



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
<i>Statement by the representative of India . . .</i>	501
<i>Statement by the representative of Pakistan . . .</i>	503
<i>Speech by Mr. Guirma (Upper Volta)</i>	504
<i>Speech by Mr. Wachuku (Nigeria)</i>	508
<i>Speech by Mr. Padilla Nervo (Mexico)</i>	516

President: Mr. Muhammad ZAFRULLA KHAN
(Pakistan).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of India, who has asked to exercise the right of reply.
2. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India): I very much regret the necessity of coming here again to reply to some of the misstatements made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan on Friday last. As I shall attempt to show, he did not answer any of my questions nor did he attempt to disprove the accuracy of my statement. He apparently found it impossible to do so and therefore tried only to confuse the issue. The Foreign Minister asked me whether I can claim "that provisions and procedures set forth in the Indo-Pakistan Passport and Visa Agreement of 1953 have been paid the slightest respect" [1151st meeting, para. 11]. He quoted paragraph 17, sub-paragraphs 3 and 4 of that Agreement.
3. I confess that I am somewhat surprised at this question, and I find it difficult to believe that he does not remember the developments subsequent to that Agreement. Soon after the ratification of the Agreement, it became apparent that co-operation was not forthcoming from Pakistani Missions in India for the repatriation of thousands of Pakistani nationals who continued illegally to cross over into India without any travel documents. All our efforts to induce the Pakistani Missions to follow the procedure laid down in these sub-paragraphs of the 1953 Agreement were in vain.
4. In 1955 Pakistan amended its Pakistan (Control of Entry) Act of 1952. Under article 7 of this amended Pakistani act, the Central Government was authorized to prosecute or remove Indian nationals from Pakistan and to "use all means as may, in the circumstances be necessary to effect [their] removal". This was in direct violation of the very procedure referred to by the Foreign Minister.
5. In January 1956 the Pakistan High Commission in New Delhi was informed that, since they were making a dead letter of the 1953 Agreement, the Government

of India would be forced to assume powers to expel the large number of Pakistanis who had infiltrated into India. Even this produced no result.

6. It was this continued non-co-operation from Pakistan that compelled the Government of India in 1957 to amend the Foreigners' Act of 1946 and to apply its provisions to nationals of Pakistan as much as to other foreigners for purposes of deportation, etc. Pakistan also immediately followed suit and amended the Pakistan Foreigners Act to cover the deportation of Indian nationals. Am I to understand that the Foreign Minister is not aware of this legislation of his own Government which put an end to the provisions of sub-paragraphs 3 and 4 of paragraph 17? May I also, in all humility, remind him that these provisions were not followed by Pakistan when Indians were deported from East Pakistan.

7. The Foreign Minister quoted from an Indian weekly called The New Age, which is run by an opposition party. Pakistan, which does not now believe in any political parties, may not know it, but those who are familiar with such a system will know that opposition parties sometimes try to make capital out of any situation which they consider to be the result of the Administration's inefficiency.

8. The Foreign Minister has, however, not been fair to The New Age by quoting out of context only some portions from that lengthy article. Fortunately, I have the journal here, and I crave your indulgence to read the first part of the same article which the Foreign Minister thought fit to suppress:

"The infiltration of Pakistani Muslims into Tripura is not a new feature. For the last fifteen years infiltration has been going on, often with the connivance of the local administration. Driven mostly by hunger for land and jobs, Pakistani Muslims entered Tripura, raised huts on Khas Government lands and bribed the corrupt officials in order to get permission to stay on permanently in Tripura.

"But this infiltration by Pakistani Muslims could no longer be ignored because of the present deterioration—they were writing this in July—of relations between India and Pakistan; particularly, on the issue of Kashmir, and also because of the frequent border incidents followed by heavy concentration of Pakistani forces in the regions bordering on Tripura. These developments were rightly viewed with alarm and anxiety by the people of this territory.

