness to the new world.

95. Today the new world consists not only of Latin America but also of Asia and Africa and, in a deeper sense, of the whole planet, which must revise its ancient ideas and methods or be prepared to expire in an inglorious blaze of thermo-nuclear destruction.

96. Last year Dag Hammarskjöld said that the time had come to introduce a new theme into the symphony of human life—the theme of reconciliation and of joy in reconciliation. But how can that be achieved in a planet which is more divided with every day that passes? What procedures, what techniques, what paths can we follow to transform the growing opposition into growing agreement, exchange bloody battles for fruitful co-operation and beat swords into ploughshares?

97. As a contemporary Spanish writer has said, for the first time in history peace is essential for the survival of the human race; notwithstanding that fact we continue to use theories and techniques for war and revolution which belong to previous centuries and were based on a situation quite different from that of the present day. Undoubtedly, if we do not wish the political systems which are endeavouring to unify the world from opposite points of view to end by destroying it, we must make a gigantic effort to find new methods and new solutions. But is there any hope of finding new solutions? Is there any hope that man, who has constructed so many wonderful machines for destruction, can also learn to build machines and institutions for peace? Cannot the ideas of man, who has invented thermo-nuclear weapons, be used to forge an indestructible peace? As we see it, this is the fundamental question of our time, to which a reply must urgently be found.

98. It was modern science, twentieth-century research, the new technology which won the Second World War. It was also modern scientific ideas, the abstract theories of nuclear physics, information

theory, mathematical logic, that created atomic weapons and the means of delivering them. For good or ill we are living in a new age, presided over by science, and this gives us the right to wonder whether we cannot find in this same science, the creator of the dangers that directly threaten us, new methods of establishing peace. If science is one and if humanity too is basically one, might it not be possible, as has been suggested, to find scientific solutions to certain problems which hitherto have been regarded as essentially political? What other solution than a scientific one can there be for the demographic, economic, political and social problems which overwhelm us?

99. Scientists have incurred a great responsibility towards the human race by discovering the secrets of the energy which illuminates the stars, and converting it into a means of destruction. They can only discharge this responsibility by making a decisive contribution to the establishment of peace.

100. Scientists have proved that international collaboration is possible; one example among many was the International Geophysical Year. Barely two weeks ago, notwithstanding the political tensions which rack the world, distinguished Western and Soviet scientists employed in high positions by their respective Governments drew up plans for working together in various scientific undertakings.

101. With increasing frequency diplomats and statesmen have recourse to scientific advisers to analyse each other's positions, motives and interests and find practical means of action. It is already recognized that the dissemination of objective, scientific knowledge of possible solutions is necessary if disarmament and inspection are to be effective. This, however, is only the beginning of a long road the end of which is the intervention of science in the final settlement of human disputes.

102. Undoubtedly it is because of this fact that the new United States Administration has decided to set up a disarmament agency whose ultimate objective was stated by President Kennedy [1013th meeting] to be that men should be able to live in a world free from war and from the dangers and burdens presented by armaments, renewing hope that we may work together for progress in the critical battle which is being waged for the survival of the human race.

103. The delegation of Honduras, encouraged by these favourable signs which cast a faint ray of light in a world darkened by fear, will in due course submit a draft resolution which it hopes a number of other delegations will join it in sponsoring, inviting States Members of the United Nations to establish ministerial departments and bureaux for peace and disarmament which will contribute, from various points of view, to the study of the possibilities and means of solving the present conflicts and preventing future ones, with the assistance of those non-governmental organizations which are particularly concerned and which wish to contribute to this formidable task.

104. The delegation of Honduras accepts the idea that the time has come to make a vigorous and coordinated effort in the public and private, national and international spheres, in favour of peace by means of strict and effective investigation, using modern science and technology for constructive purposes and gradually dissociating them from work designed for destruction. It is simply a matter of making use of

the immense intellectual and material resources which are available to modern man in the task of building peace instead of letting them be consumed in the holocaust of thermo-nuclear war.

105. We sincerely believe that this is the only method and the only possibility today of achieving the triumph of an integral democracy which will be the happy culmination of the history of mankind—political and economic democracy uniting social justice and freedom in a harmonious synthesis in a world at peace.

106. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): Though rather late in the proceedings, my delegation yields to none in the congratulations it would like to offer to Mr. Slim on his election to the presidency of the Assembly. Even if his election had stood alone it would have been a matter for congratulation by itself. However, we should like to express our appreciation of the fact that he has been unanimously elected to his office. We hope that this great unanimity shown in his election and the understanding shown by his then prospective rival will be emulated in other fields so that we shall have more unanimous decisions in the Assembly. I would like to take this opportunity of saying also that it is not only a tribute to his personal qualities of which we are all well aware—for although he is a comparative newcomer to the United Nations he has become acquainted with the delegations and the work of this Organization—but also a tribute to his country, especially at the present time.

107. We would like, further, to express our appreciation of the services rendered by his predecessor in a rather difficult year which ended tragically. My delegation has already expressed its sentiments with regard to the tragedy that overtook the Secretary-General and his colleagues in the disastrous journey they undertook over Africa. I would, however, like to take this opportunity of saying that my delegation, along with a number of others, has requested him [see A/4896] through the General Committee or by such other procedures as may be necessary, to act in order that the question of an international investigation into the conditions and circumstances resulting in the tragic death of Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld and of members of the party accompanying him may be inscribed on the agenda of this Organization. Since this matter is likely to come up in another place and in other ways it is not my desire to go into it now, but my Government takes a very serious view of this question. Irrespective of what may come out of the inquiry, it would be tragic if those who go out on United Nations missions and come to ends of this kind in circumstances of this character were not to become the concern of the Assembly in a very serious way. Therefore, as I say, we have gone to the length, along with other delegations, of asking to have this inscribed as an additional item on the agenda. It is now several days since attention was drawn to this, and we hope that the item will come up very soon.

108. Owing to the change in the procedure it has not been possible for us to take an earlier opportunity to congratulate the one hundredth Member of this Assembly, Sierra Leone. This country, with an area of some 28,000 square miles and a population of 2.5 million, comes into the picture of modern history with the advent of the Portuguese in the continent of Africa in order to capture slaves to be sold elsewhere in the world. For 200 years slavery went on. Ultimately Sierra Leone came into existence in the shape of Freetown—strangely enough, not as a colony in the

beginning, but in order that liberated slaves might find somewhere to go. But, as history would have it, "Freetown" soon came under the commercial organization of an exploiting company and subsequently passed under colonial rule, reminding one of what Abraham Lincoln once said:

"The shepherd drives the wolf from the sheep's throat, for which the sheep thanks the shepherd as his liberator, while the wolf denounces him for the same act as the destroyer of liberty, especially as the sheep was a black one. Plainly the sheep and the wolf are not agreed upon a definition of the word 'liberty'; and precisely the same difference prevails today among us human creatures, even in the North, and all professing to love liberty".

109. It was soon after Freetown was founded—and it is also interesting that Freetown came into existence soon after the American revolution and just before the French revolution, that is to say while, in other parts of the world, the liberty of men was being proclaimed and republics were being founded—that another town also came into being in Africa in this way, originally as a sanctuary for the freed. Freetown did not, however, follow the course of the history of Liberia. It became a Crown colony; but over a period of 100 years, by gradual processes, it attained its present situation, its rulers and the colonials, in the same way as in our own history of Imperial rule over us, in its last stages, came to an agreement to part company in friendship as independent States.

110. Soon after the establishment of Freetown, as in other countries, King Nambina ceded twenty square miles of land to Captain Taylor, on behalf of the free community of settlers, "in exchange for rum, muskets and embroidered waistcoats". Soon afterwards the inhabitants rebelled against the Company's misrule; the rebellion was put down, but it had the result, as in the case of India and Warren Hastings and others, of attracting domestic attention in England, as it was then, to misrule and the character of the administration.

111. In 1807 the British Parliament made the slave trade illegal and the new colony was used as a base of operations. From 1924 onwards institutions came into existence and by slow processes, over thirty or forty years, it has at last today become an independent and self-governing dominion of the British Commonwealth with freedom to choose its own form of government today, tomorrow and any day it likes. We are glad to think that its later stages have followed the course of events in our own country rather than that of violence.

112. On 27 April 1961 Sierra Leone became independent, and on the same day the Republic of India recognized it as an independent State and established diplomatic relations with it.

Mr. Slim (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.

113. I would like, however, to draw attention to what the Prime Minister of Sierra Leone said in the Assembly the other day. Sir Milton Margai said:

"When, in future, both within and without the United Nations, we"—that is, the Sierra Leone—"persistently champion the cause of a speedy and final end to every variety of colonial rule everywhere in the world, we wish the fact to be remembered that we do not speak out of bitterness, but out of conviction that the right of self-determination

which we ourselves now enjoy is a right which all men everywhere must enjoy. We wish, further, to make it clear that we reserve the right to express ourselves fully and independently on all issues." [1018th meeting, para. 229.]

No one could have put this better, because very often, when those of us who are ex-colonials speak perhaps with more feeling than some others in the cause of colonial independence, it is likely to be regarded as past bitterness expressing itself. We believe it is not possible for this world to remain half free and half slave. It is not possible, either to restore the economic imbalances or to establish peace, coexistence and co-operation in this world, or indeed to restore the dignity of human beings, so long as there are subject peoples.