"And when, in this background, the Administration revealed that the percentage of Muslim population in Tripura had doubled during the last ten years (between 1951 and 1961) and the infiltration of Pakistani Muslims was still no less than a hundred a month, a spontaneous cry was raised to stop this infiltration and to drive out the Pakistani Muslims who had infiltrated during the last 15 years.

"... Amarpur"—which has been referred to by the Foreign Minister—"where the Muslim population during the last 10 years increased by 242 per cent, was selected as the 'worst nest' of Pakistanis ..."

I think I have quoted enough to show what this weekly, which the Foreign Minister of Pakistan recognizes as a well-known Indian journal, has to say about Pakistani infiltration and what a distorted picture he has presented by quoting out of context from the article.

9. The Foreign Minister has seen an ominous significance in a simple reorganization of our Eastern Army Command, which became necessary for facilitating military operations against recent aggressive Chinese incursions into India. Pakistan, which is still looked upon as a crusader against communism and which is given substantial military aid on that consideration, has now chosen to flirt with China.

10. A Reuter's report of 13 October said that border negotiations between China and Pakistan had begun in Peiping. No wonder Pakistan has of late been less enthusiastic about its membership of the South-East Asia Treaty Organization.

11. I now come to the Foreign Minister's comments on the statement which I made on 3 October. He made much of an unfortunate typographical error in the provisional records, which were corrected immediately. What I said was: "statutorily debarred from holding the highest office in the State", not "the highest offices" [1141st meeting, para. 222]. He also misunderstood me in thinking that non-Muslims are second-class citizens merely because they are so debarred. I did not say that they were second-class citizens only because they were deprived of the birth-right of every citizen to hold the highest office. I gave other evidence as well, namely, that they are subjected to political and economic discrimination and are left with a sense of insecurity.

12. In his attempt to justify the discriminatory constitutional provisions in Pakistan, the Foreign Minister gave, as an example, the fact that in the United Kingdom the Crown could be worn only by a Christian, and that of a particular denomination. This is indeed a queer example to cite. The Crown is not an elective office. Not every Christian, even of that particular denomination, can aspire to be King or Queen of England. What discrimination can others complain of? It is only to an elective office that a citizen can aspire, not to a hereditary monarchy.

13. Again, if he had to refer to the Constitution of the United States, he might have done well if he had paid a tribute to the American electorate, who are not swayed by religious considerations in electing their President.

14. I used the words, "Pakistan claims to be an Islamic State", advisedly because I have no reason to think that Pakistan is truly an Islamic State. The Foreign Minister merely tried to sidetrack the main issue which I had raised, namely, that as many as 2.25 million non-Muslims had been driven out of East Pakistan during the period 1951 to 1961. This is an indisputable fact which he has not been able to challenge.

15. The Foreign Minister misquoted me again when he said that I had alleged that "not a single general election had been held in Pakistan since its establishment in 1947" [*ibid.*, para. 232]. He omitted the

very important phrase which I used, namely, "even on the comparatively limited franchise which was obtaining in the British days". The only election that has been held since 1947 was the one held in the early part of this year, and that was a indirect election through an electoral college of 80,000 electors in a population of 90 million. Does he challenge my statement that this election to the National Assembly was not even on the comparatively limited franchise which was obtaining during the British days? No, he cannot.

16. Coming now to the question of Kashmir, again the Foreign Minister summarized my arguments but evaded a straight answer. Does he challenge my statement that the British Government made it clear that the partition was of British India and that it did not apply to those States ruled by Indian princes? No. Does he challenge my statement that both India and Pakistan, as also the United Kingdom, were partners to the decision that accession should be decided only by the princes ruling the State? No. He was not able to challenge my statement that the right to accede to either India or Pakistan was the right to be exercised by the princes; that the accession of a State had nothing to do with the principle on which British India was partitioned. He did not answer my question whether Pakistan would grant the right of self-determination to the people of the States whose rulers acceded to Pakistan. Does he question the legality of those accessions? He did not answer my question why Pakistan, if it believes in the principle of self-determination, had to invade the State of Kashmir in the first place. These are indeed inconvenient questions—best to be evaded.