114. And that takes us to the problem of colonies as such. We have in the Assembly made considerable advances in this direction in the last year or two. It has now been resolved in the Assembly that the whole régime of colonialism must come to an end, and while no date on the calendar has been fixed, it is the spirit and the intention of that resolution [1514 (XV)] that it shall come to an end quickly. And while we refer to this matter, it is only fair and right that we take both the welcome factors as well as the others in this way. In a short time, Tanganyika, a Mandated Territory originally, afterwards a Trust Territory, which only a few years ago was expected to take fifty years before it attained its independence, will apply for admission as an independent State to the United Nations. It may well be that before we disperse, we shall have added the one hundred and first State to the United Nations.

115. In the Caribbean there is British Guiana which has passed through some troublesome periods of recent history and which is also about to attain its independence. The Caribbean Islands are likely to take the same position. So in the whole of what was formerly the British Empire, there seems to be a process of—I would not call it disintegration—the resolving of the Empire into its proper component parts taking their places. We hope this process will speed up in East Africa and elsewhere.

116. My Government would also like to welcome without reservation the statement made by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs for the United Kingdom, when he informed the Assembly [1017th meeting] that, although it had no obligation under the Charter to submit political information in regard to Non-Self-Governing Territories, the United Kingdom intended to do so. It is true that it will be only for a short period because all these territories, in the process of historical progress at the present time, should in less than even twelve months have become independent.

117. We are equally concerned about the fact that this independence should be real and should not be, as in the case of another part of Africa, independence for the few and not for the many. Therefore, when there are large populations, as in the Central African Federation or that part of Africa, if in the name of independence a large number of people are consigned to the rule of a minority which believes in a racial doctrine and a form of government which the Assembly has disapproved so many times and condemned in no uncertain terms, then we cannot welcome that as independence. It is particularly so when these territories, though they are not Members of the United Nations, are members of what may be called the

"solar system", that is to say, of the various specialized agencies and so on.

118. We also look forward to the time when the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi will become an independent State. We hope it will not pass through the travail of the Congo, that there will be no rearguard action fought in order to regain a Trust Territory for an empire; that Australian New Guinea will similarly become independent; and that the man, many territories in Africa and elsewhere, about fifty in number, will in a short period of time have gained the status of independence.

119. We ourselves have not put down a date by the calendar, but we go by the spirit of last year's resolution—it was not mere empty words—when we think that the United Nations, having decided on the end of colonialism, will now see to its implementation, that there will be machinery set up. Article 73 now acquires a new meaning, and therefore, when the Republic of Portugal refuses to obey the mandate of the United Nations to submit information, a new situation arises. Article 73 has to be read along with the new decisions of the United Nations, and we are entitled to obtain information with regard to Portuguese Colonies from whatever sources may be available to the United Nations.

120. The three main slices of the colonial empires that still remain are that of France, with its ten and a half million people, mainly in the territory of Algeria, where over a period of eight years sanguinary war has been going on in which a very considerable part of the French Air Force and French Navy is engaged, and where, according to where you get your figures, the casualties have been from 200,000 to 700,000. Equally, there seems to be no reconciliation of the points of view between the Algerian people who demand their birthright of independence, recognized by the United Nations not only in its Charter but by subsequent resolutions, and France, which denies them that right. Attempts at negotiation have so far failed. But my country stands foursquare with the Algerian people in their demand for full and complete independence.

121. Portugal's is the largest empire today—the oldest ally of the United Kingdom—a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Portugal owns 1.3 million square miles in the world, the greater part of it in Africa, with small enclaves on the Indian continent, in the Pacific Ocean, south and east in Timor and Macao. We are not here to make any special pleading on behalf of a particular part of these territories, but Portuguese colonialism does not even have the characteristic of nineteenth century or twentieth century colonial rule. It is characterized by cruelty and repression which have resulted in—according to authoritative estimates—somewhat over 130,000 refugees fleeing into the Congo.

122. The Assembly knows that conditions in the Congo at present are not such that anybody would like to go there as if it were a sanatorium, but the conditions in Angola are obviously far worse and therefore refugees are driven into these areas, and they are going at the rate of 10,000 a month or so. These are not reports by political parties but by the International Red Cross, which is taking care of these people. They are mainly children driven from Angolan homes where men and women are forced into the modern slavery of forced labour. The view that is taken by the Por-

tuguese Empire in this connexion is something that is inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations.

123. Since 5 February 1961, there have been enormous casualties arising from the attack on the population by the ruling Power; neither the police nor the army recovered themselves from the troubles given by the Africans in resistance to oppression, and with armed settlers they invaded African quarters, beating up and shooting Africans indiscriminately.

124. An eye-witness who left Luanda on 6 February told of a count of forty-nine African corpses, hundreds wounded and hundreds more in prison. The massacre continues.

125. Picking up the story on 24 February 1961 the magazine Time reported, on page 22, that a Luanda cabdriver had:

"told reporters that he saw five trucks loaded with corpses driven out to a mass burial in the bush...

"While tanks and armoured cars patrolled the streets at night and Portuguese gunboats and planes combed the coastline, a doctor said wearily, 'I don't know how much more of this I can stand. Every night we deal with men dreadfully wounded and cut up!'"

Another eyewitness said the following:

"On 29 July, on our way back, we passed through this village again. Three hours after we left the village that day, it was completely wiped out. Some other journalists later visited this village and said that they had seen evidence of napalm bombs"—

these atrocious methods are shocking enough when used by nations in wars against other nations, but they are even more shocking when used by nations against peoples over whom they rule.

126. We could go on recounting more stories of such atrocities. Africans are pulled out of their homes at night and shot dead for no reason except that they are African Angolans or other Africans living in their own territories.

127. What is the Portuguese theory about this? I think that we must understand this particular aspect of the question when we discuss Article 73. The following is a memorandum^{4/} which was written by the Portuguese Government to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in 1924:

"In new countries, and particularly in the African Colonies, the regulation of labour is an important consideration . . . Forced labour, for instance, is a form of slavery, and therefore measures should be taken to prevent it. Moreover, the European races which bring civilization to the natives need their assistance to attain their aims: the work of the colonists must combine with that of the aborigines. It is not reasonable that the colonization and development of uncivilized countries"—the question is: who is uncivilized?—"with the advantages which accrue to the natives therefrom, should be the result of the colonists' work and organization alone, without any assistance on the part of the native. Why should the negro be the only person in this world to be exempt from work? If he works of his own free will, he should be aided and protected by the law. If he does not, he must be induced to work by persuasion and by gentle and kindly methods. But

^{4/} League of Nations, document C.532.M.188.1924.VI(CTE).

if even these means prove ineffective, we have to resort to the methods which civilized communities adopt against those of their members who desire to live on the results of others' labour—that is to say, vagabondage and idleness have to be punished.

"In African countries the principal industries now being established are the exploitation of the subsoil and agriculture. Both of these industries require abundant manual labour. But colonists and authorities are interested in the industrial development of the country. If, therefore, manual labour is scarce, and if a charter of labour has not been duly established, and if, for this reason, the development of the country is impeded, abuses are bound to occur, and, in spite of all laws and regulations, the natives will be the first to suffer.

"... While individual liberty should be respected and the principles of justice and equality for all should be upheld, we have some reason to ask whether certain philanthropic ideas are not sometimes, as applied to the negro races of Africa, likely to produce an effect contrary to that intended. If we are to avoid forcing an evolution which in so-called civilized countries has taken centuries, we must see that tropical Africa does not come to full civilization without passing through a number of intermediate stages.

"To desire to convert the native of the bush, with his customs, habits and manner of life, into a man with all the rights and duties of a European is to provoke a situation which may cause bitter disillusionment. The negro has to be civilized by his labour and must be made to co-operate by this labour in the process of civilizing himself and developing tropical Africa. Kindly and humane methods must be used to induce him to co-operate, but that co-operation must also be a means of modifying his mental outlook. Such an undertaking requires great moderation, prudence and forethought. It is not an easy task, and it is a task which should be dealt with not only from the point of view of the treatment of the negro, but also of the manner in which he responds to it."

128. I repeat: that was a memorandum from the Portuguese Government to the League of Nations in 1924. About forty years have passed, but the position is much the same. When a few years ago a commission was appointed by the United Nations—a commission on which a countryman of mine sat—it met with the same reaction, the same attitude, the same philosophy, on the part of the Portuguese Government.

129. Of course, there are some enlightened administrators in Portugal, also. One of them—Captain Henrique Galvão—said the following when, as a senior inspector of colonies, he reported to the Salazar Government in 1947:

"In some ways the situation [in Angola] is worse than simple slavery. Under slavery, after all, the native is bought as an animal: his owner prefers him to remain as fit as a horse or an ox. Yet here the native is not bought—he is hired from the State, although he is called a free man. And his employer cares little if he sickens or dies, once he is working, because when he sickens or dies his employer will simply ask for another."

130. Africans have to carry out two kinds of forced labour. First, there is work for the Government. Under this heading, there are the following categories:

(a) Work on the "chefe de posto's" garden. This is an official garden, but the vegetables and crops are grown partly for his personal use and partly sold for profit. Every man, woman and child over fourteen years of age has to work for fourteen days on the "granja". Workers get no pay and have to provide their own tools.

(b) Road work. Again, every man, woman and child has to work—even cripples and old people—to get the work done. The Administration has moved villagers in close to the roads to make it convenient to use them for roadwork and also to control them for forced labour. There is no pay for this work and the Government gives no tools or rations. People are called out for this work as required. It is never known when it is finished.

(c) The Government uses forced labour on the harbour works at Luanda and on barrages on rivers for irrigation of the lands for Portuguese settlers. It also uses them on government building schemes. An eyewitness has said that he remembers seeing them working on a government housing scheme for Portuguese civil servants.

131. Second, there is work for private enterprises. There is not a great deal of difference between contract and voluntary work. A man may volunteer to avoid a contract that he is afraid of. Sometimes the volunteers are worse off than the "contratados" because they can be more easily cheated by their employers over wages and time of employment, which may be extended after the agreed term is finished or may be renewed for another full period without the workers' consent.

132. For a year's forced labour a man is unlikely to get more than \$14 by the time the native tax has been taken off and the other deductions which the "chefe de posto" imposes. When the "chefe de posto" is paying off a gang of forced labourers, the traders are called and they bring wine and goods for sale so that the worker shall not get away with his money.

133. It is almost impossible to think that such things can happen in modern times.

134. We now have a situation in Angola where we have actually moved away from the question of repression of Africans and their rebellion against such repression: we now have a situation which affects the peace and security of the world. The United Nations must now take up the situation not only from the point of view of the atrocities being committed in a colonial empire, but also from the point of view of the effect on Africa as a whole and on the world. In the name of law and order, weapons of war are being used to suppress populations. Some of these weapons of war are made available to the colonial Powers—whether it be France or Portugal—because of their alliances with other nations. That is to say, countries that are against colonial rule, that certainly would not adopt these tactics, find themselves in a vicarious way in the company of countries that are suppressing populations, using not merely the time-honoured methods of war, but modern methods of war.

135. In Africa, again there has been no progress with regard to South West Africa. It is not my intention to deal with this matter here, because it is a separate item on the agenda of the Fourth Committee. South Africa continues to apply the policy of racial discrimination known as apartheid in spite of repeated

appeals and condemnations by this Assembly, appeals and condemnations voiced year after year.

136. In the continent of Asia we have a spot of trouble in Indo-China. A conference^{5/} on this subject is going on in Geneva. It is not my intention to deal with this subject in detail, although other people have referred to it. One hopes that the meeting of the Princes in Zurich, the desire of the Laotian parties to come together, and the view of the great Powers and others concerned in the Laotian conference—at least as publicly expressed—that Laos should remain a neutral country will lead to the emergence of a government of national unity in such a way as to bring peace to this war-torn country, this country that has not known peace for the last twenty-five years. It fought the Japanese in the great war, then the French colonialists, then the inhabitants have fought amongst themselves, with foreign intervention as the main promoting factor. It goes on in this way. For the last twenty-five years, war has been practically continuous in that country.

137. Every speaker from this rostrum has referred to the problem of Berlin. It is not my intention to go into the details of this question, because the parties mainly concerned are, apparently, according to newspaper reports, engaged in private discussions. It is not our desire to say anything that might in any way come in the way of an agreement of some kind. Perhaps before the end of my observations I may have something more to say.

138. Now we come to one of the most important problems before us, that of the Congo. In the Congo, the war still drags on after eighteen months, but in the last few months there has been progress. The appeal made in the Assembly time after time during the course of the last session, for the convening of Parliament and for the emergence of a Government that would have, after the death of Lumumba, some responsibility from Parliament, seems to have at last produced results. Today there is a government of unity and we are glad that countries of the eastern and western blocs today have decided to establish missions in Leopoldville, so that there is gradually a movement under the new Prime Minister towards unity and settlement.

139. The United Nations policy of integrity, independence, the maintenance of law and order and of economic assistance, which had been reiterated, is solidly supported by my Government which will give whatever assistance is possible in this direction provided it is used for those purposes. There have, however, been very considerable difficulties. The Government of India, at the request of the United Nations, has placed at the disposal of the Organization considerable personnel for the purposes of the maintenance of integrity, independence and law and order, and for the facilitation of economic assistance. The Assembly has, time after time, asked for the withdrawal of those non-Congolese who are not in the country by permission of the Congolese Government, or through the United Nations, but the position of foreign intervention of this kind still continues. In spite of eighteen months of repeated pressure from various quarters, there is still trouble of this sort going on, and the serious troubles of the last few days have largely arisen from the operation of mercenaries who are assisting in the disintegration of the Congo.

^{5/} Conference for the Settlement of the Laotian Question opened on 16 May 1961.

140. In this connexion, I would not be doing my duty if I did not say something with regard to the operations of the Indian troops in this area. Unfortunately, there have been mis-statements in regard to the performance of United Nations personnel. It is not my obligation to speak about all the others. Similar statements have been made about Irish troops, for no reason whatsoever. I regret that the first of these came out in the United Kingdom newspapers, though I would like to say at once that officially the Government of the United Kingdom not only has not condoned any of those reports but, what is more, has informed my Prime Minister that it does not share the views that have been stated.

141. What has actually happened, however, is that in this territory there have been operations against the United Nations forces by those who ought to know better. On 15 September 1961, Sir Roy Welensky, the Prime Minister of Rhodesia, called upon free countries of the world without delay to demand a ceasefire in Katanga to restore the Tshombé Government. There is no objection to anybody demanding a ceasefire anywhere, because we do not want to see any fighting, but to operate against the United Nations policy there—this, by someone who no doubt in due course aspires to come here—is another matter. And, if one may say so, the United Kingdom is responsible for the defence and external policies of the Rhodesian dominion. Sir Roy also said the fighting was bound to get worse.

142. On 15 September 1961 a French Government spokesman charged that the United Nations had exceeded its mandate and possibly violated the Charter by intervening with force in Katanga. Considering that the operations of the forces for which we have some responsibility were ordered by the United Nations, at the request of the Congolese Government and Parliament, this does not correspond with the facts. I think the best comment on this comes from a New York newspaper which says:

"The sudden entry into the picture of Sir Roy Welensky, leader of the white settlers in the neighbouring Rhodesian Federation, is a reminder that even before the Congo became independent, African leaders were warning the United Nations of a Rhodesian plot to annex Katanga. It is inconceivable that Welensky will try by armed force to prevent unification of the Congo. If he does, what has up to now been the crisis of the Congo may well turn into the crisis of Rhodesia."

143. It says at a later date:

"The current bloody struggle in Katanga, the first time a United Nations force has been involved in fighting, is not, as reports to the Security Council make clear, a result of a United Nations effort to end Katanga's secession by force . . .

"This is basically a struggle between the United Nations and a group of freebooters and adventurers—including French ultras exiled from their own country because of participation in the thwarted military rebellion in Algeria.

"For months now the United Nations has been engaged in patient, persistent, efforts to fulfil repeated General Assembly and Security Council directives that foreign mercenaries be evacuated from Katanga. Despite all its pleadings there were still some 500 left less than a month ago. They

were the backbone of Katanga's resistance to national unity."

African nationalist leaders have supported the action of the United Nations in the whole of that region.

144. Then we come to certain matters to which I must draw attention. There have been charges of Indian troops firing on Red Cross vehicles. I would like to say here, on the basis of completely checked information, that this is entirely false. General McKeown told a Press conference, "Indian troops are well led, well disciplined, and conducted themselves well". He said that the Indian troops had the hardest job, having to take radio and post office installations, and come under heavy fire and sniping. But they were restrained. He denied that Gurkha troops fired at a Red Cross van. The General said that the Red Cross van was mounted with a bazooka by Belgian paratroopers. A Red Cross van does not become a Red Cross van because a cross is painted on it. It fired on and killed the Irish crew of a United Nations armoured car.

145. General McKeown referred to the allegations of a British correspondent that Gurkha troops had inflicted heavy casualties on the other side during the capture of the radio station. "I do not accept any charge against them", he said.

146. Then we come to more recent matters in this connexion. During the recent fighting in Elisabethville a Red Cross ambulance car carried a bazooka and fired on soldiers in the same incident. Here is another one: on several occasions European civilians traveling in cars carrying Red Cross flags have been seen to carry machine guns. An Italian Red Cross medical team who were working for the United Nations was arrested in Elisabethville by Katangese soldiers under their European mercenary officers. This Italian Red Cross team was giving aid and succour to both the Katangese and United Nations troops. The Italian Red Cross hospital which was supporting the United Nations troops was constantly under fire and had to be evacuated. At Albertville, Indian soldiers captured two Belgians in civilian clothes manning a gun. They were later identified as doctors. A gentleman in priestly garb—I do not like to say a "priest"—was apprehended in the United Nations Italian military hospital in Albertville under suspicious circumstances. When he was searched, a bayonet and hand grenade were found concealed in his robes.

147. By early September half the mercenaries had been removed by the United Nations. Consuls concerned in Elisabethville gave the United Nations assurances that they would help in removing others. The Belgian Consul undertook to repatriate sixty-odd who had taken shelter in his consulate building. When fighting broke out, it was these who led elements of the Katanga "gendarmarie". These Belgian army officers are members of the regular metropolitan army. Rhodesia has permitted the full use of its territory in support of Tshombé. It has helped with technicians, and has permitted passage of arms and ammunition.