17. While he evaded answers to my questions, I shall not evade an answer to his question whether I have the audacity, as he says, to maintain that it was for the feudai Maharaja alone to decide the destiny of the 4 million people of Kashmir. My answer is categorical and straight. Yes, that indeed was the decision and, what is more, a decision to which both Pakistan and India, as also the United Kingdom, were parties. That was the principle followed in the case of some 600 princely States which acceded either to India or to Pakistan. That the accession is not related to the principle of partition of British India is clear from the British Government's announcement of 3 June 1947, which said:

"His Majesty's Government wish to make it clear that the decisions announced [about partition] relate only to British India and that their policy towards Indian States contained in the Cabinet Mission's Memorandum of 12th May, 1946, remains unchanged."/>

The Cabinet Mission's memorandum reads as follows:

"His Majesty's Government will cease to exercise the powers of paramountcy. This means that the rights ... which flow from their relationship to the Crown will no longer exist and that all the rights surrendered by the States to the paramount power will return to the States. Political arrangements between the States on the one side and the British Crown ... will thus be brought to an end. The void will have to be filled either by the States entering into a federal relationship with the successor Government or Governments in British India, or failing

L/ Official Records of the Security Council, Twelfth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1957, document S/PV.761/Add.1, annex VIII, para. 18.

this, enter into particular political arrangements with it or them."^{2/}

18. Provision for accession was made in the Government of India Act, 1935, as adapted under the Indian Independence Act of 1947: "An Indian State shall be deemed to have acceded to the dominion if the Governor-General has signified his acceptance of an Instrument of Accession executed by the Ruler thereof..."^{3/}

19. The Foreign Minister has referred to Junagadh. The objection to the accession of Junagadh to Pakistan was because it was contrary to the principle of contiguity; because the State was not contiguous to Pakistan. There was also an expressed opposition from the population. In the case of Kashmir, not merely the Ruler, but also the principal political party in the State, 90 per cent of whose members were Muslims, also agreed to the accession.

20. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has asked me whether a plebiscite now would be disastrous for India. Again, I would not evade the issue as he has done to my questions. My answer is that, of course, it would be disastrous for India, not because, as the Foreign Minister imagines, the plebiscite would go in favour of Pakistan, but because the rousing of communal passions would be disastrous for the minority communities both in India and in Pakistan. Pakistan may not care for the fate of its minorities; India does. Even though the accession of Kashmir was legally final, we accepted the Security Council resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949 for the sake of a peaceful settlement, but on the specific condition that Pakistan would first withdraw its troops from that part of Kashmir occupied by it. It was also made clear that if that were not done we would not be bound by the resolutions. We had then hoped that the plebiscite would be over in a few months' time. In 1948 and 1949, we were still passing through the horrors of partition, attended by mass migrations and communal riots. Conditions in India and Pakistan at that time were in any case unsettled. The situation was disturbed, and a plebiscite in Kashmir involving the rousing of communal passions in those circumstances could not then have led to a very much further worsening of the situation.

21. Today, all that is past history, a history of which both India and Pakistan should be ashamed. Fourteen years have elapsed since then, and as Pakistan deliberately did not comply with those resolutions, and since there have been developments in Kashmir itself, it is no longer possible to be bound by or to proceed on the basis of those resolutions. During these years we have, after a great deal of effort, succeeded in building up a stable democracy in India on a secular basis. With 60 million Muslims, and many millions of Christians and many other minorities, we are not prepared to have another mass migration and large-scale killings which would disturb the stability of India and endanger our very existence. It would spell the ruin of all that India has striven for and accomplished during the last fifteen years. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan quoted Ambassador Jarring, but he forgot what Mr. Jarring said in his report to the Security Council dated 29 April 1957. Mr. Jarring stated:

"The implementation of international agreements of an ad hoc character, which has not been achieved fairly speedily, may become progressively more difficult, because the situation with which it was to cope has tended to change."^{4/}

That is precisely what has happened. It is too late in the day for Pakistan now to suggest that we get back to the situation which obtained in 1948 and 1949.