148. I think I would like to stop there, because otherwise it will take too long at this late hour. I want to point out that this is a United Nations operation and, that being so, whoever is ordered by the United Nations to take part in it ceases to be a national of his country for that purpose and is entitled to the protection of the United Nations. The symbol of the Red

Cross being used as a cover for other purposes is more than can be accepted as an excuse. There has been no question of Indian troops firing on Red Cross officials—except where the Red Cross has been used by others in this way, a crime has been committed.

149. I now come to a more important aspect of the items we are to consider. The first of these, which disturbs my Government greatly, is the resumption of nuclear tests. We are a country that is normally known as "uncommitted". We do not take our instructions from either of the war blocs. Nor do we, in spite of differences that may arise in regard to either of them, always fail to express our opinions in a matter of importance. With regard to these nuclear tests, it is necessary, however, not to take this thing at a particular stage but to look at the thing as a whole.

150. It was first brought here by the Government of India in 1954,^{6/} and from 1954 it incurred the opposition of the United Kingdom. When first India brought the idea that nuclear tests ought to be suspended, it was opposed by the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom for three reasons. First of all, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd said it was not disarmament and therefore it need not be discussed. Secondly, it was said by the permanent representative at that time that the fall-out was negligible: that there was natural radiation, there was always radiation from luminous wrist-watches, and therefore, it did not matter whether there was more radiation. Therefore, there was no such thing as radiation hazard. That was the second reason for which our appeal was not to be considered. Third, in the second or third year, when these things were wearing down, it was said that tests were not detectable: in other words, you could explode an atom bomb in your pocket! That was the idea. For those three reasons, our proposal was opposed.

151. Ultimately, after four years, there was a conference^{7/} in Geneva, and the United States and the Soviet Union together came to an agreement, which had been discussed here also, that perhaps the technical parts of this problem could be investigated. A conference thus took place, and just before that the USSR stopped explosions—in March of 1958—and the United Kingdom and the United States stopped them in September of the same year. And, until September 1961, so far as we know, there have been no explosions except by France, which proclaimed what is called atomic isolation. In other words, they claim the liberty to explode atomic bombs in the Sahara, which is African territory.

152. In the course of these negotiations in Geneva, there were attempts—of course, we are not a party to them, we can only obtain news of them from such published information as is available—to bring them into the general ban. Our submission was that nuclear explosions, in whatever form they may take place, are bad, and that they ought to be stopped—and completely stopped. The reasons are twofold. One is the effects of radiation, and the other is that nobody explodes these bombs just for amusement: it is only preparation for nuclear war. So, for one reason or the other, these explosions should be stopped.

153. Then, at that time, there came a dent in the idea of the general blanket prohibition of explosions that

^{6/} See Disarmament Commission, Official Records, Supplement for April, May and June 1954, document DC/44 and Corr.1.

^{7/} Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests, opened on 31 October 1958.

was being pursued. The Western side proposed that underground explosions might be permitted, and there seems to have been disagreement about it. Since this will come up in the First Committee, I will not go into details about it. It was also said in the West that it was difficult to detect these underground explosions.

154. Ultimately, in the March of 1959, the United Kingdom Prime Minister went to Moscow and proposed to the USSR that they might establish a principle which would permit underground blasts below a prescribed level.

155. My Government thinks that it was a great mistake to have gone away from the idea of a blanket prohibition and to say that there may be good explosions and bad explosions. We are familiar with this argument in the Assembly. I remember that, two or three years ago, it was between the "clean" bomb and the "dirty" bomb. Which was the clean bomb, I do not know—but there it is. Now, it is the nice explosions and the not-so-nice explosions.

156. Anyway, in May of 1959, the United States agreed to study some proposals—in regard to the inspection quotas, and so on [see A/4853].

157. To make a long story short, this year there came the renewal of explosions by the Soviet Union. My Government, without reservation, regrets this and regards it as a set-back to peace. The moment it was confirmed, we made no reservations in this matter—because we think that only purpose of these explosions is to prepare for atomic war. It is not only a question of more radiation or less radiation, whether radiation is harmful or not so harmful, because, according to some United States scientists, even if there was a nuclear war, in the first year only 2 million people would die, and it would become 160 million in one hundred years: there are different calculations. These Government scientists are like the bishops of the eighteenth century: they reflect the opinions of their Governments. And therefore we need not pay exclusive attention to it.

158. Our position with regard to the renewal of explosions by the Soviet Union is that it is highly regrettable. We have heard all the explanations; we are prepared even to consider the fact that they might have known that somebody else was preparing. But these do not change our position. Equally we think that anyone else who explodes a bomb because the Soviet Union did so is also wrong in doing so. Our position is one of 100 per cent opposition: no explosions under any circumstances, because the explosions are merely preparations for nuclear war, irrespective even of the question of radiation alone.

159. Therefore, we have brought to the Assembly an item, "Continuation of suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests and obligations of States to refrain from their renewal", which differs from the one put down by the United States, "The urgent need for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective international control". The treaty and such things may come afterward, but there should be a stopping of these explosions if we are to move toward disarmament or even toward the lowering of tensions.

160. We have been told in one case that it is because of all the troubles in regard to Berlin and general activity on behalf of NATO, the proposals of the West to give nuclear arms to West Germany, and so on. All this may be true. We are not one of the great Powers, we are not among the great killers of the

world—we are among the minor Powers—so we cannot take effective responsibility in this. But irrespective of the fact whether the nuclear power of the United States and its allies has increased or not, our answer is that the resumption of tests is regrettable, is a setback to peace. A little later I shall quote Mr. Khrushchev on this, which is perhaps the best thing to do.

161. It has been said—it was said by the Secretary of State the other day—that the fact that these tests are taking place now means that there must have been preparations for tests in this way beforehand. Obviously there had been preparations for these tests. That appears to apply to both sides, because it so happens that, with the system that prevails in the Western world, all these things are published, and in the Congressional inquiries in regard to underground test explosions, it is pointed out that it takes two or three years to make one of these big holes in which explosions are made—the question whether these underground tests radiate anything or not is a different one. I do not know the answer.

162. At a hearing before the Sub-Committee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate held on 4 February 1960, Dr. Panofsky made the following remarks to Senator Hubert Humphrey:

"...

"First, the length of time has been estimated to be between two to four years to make a hole for seventy kilotons.

"Senator Humphrey: 'Two to four years?'

"Dr. Panofsky: 'Right.

"Now, let me make one other remark. We keep focusing our attention on salt.

"Now, there is nothing magic about salt. The reason one talks about salt is because that is the medium in which engineers believe it would be the easiest to make such a big hole.

"It is not the properties of salt which make the muffling better, but it is just the fact that salt appears to be the most economical way of producing such a hole.'

"Senator Humphrey: 'It would take two to four years, in other words, in the salt area'—

"Dr. Panofsky: 'Yes'.

"Senator Humphrey: 'And if you happen to run into something a little more difficult than salt, it would take longer?'

"Dr. Panofsky: 'It would take longer and cost more'.

"Senator Humphrey: 'Where do the salt areas of the world predominate?'

"Dr. Panofsky: 'Everywhere.

"We know the Russians have large solution-mining operations and they are, therefore, familiar with the technique ...

"Actually the question of naturally occurring holes is not so critical because the naturally occurring holes we know about are small. They are only useful for concealing explosions of one kiloton or so, which are difficult to identify anyhow.

"No really thorough engineering studies have been made which give reliable cost figures, but just as rough guidance, several hundred thousand dollars per kiloton for the hole is the kind of figure which the engineers discuss.

"This means that for 50 kilotons you might end up with figures in the general order of \$10 to \$30 million.

"These were figures which were produced by a rather brief study of the Atomic Energy Commission'."

163. Statements have been made in the Soviet Union by way of explanation—and I am not going to read out the explanations given—that the need arose against their will because of the situation with regard to Germany or because of threats against the Soviet Union. We have been told here time after time—and I shall point out and give the figures when we come to talk about disarmament—that there are enough atomic bombs in the world to blow up the world several times over. Then what is the point of having more of them? We have not been able to understand this even from a purely power point of view.

164. Therefore, my country stands entirely without reservation in condemnation of the renewal of tests, whether they be by one party, by two parties or by three parties. The French always keep out and make it difficult to draw any kind of tight cordoning in this matter.

165. Then there is the proposal made with regard to the abandonment of tests under water and in the air, to which the Russians reply: "Yes, you are quite prepared to do that, but it is the other one we want to see abandoned". Then we come back to the same position, that whether it be underground or over ground, with the amount of material available it is quite obvious that there are all sorts of diabolical weapons with either side which can be released from one place or the other. There is only one way of dealing with the atomic weapon, and that is to do away with it. There cannot be any kind of half-way house.

166. From 1945 to 1958, the United States has been responsible for 169 explosions, the Soviet Union for 55 explosions, the United Kingdom for 21 explosions and France for 4 explosions, making a total of 249. Of course they are of different sizes. The total yield is estimated to be 170 megatons, which is equal to 170 million tons of TNT. Today, so far as nuclear testing is concerned, with the renewal of tests by the Soviet Union, two or three tests by the United States and the continuation of tests by France, we are in a much worse position than we were in 1959.