22. The Foreign Minister ended up with a quotation from the founder of Pakistan. These were indeed noble expressions of sentiment by a great leader, but the squeezing out of two and a quarter million non-Muslim citizens of East Pakistan during the period of 1951 to 1961, even after the initial mass migration, bears eloquent testimony to the manner in which these promises and assurances have been honoured since his death by successive Pakistan governments.

23. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Pakistan in the exercise of his right of reply.

24. Mr. CHEEMA (Pakistan): It was not my intention to ask for the floor this afternoon, but the Permanent Representative of India has again seen fit to throw out a challenge on several issues which makes it incumbent on my delegation to ask to exercise its right of reply.

25. The Indian representative made several allegations, particularly of misquoting and quoting out of context, of ignorance of our own legislation, of flirting with China and so on and so forth. He has also been pleased to say that both India and Pakistan should be ashamed of what has transpired during the past seven years. I should like to make it clear that, so far as Pakistan is concerned, it has nothing to be ashamed of, and has no need to be apologetic about anything it has done. In fact, India has a lot to be ashamed of, if India only bears in mind the classical mockery of a seven-year-long trial of Sheikh Abdullah, the accredited leader of the people of Kashmir, punctuated by offers of a premiership, if India only bears in mind the treatment of minorities, particularly of Muslims, the systematic and pre-planned communal riots, at times under minor pretexts such as the slaughter of a cow, if India only bears in mind the treatment which it has meted out to the Nagas, if India only bears in mind what it is doing with its lofty claims to secularism, with its grandiose claim of non-violence, and yet at the same time preaching that it is a secular State, giving equal rights to all citizens.

26. I am afraid that there seems to be a basic misconception about Islam, not only in the mind of the Indian representative, but also in the minds of some other people. I would like to submit that Islam is not a matter of private rites or ritual, it is a way of living, it is a comprehensive scheme of life, it is a political and a social movement. Islam is the ideology on which the constitution of Pakistan is based. We are not ashamed of it, and we are not hypocritical about it. We preach what we practice and we practice what we preach, unlike India, which is more hypocritical in its preaching and in its profession than it is in actual exercise and implementation.

27. It is very difficult for me at the moment to give a comprehensive reply on each and every issue raised by the Indian representative, and I would therefore

^{2/} *Ibid.*, annex IV, para. 5.

^{3/} *Ibid.*, para. 6.

^{4/} *Ibid.*, Twelfth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1957, document S/3821, para. 21.

request that my delegation be given the right of a detailed reply on some future occasion.

28. Mr. GUIRMA (Upper Volta) (translated from French): Coming to this rostrum for the first time to speak in the general debate, the delegation of the Republic of the Upper Volta would first of all like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your election to the Presidency of this Assembly. We are happy that an able and experienced man, universally esteemed, has been elected to conduct our proceedings. The Government of the Upper Volta offers you its congratulations. There is no doubt that under your competent guidance the problems exercising us will be discussed seriously and with particular care.

29. I shall not review every one of these problems. I shall simply state the views of the Government of the Republic of the Upper Volta on those which are the most important—namely, disarmament, the "cold war", and decolonization.

30. Like all peoples, the people of the Upper Volta thirsts for peace. But the rattle of guns and the explosions of atomic bombs, polluting our atmosphere, do not speak the language of peace. Everyone knows how, with a great to-do, the Soviet Union resumed atomic tests last year. Despite the protest of the majority in this Assembly, it did not hesitate to explode the most powerful and noxious bomb ever made by man. It was obvious that after this step, as undesirable as it was untimely, the United States would also resume tests, so as not to be out-distanced by the Soviet Union.

31. Since then, atomic bombs have been bursting practically every day, like rotten eggs—underground, in the atmosphere, and in outer space; and because of fall-out the atmosphere's radioactivity is increasing. Monster babies are being born in ever greater numbers, and it is hard to believe that all these monsters are solely the result of the new drug known as thalidomide. Our peoples, which watch the race into space and to the moon like spectators at a football match, are beginning to grow uneasy and to wonder whether the devices orbiting the earth, sometimes with an astronaut on board, are not on a mission of death as well as a mission of science, and do not represent a source of calamity for mankind. For this reason we shall spare no effort in working for rapid and complete disarmament.

32. It is not true to say that the whole world wants disarmament. If it did, instead of there being squabbles over words and questions of procedure, a solution would be found immediately.

33. For its part the Upper Volta thinks that a comprehensive inventory should be drawn up of all nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles after the signing of a treaty providing for an immediate halt to nuclear tests. Once these weapons had been enumerated under the supervision of a control mission on which the small and neutral countries were included, the weapons themselves would be collected on a public square and a magnificent bonfire would be made of them to celebrate peace. This is the only way in which we can be absolutely certain that all harmful weapons, their delivery vehicles and their means of production have really been destroyed.

34. In the meantime, on the basis of personal experience, the Upper Volta publicly raises here the question of the indemnification of possible victims of

all these devices which are sent into space without any precise knowledge of when and where, after their disintegration, their fragments are going to fall. In August 1962, at Fada N'Gourma in the Upper Volta, a mysterious object fell with the noise of a thunderclap and to the accompaniment of blinding flashes, all of which spread terror in the nearby villages. The point of impact is marked by a pit three metres long, dug by the force of the object's explosion. This object might have fallen on a school full of innocent children, on peaceful peasants at their market or on harmless administrative or business premises, killing hundreds of people and causing millions of francs worth of damage.

35. Two explanations are possible. The object could have been a meteorite—in which case it would have been reported through Press, radio and television, there would have been talk of a natural calamity and its victims, kindly souls, would have become distressed, and presents and gifts of every kind would have flowed into the Upper Volta, together with telegrams from all quarters expressing the sympathy of the entire world. But it might also have been a man-made contrivance, falling to earth either because of a technical defect or because it had come to the end of its "space life". Now we know today the two principal countries which are rich and powerful enough to be able to squander their money and exhibit their power in this dangerous game. Do you not think, then, that it would be just—after checking and expert examination—for responsibility for possible damage to be laid at the door of the country which had fathered these devices? Would it not be just for the countries adjudged responsible to pay compensation and make reparation to the country suffering from their enterprises? In any event, the Upper Volta raises this problem and will work with all men of goodwill to submit to this distinguished Assembly a resolution calling for provision to be made for reparations to countries which might be victims of this game of nuclear and space tests.

36. Clearly, the arms race goes on furiously because since the end of the last war, the allies of yesterday have been competing for domination of the world.

37. One side already held sway through its economic power, covering entire peoples with the heavy and stifling cloak of its imperialism. The other side wanted to start its rule through a new kind of imperialism, flavoured with a ideology which is meant to be enticing which it is trying to impose on the whole world by every possible means. This is the situation known as the "cold war", and it is sustained by both real and sham issues. The sham issues of the "cold war" are those which stress all the external aspects of the question without going to its roots.

38. An example of the sham issues which sustain the "cold war" is the problem of Hungary, which comes before this Assembly regularly every year. In fact, we all know very well what happened at Budapest in 1956; we know that a people attempted to shake off the yoke of a régime it detested. We know that the hopes of this courageous and proud people had been nourished and fostered, although it was common knowledge that since Potsdam and Yalta a new world had been born, in which there was no longer room for fine traditions of chivalry or for the keeping of promises.

39. Thus, when the Russian tanks ground into the macadam of Budapest the flesh and bones of the Hun-

garian heroes who were desperately calling for help, it was found that the only help which could be sent consisted in fine words and tears of compassion. In 1939, a blank cheque given to Poland proved very expensive. In 1956, the blank cheque given to the Hungarian people was not covered at all.

40. That being so, why press the matter further? A Government has assumed power; whatever one's opinion of that Government, it is the legitimate Government, since it controls the country and lays down the law there.