167. We hope that the efforts which were made by the Geneva Conference and which nearly came to a successful conclusion can perhaps be renewed. We may quote what was said recently on the one hand by Mr. Khrushchev and, on the other hand, by Mr. Stevenson. In January 1960, Mr. Khrushchev told the world:

"It should not be hard to realize what consequences would follow if, in the present situation, any country were to resume weapon testing. Other nuclear powers would be obliged to follow suit. This would spur resumption of an absolutely unrestricted drive in the testing of nuclear weapons of any capacity and under any conditions. The Government that

would be the first to resume testing would be assuming grave responsibility to the nations." ^{8/}

168. Mr. Stevenson, some time before that, said the following:

"The recent proposal by some of our leaders that the United States resume underground nuclear tests, just when the first break in the deadlock seems possible, shocked me. I can think of few better ways to chill the prospects, deface our peaceful image, and underscore the Communist propaganda that they are the peacemakers and we the warmongers. We should extend our test suspension so long as negotiations continue in good faith and Russia maintains a similar suspension.

"I am confident that some at least of the Russian leaders are anxious to halt testing and development of nuclear weapons before the danger becomes even more uncontrollable.

"The good faith of the negotiations is decisive, because indefinite suspension amounts to a test ban without inspection.

"... the argument goes, disarmament is impossible until political settlements have been reached and confidence restored.

"I disagree. I believe the nuclear arms race with weapons of mass destruction is a new element and in itself a cause of tension... fear will not vanish until the arms race is arrested." ^{9/}

169. It is quite true that there are reservations in the statements, but they both show an attitude of mind which, if I may say it with respect, coincides with the views we have expressed, namely that there cannot be a half-way house in this matter. Either there are to be nuclear explosions or there are not to be nuclear explosions. It is not sufficient if somebody says that the radiation is greater in Minnesota than somewhere else. It makes no difference to the world as such, because apart from the radiation there is a stepping up of the nuclear arms race, and that concerns us even more than anything else.

170. With regard to disarmament, our Prime Minister recently expressed his views. The ruling party in India yesterday passed a resolution with reservations expressing appreciation of the agreement [A/4879]—or whatever you would like to call it—resulting from the exchanges between the Soviet Union and the United States.

171. The Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, speaking here the other day [1017th meeting], referred to the communiqué of the Commonwealth Conference [A/4868 and Corr.1]. I wish he had not, because it is my duty to say that while we have subscribed to that communiqué, my Prime Minister has made it clear beyond any doubt that my country stands by the twelve-Power draft resolution ^{10/} that was submitted to the First Committee in 1960 and is still under discussion. We are glad to think that the joint statement of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations issued by the

^{8/} See Report by N. S. Khrushchev to the USSR Supreme Soviet, 14 January 1960, published in New Times, No. 4, January 1960, Supplement, p. 9.

^{9/} See Adlai Stevenson, "Putting First Things First", Foreign Affairs vol. 38, No. 2 (January 1960), pp. 200 and 201.

^{10/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda items 67, 86, 69, 73, document A/C.1/L.259 and Add.1 and 2.

United States and the USSR [A/4879] in very large measure adopts the substance of the phraseology of the draft resolution. But there are some very significant omissions and significant additions to which I shall briefly refer today. My delegation will no doubt take this up in the First Committee if it comes there for discussion and if the discussions are not taking place among the great Powers outside that context. We have felt that the only way to get anything worth while done in the United Nations on one world issue or another is for the United States and the Soviet Union to come to agreement on it. We have found this to be the true, factual position and from 1952 onwards we have made the appeal each year that unless the United States and the Soviet Union come to an agreement, we are not likely to move forward. We still stand unreservedly by that position.

172. It is quite true that we are all equal here in status, but as the late Lord Balfour said, equality of status does not mean equality of function! It is in the hands of the powerful nations that the peace of the world immediately rests. Therefore, we hope that this agreement will come about. However, I am sorry to say that already annotations have come out in the way of two statements, one by the United States [A/4891] and one by the Soviet Union [A/4892], which already show the difficulties involved when we embark on a question like that of full and complete disarmament.

173. This is the policy which has been put forward in the twelve-Power draft resolution. By full and complete disarmament we mean full and complete disarmament. I shall come to that in a moment. We may look at the whole of this discussion on disarmament from 1945 onwards. There is no doubt that there has been a considerable amount of debate. At one time it looked as though we would go further and further. But, as my Prime Minister said at Belgrade the other day, looking at the world we see more and more arms and not disarmament.

174. On 25 July 1961, the President of the United States asked for an additional grant of \$3,247 million of appropriations for the armed forces. To fill out present army divisions and to make more men available for prompt deployment, he requested an increase in the Army's total authorized strength from 875,000 to approximately 1 million men. He requested an increase of 29,000 and 63,000 men respectively in the Navy and Air Force. These are all published figures, so there is no harm in repeating them.

175. Then we go on to the other side. We read in The New York Times of 5 September 1961 in a dispatch from Warsaw:

"Marian Spychalski, Defence Minister, disclosed today that other Soviet-bloc countries, as well as the Soviet Union and Poland, had taken steps 'conducive to the strengthening of defence readiness'.—"Defence readiness" is what it is called politely. The article continues—"General Spychalski, addressing a graduation ceremony of the Czarniecki officers' academy at Poznan, reported in general terms that a military alert had been ordered within the Soviet bloc."

176. In 1955, 1956 and 1958 the Soviet Union claims that its armed forces had been reduced by 2,140,000 men. On 14 January 1960, a decision was taken on a further reduction of the numerical strength of its—the Soviet Union's—armed forces by 1,200,000 men.

Then it is stated in a statement of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR that it will not fulfil this decision if there is an intensification of war preparations in the NATO member States, threatening the security of the socialist countries.

177. We are not concerned with the reasoning in this matter but with the facts. The fact is that in 1960, instead of a cut-back of 1,200,000 men, they remain. The statement continues:

"Taking into consideration the necessity of strengthening the defence potential of the Soviet Union in these conditions, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Council of Ministers of the USSR found it necessary temporarily to retain in the armed forces of the USSR soldiers, sailors, sergeants, sergeant-majors and petty officers of the appropriate arms of the service and qualifications, who have completed their term of military service established by law and are subject to transfer to the reserve, to the amount necessary for securing the combat readiness of the Soviet Army in case of any possible provocations by the aggressive quarters of the Western Powers."

178. Thus, irrespective of the reasons, the facts are that on both sides armaments expenditure in money goes up more and more and more. An estimate of national defence expenditures for arms, armaments and personnel shows that the world is spending \$14 million an hour for arms and armies. All this may not concern the great Powers so much, but I think that the peoples of the world, if they know more and more what is going on in these directions, will less and less use the legalisms and all the arguments, all the "pros" and "cons", all the finding fault one way or another.

179. This is \$40 a year for every man, woman and child on earth. That is very much more than the per caput income of the African population of the Congo. At least 15 million men are members of the various national armies, and a total of 75 million men are engaged in tasks directly or indirectly connected with making war. Not included in these totals are an uncounted number of scientists whose research is more or less directly aimed at producing weapons or at improving existing weapons.

180. Of the total arms expenditure, the United States and the Soviet Union together account for 73 per cent, \$88 billion a year. The United States has the largest armaments expenditure of any nation—\$46 billion a year. This is 55 per cent of the total Federal budget. However, it has been estimated that the Soviets spend as much as \$42 billion a year for military expenses, among which would be expenditures titled "Heavy Construction", "Education" and "Scientific Experiments". The Soviets claim to be spending only \$10.2 billion a year for arms and armed forces.

181. Ending the arms race absolutely would make it possible to double the incomes of 1.2 billion people who now make less than \$100 a year. Or it would enable adequate housing to be provided for 240 million families which are now inadequately housed.

182. Thus while there has been all this talk of cutting down on arms, if you take the year 1950, as regards expenditures on arms of France, the United Kingdom, the United States and the USSR, you will see that the expenditure on military budgets in France has gone up from 1.55 to 3.2; in this particular case largely because of colonial wars. The United Kingdom has

gone up from 2.38 to 4.2. The United States has gone up from 14.6 to 46. The USSR has gone up from 20.72 to 24.0. I suppose that is because of different calculations. Anyway, in every country there has been an increase in military expenditures.

183. We explain the military expenditure in our country as irrelevant for this purpose because it does not come into this particular arms race. However, as a matter of interest it has decreased in the last three years from .613 to .510, so in a small way one makes whatever contribution one can. I do not intend reading out all these figures because, even though they are very important, this would not be welcome perhaps at this time of the evening.

184. With regard to the disarmament position, in 1946, directives [resolution 41 (I)] were given by the United Nations and then we came to a period of deadlock. Again in 1952 directives [resolution 808 (IX)] were formulated. Last year, my delegation, in common with eleven others, tried to persuade the Assembly to accept the giving of directives to the people who were engaged in disarmament negotiations. For the first time there was an attempt on both sides not to kill the draft resolution but to have it considered. It has been discussed now for a long time and certainly there is the advantage that there has been an agreement put out between the United States and the Soviet Union with regard to the goals of disarmament. And here may I say this. There are two ways of looking at a goal; one is a goal of something you try to reach; but if you look at a goal from the point of view of a goal-keeper, to prevent the other fellow from getting there, then the word "goal" has a different meaning. That is the difficulty in using this word because "goal" means that if all difficulties are overcome they will get there.

185. So far as the goal of negotiations is concerned, both countries, as in the draft resolution^{11/} before the Assembly, have agreed to accept general and complete disarmament, which indeed was accepted even two years ago [resolution 1378 (XIV)].