41. For this reason the delegation of the Upper Volta voted against the inclusion of the question of Hungary in the agenda; for to debate the question, far from solving anything, will simply aggravate an already very bad and explosive situation.

42. On the other hand, the people and Government of the Upper Volta stand solidly behind the peoples fighting for their liberty, the peoples which have been arbitrarily divided and which, because part of their country is still free, can claim from all Members of the United Nations the application, in their case, of what the United Nations Charter prescribes for all peoples—the right to democratic self-determination.

43. Here I will merely mention the cases of the German and Korean peoples.

44. It is true that Germany lost the war. But it is probably the first time in history that a war has been over for seventeen years without a treaty having been signed. Since the Hundred Years' War such a practice has rarely been seen in civilized countries.

45. Certain earlier speakers have been most eloquent in denouncing the German revenge-seeking spirit, German warmongering, German militarism, and so forth and so on. In the first place, it is inelegant to attack a country which is absent and to accuse it when it has no way of defending itself against attack. Secondly, as everyone knows, Germany has been divided into two parts.

Mr. Allott (United States of America), Vice-President, took the Chair.

46. In the East, the builders of paradise on earth went to work. In the West, work was resumed in the conviction that, since God expelled Adam and Eve from the earthly paradise, man could be sure only of his weakness and suffering.

47. But what do we see today? Millions of people have fled from the so-called paradise of the East to go and live in the so-called hell of the West. We were told that this was false; that there were no refugees, that it was all capitalist and imperialist propaganda designed to vilify a scientifically constructive socialism. In fact, to our great surprise, this socialism was soon constructing a concrete wall to divide Berlin in two. Contrary to all expectations, this was not to protect the socialist paradise against the illicit immigration of undesirable persons from the West. No, this wall—which is also the wall of truth—showed us that there was no paradise in the East. The wall was proof that the East preferred the régime of the West. Since then, this wall has been several times stained by the red blood of a martyr sacrificing himself to freedom in order that the world should know that, throughout the centuries, it is the barbarians who have always surrounded themselves with thick walls

so as to conceal their outlandish and reprehensible proceedings.

48. The whole people of the Upper Volta, unanimous behind its democratic Government, expresses its deep indignation at this wall of shame erected in Berlin; I repeat that, for the Upper Volta, the right solution of the Berlin question and of the German question as a whole lies in free, democratic self-determination, by vote of the sovereign people. Some speakers raise the problem of the *de facto* existence of two Germanys. The Berlin wall clearly shows that there is only one German people, and hence only one Germany; the long martyrdom of millions of refugees and the blood they have shed so generously in the path of their flight, strewn with heroic dead, reveal the way of truth and the course of the real Germany, the only Germany that counts.

49. I mentioned the Korean question because, here again, the problem is one of defending freedom, and in this case the United Nations, with all the moral force of the Charter which governs our Organization, is involved.

50. For what is it the Korean people wants but peace and reunification? In Korea, too, it was claimed that the North was a paradise and the South a hell. Soon, however, more than 5 million of the blessed ones were throwing their haloes and wings to the communist winds and joining the reputedly damned ones in the South. The growing disparity between the populations of North and South Korea tells the real story.

51. Let us not be told that the foreign troops stationed in Korea on the demarcation line of the neutral zone must leave the country. Is it not curious that Members of the United Nations should describe United Nations forces as foreign troops? In any event, the Korean people, which is a peace-loving people, regards those troops as the moral and material guarantee that its reunification, through the democratic process of an impartial popular referendum, will be supported by all nations of good will.

52. Since I am speaking of a problem in Asia, I shall briefly state my Government's views on the question of China.

53. The legal aspect of the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is clear. Moreover, the United Nations cannot pretend that a country with nearly 700 million inhabitants does not exist. To close the door of the United Nations to certain countries would be to repudiate the universality of the Organization. What is more, if it is true that mainland China will soon seek membership in the atomic club, it becomes increasingly evident that no disarmament will be feasible without the participation of the country possessing the largest army in the world. All that is obvious.

54. But if mainland China really wants to come into the United Nations as a co-operative Member, its admission depends entirely on its own attitude. Its leaders, likewise, have resolved to build a paradise on earth. We wish them luck, although we are told that they are encountering serious economic difficulties. Let them solve those difficulties, build their paradise on earth and stop alarming their neighbours.

55. The people of nationalist China have a perfect right to live otherwise if they so choose, for there are instances in which divorce in a family is, not only tolerable, but admissible and acceptable. If the people

Formosa has chosen to live outside the paradise of the peoples' communes of communist China, it will never be deprived of that right of self-determination by a vote of the Upper Volta. That is why we regard the question of the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations as really very important.

56. I shall conclude my comments on "cold war" questions by referring to a problem which is another source of great anxiety—the problem of the Palestinian refugees.

57. This problem is a false one which has dragged on long enough. It is one of those questions which must be resolved before the path to world peace can be cleared, because, as we all know, that part of the world is sitting on a powder-keg as dangerous as that of Berlin or Cuba. It is steadily becoming a fantastic arsenal replete with terrible menace. The parties confronting each other have learnt the lessons of the "cold war" so well that they speak its language to perfection. Let people test their rockets if they want to play that dangerous game. But when they tell us precisely where those rockets may fall, it is not very reassuring. Soviet-manufactured military jet planes with all kinds of armament cover whole areas, and the United States is supplying other defensive weapons.

58. Here is an instance where reason should prevail. More than that. Here is a case for talking common sense. And what is common sense? It is quite simple.

59. The State of Israel exists. It is a Member of the United Nations. It is universally recognized, and many countries hold it in high esteem. It is very active in practical international co-operation. It is impossible to strike this State off the map of the world merely because a million Arab refugees are being intransigent on the subject of how they should receive compensation, for losses in property, to which they have a right.

60. The great Powers are not likely to remain indifferent to a war in the Middle East between Israel and the Arab States, and we should soon find them pitted against each other through the immediate adversaries, as they have zealously managed to contrive thus far whenever even the mildest conflict has broken out anywhere in the world. Their zealotness in supplying arms should be enough to convince us that if such a conflict were to erupt in the Middle East, they would not remain on the side-lines.

61. Moreover, anyone who knows the Middle East, its history and its intrigues must conclude that the disappearance of the State of Israel can only leave us with problems just as complicated and dangerous as those which we now face.

62. Consequently the Government of the Upper Volta believes that we should significantly further the cause of world peace by exerting every effort to make the State of Israel and the Arab States sit around a table and discuss their problems with a view to negotiating a peaceful settlement in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Charter.

63. The Government of the Upper Volta welcomes the declaration, from this rostrum, by the Head of an African State having ties with the Arab world—Prime Minister Ben Bella, Head of the Government of the newly independent Republic of Algeria—that his country has learnt from the experience of a long, seven-year war, that negotiation can settle many problems and alleviate the sufferings of peoples [147th meeting]. For this reason I say, once again, that the problem

of the Arab refugees is a false problem when stated as it usually is. Today it must be put concretely, in proper perspective, as it inevitably will be with the passing of the years, thus: the State of Israel and the Arab States must negotiate; the Middle East must be disarmed. Moreover, it is hard to see how those who have demanded the denuclearization of Africa and, consequently, the disarmament of Africa can fail to favour the unsettling of all the booby-traps which in the Middle East, have been strewn on the path to peace.

64. The Middle East has been the cradle of the two greatest religions in the world, and the source of many other divine appeals for brotherhood and peace. It would be a scandalous betrayal of the divine apostles of peace if it were sought to maintain a climate of war in that part of the world. I should like to congratulate Mrs. Golda Meir, Israel's Minister for Foreign Affairs, on her constant repetition from this rostrum of the proposal that the Middle East should be the place where genuine and complete disarmament might begin. This is a constructive proposal, which the Government of the Upper Volta endorses and which should be borne in mind by all who seek peace.