186. However, as far as our draft resolution, the twelve-Power draft resolution, is concerned, there is a paragraph in it which enjoins and urges countries to refrain from actions likely to aggravate international tensions. This has been taken out and has been substituted by reliable procedures for the settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace.

187. Now we go on to the other side with regard to the maintenance of international forces. Until there is international law in the world and until the one-world principle has been agreed upon this is an impossibility. We are not, as Lord Home tried to persuade the Assembly [1017th meeting], ready to accept the doctrine of the balance of power. It is not possible for small countries to accept the idea that the great Powers would have armed forces which would be placed at the disposal of the international authority. The draft resolution as it is put out, and the agreed principles both contemplate such a force, a police force. In the twelve-Power draft resolution national contingents, constituting the international force, should, it is contemplated, exclude the possibility of their being used for purposes inconsistent with the Charter, including their use in the interest of one group of another. There is no such provision in the

agreed principles. Here is the trouble. International forces had to be used at various times and unanimity could not be obtained in the Assembly, not necessarily as between one bloc or the other, but even as between countries.

188. Another important difference between these agreed principles and the draft resolution is in regard to nuclear stockpiles. The draft resolution refers to the elimination of nuclear stockpiles and means of chemical and bacteriological warfare.

189. The agreed principles between the Soviet Union and the United States talk about the elimination of nuclear stockpiles. It is not said that once eliminated you cannot replace them. However, the draft resolution asked for the prohibition of these means of war, and this has been the position of the United Nations since 1952, when we accepted the prohibition resolution [502 (VI)]. In that sense, unless it is merely a verbal change, it is something on which we will have something to say afterwards.

190. Then we come to one of the main controversies on which there was a possibility of reaching an agreement in 1960, and that is with regard to what was called partial disarmament and complete disarmament. We are one of those countries who, on the one hand, think that it is not possible in today's world to reach any agreement on disarmament without controls, without inspections and without everything else agreed to. But, equally, we have always stated that any form of disarmament, however well-intentioned or desirable, will take time, whether it takes one minute or one year or ten years; it will take time. But in this twelve-Power draft resolution it is clear that the first part of it is not supposed to be a sort of probationary period or trial experiment, to see how it works—that is, if everybody behaves properly, to go on to the next step. It seeks to commit the world as a whole to disarmament.

191. There has been discussion about this, and that part is still left in ambiguity in the statement of agreed principles.

192. I have dealt with the main aspects, with this exception. According to the agreed principles, the international inspecting officers would have unrestricted access, without veto, to all places necessary for the purpose of verification. This is a great advance as compared with the resolution which we submitted, and we welcome it—unrestricted access to all places, without veto. It would work out if there was agreement on general and complete disarmament.

193. On the other hand, the agreed principles omit altogether the provisions contained in the sixteen-Power draft resolution which relate to the use of outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes. No doubt that may well be a simpler matter, because there are only two countries concerned.

194. There was also a provision in the draft resolution with regard to surprise attacks. It was stated that all countries should refrain from all forms of surprise attack and preparation for the same. This has also been eliminated in the agreed principles.

195. I have now dealt with most of these matters. All that now remains is an aspect or two with regard to the drift towards war. Now, we are not ourselves directly concerned in the Berlin dispute, in the narrower sense. It is not before the United Nations either. We have not sought to bring it before the United Na-

^{11/} Ibid.

tions because we think that if the great Powers concerned could bring about a settlement—and we hope they will—from all that has been heard that would be the best thing one could think of.

196. However, having regard to what has become part of present thinking, the imminence of a nuclear war and the preparations for the same—such as the resumption of test explosions—while we may not be contributors to such war, we all have the common concern of being the common victims of it, and therefore from the victims' point of view we think we have some reason to say something about these matters.

197. I do not propose to read from the pages and pages I have here that relate to various types of weapons. For the first time we have been able to get the particulars on Russian weapons, which were recently published, and on American weapons. There are these surface to surface, air to air, ground to air, water to air missiles—missiles all over the place, beautiful names with a great destructive capacity. And on top of it there is also the prohibition of the use of the moon for this purpose. This is purely a lunatic effort.

198. There was a society in the eighteenth century which met on a day wherein there was a full moon. The reason was that various people wanted to get back to their homes which were thirty and forty miles away. They were called the "lunar society". They were the beginning of the scientists of the world.

199. Now I have here an extract from testimony which was submitted to the House Armed Services Committee, which says that the United States Air Force intends to establish a missile base on the moon. There is nothing exclusively lunar about this. It is considered that the warhead would be fired from the moon to the earth without an enormous expenditure of energy, since the moon has no atmosphere and little gravity.

200. The extract goes on to say that General Putt testified that the moon would provide a base of retaliation of considerable advantage over earthbound nations. Sounds rather mystic, does it not? He pointed out that an attack upon the moon by the USSR would have to be launched a day or two before an attack upon the terrestrial United States if the United States was to be unable to retaliate from the moon. Such a preliminary attack upon the moon, he considered, would warn Americans of their danger. If, on the other hand, the Russians did not demolish the United States lunar installations, it would be possible from these installations to destroy Russia, although the terrestrial United States had been obliterated—a grim prospect.

201. General Putt's testimony was reinforced by Richard E. Horner—the extract goes on—Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development, who saw in the establishment of lunar bases an opportunity of breaking through the nuclear stalemate.

202. It is further stated here that it is curious, and typical of militarist mentality everywhere, that both these two eminent gentlemen seemed at first loath to admit the possibility of Russia also installing missile stations on the moon. It is obvious that what one side can do the other also can do, and the only result of such plans, if they are carried out, must be warfare from the moon. General Putt, it is true, did in the end acknowledge that what the United States can do on or from the moon Russia can also do, but the moral which he drew was that the United States must also

occupy Mars and Venus which, apparently, he considered to be beyond the reach of the Soviets. We are not told why.

203. The extract further states that all this curious speculation received much less publicity than might have been expected and that the writer would not have known of it but for the fact that it has been reported.

204. I have not yet seen an account of similar plans of the Soviet Union, but I must look out for it!

205. I shall now dwell on a matter which has engaged the attention of the Assembly very recently, and that is the situation which has been created by the sudden death of the Secretary-General. I have been asked by my Government to make our position entirely clear. We desire a United Nations that will function strongly. Last year when Mr. Khrushchev put forward [869th meeting para. 284] the proposal of a tripartite Secretariat, my Prime Minister spoke in opposition at that time to it, and our position with regard to the troika is the same today. I used the word "troika", because it has been generally used, here and elsewhere in this connexion.

206. In other words, we do not believe in an executive which provides for the functioning of three heads that would cancel out each other. Therefore, we are against a Secretariat which possesses these three heads.

207. We are also against what the Americans call an arrangement which contains a built-in veto. We are against any kind of arrangement whereby forward movement would become impossible. At the same time, however, we believe there is some element of merit in the collective idea, because mistakes of various kinds have been made in the past. There is no reason at all why, through the ingenuity of the statesmen who are gathered here, a solution of this character could not be brought about.

208. We think that it is possible to find a solution. In the statement put out by the Soviet Union, it would appear, so far as we understand it, that it has come away from the idea of the veto. It has also moved towards the idea of having one person—of course, with certain modifications.

209. We are not at present putting forward any proposals—because we do not want it to be thought that we are in any way hindering any bilateral agreement in regard to these proposals—but I should like representatives, particularly those with strong views, to look at the history of this matter. This idea of more than one Secretary-General is nothing new. In 1946 the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations submitted a report to the United Nations; and what is more, it was accepted—its proposals have never been carried out. At that time it was said:

"the Secretary-General should be authorized to appoint Assistant Secretaries-General and such other officials and employees as are required... The Assistant Secretaries-General should have responsibility, etc." ^{12/}

Before that it was proposed that:

"there should always be one Assistant Secretary-General amongst those referred to in recommendation 11 below, designated by the Secretary-General to deputize ^{13/} for him when he is absent or unable to perform his functions."

^{12/} See Report of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations (Pc/20), chapter VIII, recommendation 11.

^{13/} Ibid., recommendation 8.

210. Looking back, after the event, it would seem that if this recommendation had been followed, we could have avoided our present difficulty. What I am trying to point out is that this idea of having more than one person carrying responsibilities, in whatever form, is nothing new.

211. In 1952 Mr. Trygve Lie submitted to the General Assembly his report on reorganization.^{14/} In that report we find the following:

"The Secretary-General believes that many advantages would result from the introduction of a simplified scheme in which three Deputy Secretaries-General would replace the present Assistant Secretaries-General and more responsibility for day-to-day administration would be delegated to the Principal Directors. The main features of the plan would be:

"(a) To enable the Secretary-General to devote his entire energies to the most important problems of policy and programme formulation by freeing him from questions of day-to-day operation, administration and co-ordination.

"(b) To provide the Secretary-General with a small group of deputies of the highest competence and prestige to collaborate with him. Although these persons should each be responsible for the functioning of a part of the Secretariat so as to ensure that their policy considerations would be rooted in realities, their main duty would be the development and over-all co-ordination of policies and programmes.

"(c) To delegate through the Deputy Secretaries-General to the next supervisory level... the maximum responsibility for the day-to-day administration of the several areas of the Secretariat."

212. I have no desire to go into a great many details nor into Mr. Hammarskjöld's report, because it was intended for him to argue it, and since he is not here, it is not necessary. The same idea is carried through with different modifications.

213. So the idea of having a collective factor is nothing new. While we are against any kind of arrangement which divides the world in three, while we are against any arrangement which provides for a built-in veto, we think that it is impossible for this Organization to function except by agreement between the great Powers. That is the basis on which the United Nations was founded. The United States was the main delegation responsible for the veto at San Francisco; no more powerful speeches could have been made than those by Senator Connolly at that time—for some time the Russians did not seem anxious about it in those days. Therefore, we think that the private talks being carried on by these great countries with minor and smaller people as well as between themselves have probably moved them nearer.

214. There is no reason why, in our submission, with a degree of the understanding of the position of the large number of nations in the Assembly, many of which would not want to be driven into the position of subscribing to a railroaded draft resolution—because we have seen resolutions in this Assembly adopted by fifty-five votes to five and nothing happened after—a solution could not be reached. Especially when the chief executive of one of the Charter organs may have

to be appointed, such appointment must carry with it both moral and other consent of practically the entire body of people, and not become an issue wherein we merely count votes and get nowhere.

215. Therefore, we would be willing to support any agreement that is reached between the main contending parties, irrespective of our own views or desires on any aspect of this matter. We think that it should be possible for them to come to an agreement on some individual, and for that individual to appoint five or six deputies, according to geographical or other considerations. If it is felt to be more closely in conformity with the Charter if the appointments are made by the Secretary-General himself, these things can be easily provided for. We believe, therefore, that if a common individual can be agreed upon and that individual can go on immediately to accept the position and, in general, pour oil on the troubled waters, then we shall be able to proceed.

216. The Indian Government is a little concerned about the fact that an arrangement of this character must come through the Security Council—and for this reason. The Government of India has today 7,000 personnel in the Congo. For the first time, the armed forces of India have gone beyond their shores with lethal weapons. It is true that they went to Korea, to Gaza, to Lebanon and elsewhere, but today they are in the Congo as a fighting force on the demand of the United Nations. Increasing demands are made upon us each day and, what is more, we have responsibilities to our people and our parliament in regard to their performance and conditions. The whole of the Congo action emanates from the Security Council's functions and decisions. It would be a bad day if things of this kind were to be decided by a majority vote in the Assembly and not by the Security Council. We are not a member of the Security Council, but we are a Member of this Organization and, therefore, if the Secretary-General is merely a creature of the General Assembly appointed by a majority vote or even a unanimous vote and not related to another Charter organ, the Security Council, it would put the Security Council outside the competence of the appointee and vice versa. This is a serious matter. I have tried speaking privately about it, but so far with no results.

217. I think that it is necessary for me to say, on behalf of the Government of India, that we would support any arrangement on which there is comparative agreement between the great Powers, an agreement which would enable things to function. We think that it is possible to reach such an agreement because the Soviet Union has moved away from the "troika" position and a built-in veto: it said in its statement of 1 October 1961 that it was not asking for a veto. It has agreed to an acting appointment of one man as Secretary-General. Therefore, I hope that, in the next few days, it will be possible to come to some agreement. It will depend on the two sides being able to have confidence not only in each other, but in the kind of person who would come in, a person who would not be pushed one way or the other. Any person who is likely to be not totally objective and not have the courage to mention correct positions, would find himself in difficulty.

218. Given this background, we do not see any difficulty about these other functionary and collective factors being brought in on the basis of geographical considerations—five or six as the case may be by agreement—if the countries behind them do not try to condition those officials.

^{14/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Annexes, agenda item 3, document A/2214.

219. For its part, whether it be in the Congo or in the Secretariat, the Government of India has never given an instruction to any Indian personnel, either here or in the field of operations. Once they are handed over they are international civil servants, and we have scrupulously respected that position. Even with regard to the Congo operations my Government collected all its information from other sources and not from anybody within the United Nations, because there were Indian officials in charge and we did not want to embarrass them.

220. That would be our position. Therefore, I make this suggestion that it may be possible for the representatives of the great Powers to come together on this basis and to be able to earn the gratitude of large numbers of people, especially people like ourselves who do not want to be divided in this manner and who would like to see a unanimous decision somehow or other taking place.

221. Whatever decision we take, it will not be in conformity with the Charter because the authors of the Charter—in their great anxiety to say something in a few pages, or whatever it may have been—did not make any provision for this contingency. Perhaps they thought that Secretaries-General would not die! That is also possible. But, anyway, there is no precedent which can help us in the present context. It has been said that there are precedents. I do not want to argue that. If the time comes when it is necessary, we will argue it but there are no precedents—so that whatever arrangements were made would not be on all fours in terms of the letter of the Charter or precedent. Certainly they could be in the spirit of the Charter, in the sense that the Security Council and the Assembly may be able to subscribe to them.

222. The man must be able to work instead of having one party or the other being suspicious of him so that he will be unable to go forward in other ways. We hope that any further progress between the great Powers with regard to the issue of war and peace agitating the world—which is really disturbing people far more than anything else—will be helped by some movement towards that end.

223. We are a country with little capacity to influence these decisions between the giants either by force of arms, by economic power or even by the power of persuasion. Even when a proposition is submitted on merits and without partisanship it usually takes six or seven years for it to become even acquiesced in. We find that very often the approach is the same in this matter. We have made this appeal in this way in the hope that, in the next few days, having come so far—that is, the idea of a veto having been eliminated and the idea of one man not being agreeable at all being now not the case, the idea of one man plus having come into being—we shall, with a degree of give and take, find that action will be possible, especially if in the intervening period we can have five or six, or whatever number is required for the purpose, to go on with the duties as they are at present.

224. The world is exercised about the situation in Berlin, but not because people do not understand why a city should be divided like this or otherwise. So far as we are concerned, when any country makes peace with anybody we shall not say "no". If the Americans want to make peace with East Germany we shall not object to it, and if the Russians want to make peace with West or East Germany we shall not object to that. In spite of such instructions as I have, I have

refrained from going into any detail in this matter, because the situation changes from day to day, and for us to make observations on details would not be of any assistance. But it would be a bad thing for people to be told, as they are constantly told in the lobbies of the Assembly, that the world is getting accustomed to the idea of a nuclear war, so let the other side take care. Each side says, "Let the other side take care"—not that it itself should take care.

225. I conclude with two quotations. Normally one goes back to history, to somewhere else and to remote periods. Living people may perhaps not be effectively quoted since they may change their opinions next day. I remember a gentleman with whom I was discussing a particular article in the Encyclopaedia Britannica. I quoted the article against his position. At the end of it he said, "I have changed my opinion, since I wrote that". So there is always that danger.

226. However, Mr. Khrushchev said, when he visited us here at the fourteenth session of the General Assembly:

"The peoples are thirsting for peace; they want to live without fear for their future, without fear of losing those who are dear to them in the conflagration of a new year." [799th meeting, para 45.]

"For centuries, the peoples have dreamed of putting an end to the destructive methods of waging war". [Ibid., para. 46.]

"We say sincerely to all countries: As against the slogan 'Let us arm!', which still enjoys currency in some places, we advance the slogan 'Let us disarm completely!' Let us compete as to who builds more homes, schools, and hospitals for his people and produces more bread, milk, meat, clothing and other consumer goods; let us not compete as to who has more hydrogen bombs and rockets."

227. President Kennedy, speaking to us only the other day, said:

"Mankind must put an end to war, or war will put an end to mankind." [1013th meeting, para. 40.]

"Let us call a truce to terror. Let us invoke the blessings of peace. And, as we build an international capacity to keep peace, let us join in dismantling the national capacity to wage war." [Ibid., para. 41.]

The President went on to say:

"Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation, or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us." [Ibid., para. 50.]

228. I do not think that I could conclude my observations in this general debate on a better note than my placing before the Assembly the sentiments in the two quotations I have just cited. I submit these observations to the Assembly for its consideration.

229. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I give the floor to the representative of Portugal, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

230. Mr. DE MIRANDA (Portugal): In exercising the right of reply on behalf of the delegation of Portugal I wish to point out, at the outset, that there is more than meets the eye in the grossly misleading, utterly

baseless and irresponsible statements made by the representative of the Indian Union in respect of my country. I will demonstrate this point presently and the evidence I shall place before the Assembly will be my justification for requesting its patient hearing for some minutes, because the issues involved are so serious that it is necessary that the Assembly should be informed of the reality lying behind the wordy performance to which the Assembly has just been treated by the representative of the Indian Union. The performance might have been dismissed as just so much empty verbiage of the Indian representative, had it not been for the fact that behind his mischievous comments on Angola lie sinister intentions which the Indian Union seeks to carry out elsewhere and which need to be denounced so that the Assembly may not be deceived and misled into taking up a position which ought to be repudiated by all men of right conscience. That is why my delegation strongly feels that it is its duty to inform the Assembly of certain facts which show up in its true light the hypocritical game being played by the Indian Union. And I feel that I am qualified to do so because I come from Goa and my people have been feeling in the past seven years and more the cruel sting of that hypocritical game, which oozes out non-violence and pacifism for foreign consumption but has already committed aggression against my homeland and now threatens to overwhelm it with a full-fledged military action.

231. My Government has already drawn the attention of the Security Council to this threat and now I have the honour to draw the attention of this Assembly also: the Indian Prime Minister has repeatedly stated since last August that he does not rule out the possibility of a military invasion of Goa.

232. On 17 August, 1961 speaking in the Indian Parliament in New Delhi, the Indian Prime Minister stated:

"The steps to be taken for the liberation of Goa could be reviewed in order to include the use of the Indian army at the appropriate time." On 18 August the Prime Minister repeated that his Government "would vary that policy"—about Goa—"if necessary or desirable to do so", adding that "the time may come when the Army may have to march into Goa," and when the Indian Government "will have to deal with the Goan situation on an armed basis".

233. On 23 August the Indian Prime Minister, in another speech before the New Delhi Parliament, declared:

"I believe that conditions are ripening for an advance being made. It is difficult for me to say anything definitive, but in the context of what is happening in the Portuguese colonies abroad, what is happening in Goa today will produce new situations requiring a new approach."

234. The Indian Prime Minister spoke about the situation in Goa as if anything happening there could in any manner disturb the peace and security of the Indian Union. First of all, I declare most categorically that few territories in the world—and certainly not the Indian Union—enjoy the peace and tranquillity which prevail in Goa. But is it not ridiculous to argue that a situation in tiny Goa, whatever that situation be, could be a source of danger to the vast and powerful Indian Union? This argument is, ironically enough, in every way similar to that of the wolf of the fable,

which the Indian representative just mentioned in a different context, and its implications will not be lost on the Assembly. As a Goan and in the name of my people, I ask, Can the Assembly countenance the policy of barefaced aggression now threatened officially by the Indian Prime Minister? This is a situation which may come to affect the peace and tranquillity of my country in my homeland—Goa.

235. It is precisely to divert the attention of the world from such an aggressive policy that the Indian representative took the floor of the Assembly to launch his wild tirade against Portugal. While contemplating an armed invasion of Goa, the Indian representative thought it expedient to insist on what he called Portuguese "colonialism".

236. Nowadays, the slogan of "colonialism" has a magic effect in many quarters, even though it can be applied against Portugal only by making short work of Portuguese history, of the Portuguese Constitution and of the ineluctable reality of Portuguese life. But I ask, even if it be granted, for argument's sake—I repeat, only for argument's sake—that Goa is a colony, does this entitle the Indian Union to threaten Goa with invasion? Does anti-colonialism justify the invasion by another country of a territory just because it is wrongly labelled "colonial"? If this is so, what is the difference between anti-colonialism and imperialism?

237. My delegation has already proved here on several occasions that there is not and there never was the slightest trace of colonialism in Goa. The history and traditions of Goa are abundantly clear on this point and the present conditions in Goa amply confirm it, as any honest person can verify for himself.

238. The anti-colonialist mask of the Indian Union is nothing more nor less than a camouflage for Indian imperialism. What the Indian Union seeks is not to give independence to Goans but to force them, even by means of an armed invasion, to submit to the yoke of New Delhi in utter disregard of all the principles of international law and morality, so often proclaimed by the Indian leaders. Five years ago, on 6 September 1955, to be precise, the Indian Prime Minister told the Parliament in New Delhi, "The Portuguese must quit, even if the Goans want them to remain". Today, the same Prime Minister threatens the Goans with an armed invasion because, during all these years, the Goans have not submitted to his imperial "diktat". And this is true not only of Goans living in Goa, but also of the Goan communities living outside Goa: in East Africa, in the Middle East, in Pakistan and in the Indian Union itself.

239. Indian imperialism has already claimed several victims and I need not recall the fate of Junagadh, Hyderabad, Kashmir and of the Nagas. But I would like to recall the so-called annexation, recently proclaimed by the Indian Parliament, of the Portuguese enclaves of Dadrá and Nagar-Aveli, held in sequestration by the Indian Government since 1954. It must be emphasized that, even though the enclaves have been the object of a sentence of the International Court of Justice^{15/} recognizing Portugal's sovereignty and its right of access to them, the Indian Government has ignored the sentence, and by a unilateral decision has declared the enclaves annexed to the Indian Union in pursuance of an act of naked and bloody aggression involving loss of life and other atrocities.

^{15/} Case concerning Right of Passage over Indian Territory (Merits), Judgement of 12 April 1960: I.C.J. Reports 1960, p. 6.

240. These are plain facts which no amount of theorizing and verbal eloquence can explain away. Those who blindly follow the standard of anti-colonialism and try to raise that standard even where no colonial situation exists, would do well to consider what crimes are sometimes committed in the name of certain slogans which have become popular in our times.

241. No one likes colonialism and we least of all, because we have always worked to build up a multi-racial national community. Nevertheless, we cannot but lament that anti-colonialism has in many instances become a travesty of what it pretends to be, for it has become a passport to all manner of violations of international law and even of fundamental human rights to serve the ambitions of third parties. Having never been a colonial nation ourselves, we are in line with modern anti-colonialism, but not with the crafty game of unholy ambitions now being played in the name of anti-colonialism.

242. Since the beginning of this debate some delegations have used this rostrum to conduct a reprehensible campaign against Portugal in connexion with the events in Angola, making accusations of "barbarous repression", "deliberate extermination of populations", "atrocities and horrors", alleged to have been committed by Portuguese security forces.

243. They have made generalizations, and in no case has any proof of the accusations been furnished. Nevertheless, such accusations have been levelled in extremely violent and emotional terms, with no regard for the truth or for the dignity of the Assembly. My delegation deplores the verbal outbursts which have been spouted from this rostrum. They are distortions beyond recognition which sadly point either to the irresponsibility of the accusers or, in some cases, to premeditated bad faith.

244. Incredible as it is, these accusations are levelled at a country which was the first in the world to abolish the death penalty, as it was one of the first to abolish slavery and the first to regard all men as equals, whatever their race, creed or colour.

245. In view of what has been taking place, my delegation believes that it is its right and duty to make the following reply:

246. My delegation reserves its right to answer the Indian representative's gratuitous and false accusations at the appropriate time and in the appropriate place. Since, however, he seems to have excelled in his slanderous assertions on the subject of labour conditions in Angola, perhaps the Indian representative would like to know that Portugal is not afraid of any investigation—this is so true that Portugal has agreed that a study of the matter should be carried out by the International Labour Organisation, a source which the world accepts as reliable and serious, contrary to what happens in regard to the usual utterances of the Indian representative.

247. The fraudulent accusations of the deliberate extermination of populations—

248. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I would remind the representative of Portugal that he has asked for the floor in order very briefly to exercise his right of reply ...

249. Mr. DE MIRANDA (Portugal): The fraudulent accusations of the deliberate extermination of populations and of horrors and atrocities and inhuman re-

pression being committed by the Portuguese security forces are nothing but barefaced lies. With a sense of indignation my delegation denies and repudiates them with the utmost vigour.

250. The development witnessed in the northern region of Angola and the measures taken by the Portuguese Government and the local authorities fall within a very different context. In the prosecution of a sinister plan of subversion and terrorism, that part of the Portuguese Province of Angola, where white and coloured Portuguese were living in calm and peace, and unarmed—no unrest whatsoever had existed previously—was made a prey to the clandestine invasion of trained terrorists, whose skill in acts of ferocity and criminal delirium will always remain a dark blot on the conscience of mankind. Hence the blood, tears and sorrow in northern Angola. At the start of their criminal rampage, the terrorists directed their attack against villages, small town and isolated places, and they did so in large gangs. Before the arrival of the security forces, they massacred, violated and quartered men, women and children of all races—white, black and mixed—indiscriminately. They intimidated the people of the towns and villages into following them; they used murder and torture. This has been acknowledged by the main leader of the terrorists himself in a public interview.

251. The Indian representative spoke about the refugees from Angola. But he did not say, as he should have said, that the stream of refugees from Angola was largest when the terrorists were controlling large areas in northern Angola, which shows that these refugees fled from the terrorists and not from the Portuguese troops or authorities.

252. With the subsequent arrival of reinforcements, much has been done to restore calm and tranquillity to northern Angola. The objective of the forces of order has been none other than this: to restore calm and tranquillity. Unless it is held that the Portuguese Government ought passively to permit the massacre of populations whenever the terrorists choose to attack, it is difficult to see how such an objective can be regarded as illegitimate.

253. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I should be grateful if the representative of Portugal would cut short his remarks. The Assembly is supposed to finish its work by 6.30. I should be glad if he would be brief.

254. Mr. DE MIRANDA (Portugal): The Portuguese Government cannot surrender its responsibility to protect the lives, property and interests entrusted to it. It is obviously Portugal's moral duty to give that protection and, rendering a service to humanity, to take the proper means of defence against the genocidal terrorists and the help which they receive from abroad.

255. Those who have chosen Portugal as their target have made a great mistake. Portugal will never surrender its sacred duty to protect its populations, will never cease to expose the dishonesty of the international campaign launched against it, will never submit to the high-handed interference in its internal affairs, and will never be bullied.

256. Although propaganda may deceive some people—and that only for a time—it cannot alter the reality of Portugal's life. And what is this reality? It is that our overseas endeavours, which preceded the expansion of colonialism by some centuries has never had any-

thing to do with, and has always been very distinct from, the conceptions of colonialism and imperialism. In addition to developing trade in our contacts with local populations, we have always been especially guided by the ideals of men's equality before God, whatever their race or colour, and of establishing ties of human solidarity transcending the plane of material interests. That is the basis of our traditional

policy of non-discrimination, of our spirit of assimilation by interpenetration of cultures, and finally, of the economic, social and political integration of all populations on an equal footing. This is the reality of Portugal's life, and this is the reality which the international community is in duty bound to respect.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.