65. I have stressed the problems which cause insecurity—that is, "cold war" matters—because we are now witnessing the phenomenon of decolonization, resulting in the birth of new peace-loving nations eager to build a new life. In this connexion I should like to congratulate Algeria, whose people has been heroic and magnificent in its relentless struggle for liberation and national independence. I would also like to congratulate France, which has displayed great courage and a true understanding of the realities of modern life in bringing about Algerian independence. On behalf of my Government, I should like to pay a special tribute to General de Gaulle. We had already said, here, that he was a man of his word and a man of great humanity, gifted with a keen intellect which enabled him accurately to assess the events of our time. His well-known historic speech of 16 September 1959, pledging self-determination for an Algerian Algeria, came soon after his return to power. Today, it is an accomplished fact: Algeria has expressed itself in favour of national independence; Algeria is Algerian, thanks to General de Gaulle.

66. How bitterly we regret that side by side with these great men, measuring up to today's challenge to lead great peoples, there should in Europe be puny caricatures of statesmen, short-sighted dictators like the hysterical potentate who terrorizes Portugal and, seeing no farther than the tip of his nose, has made Angola into a hell on earth. There, his criminal hordes, seeking to preserve illegal and venal interests which are nothing more than intolerable usurpations, are daily massacring peaceful peoples whose only sin was that they demanded freedom to be Africans. If the licking so admirably given by India to the Portuguese Government in Goa has not cured that Government of its morbid delusions of grandeur, it should realize that the day is not far off when it will be expelled from Angola by the combined forces of all the outraged Africans. It is not even clear on whose behalf the Salazar Government is committing all these dreadful crimes. It is common knowledge that the Portuguese people itself hates its Government, curses its Prime Minister and is impatiently awaiting his imminent fall. I shall simply say that the days of Portuguese colonialism are numbered, everywhere

in Africa—in Angola, in Mozambique, in so-called Portuguese Guinea, in the Cape Verde Islands, and in São Tomé and Príncipe.

67. The same applies to fascist Spain, which has illegally arrogated to itself the rights usurped from the peoples of Equatorial Guinea. No fragment of Africa shall remain in the rapacious claws of any colonialist. That is why we would advise the Power which holds the key to the problems of Rhodesia and Nyasaland to return to its tradition of wisdom. A flagrantly unjust system is being imposed on those countries, where the Africans are subjected to rule by the Whites. Blood has already begun to flow. I would have had much to say about this problem if a significant event had not occurred, enabling all of us to appraise the situation objectively. As you know, the representative of the United Kingdom in the Fourth Committee has resigned because the instructions of his Government were in serious conflict with his conscience. Now, this man is not just anybody. He comes of a distinguished family with a fine tradition of honesty and courage. He himself has had to settle a number of delicate situations during his career. He is one of the architects of peace in Cyprus, and subsequently of that country's independence. Sir Hugh Foot did not resign from the United Kingdom delegation at this session because he wanted to condemn his country; he resigned because he wished to sound the alarm with regard to the blind policy it was pursuing and because he did not want his country, through its own blunders, to condemn itself.

68. It is not only the United Kingdom, Portugal and Spain which are still, either directly or through intermediaries, pursuing a colonial policy in Africa. South Africa can be added to the club. The representative of that country came to this rostrum with a guilty conscience; the proof that he had a guilty conscience is that he continually tried to justify his own sins by pointing to the faults of others. He accused other countries of racialism. He insinuated, for example, that that was the case with the United States and goodness knows how many others! I should like to point out to him the difference between the United States and South Africa. Certainly there is segregation in the United States; in certain parts of the country it is even very bad. But the United States Government has not given it institutional status; it does not boast about it; on the contrary, it vigorously combats it. In order that a young Negro can go to school it sends its judges legally and democratically to threaten a reactionary Governor with prison and make him pay forfeit on the spot. It sends its police to arrest an ex-general who is ignorant and limited in his ideas of human values. It sends troops to occupy the University of Mississippi to protect a Negro and disperse hysterical demonstrators. In a word, President Kennedy is a great President, conscious and respectful of human dignity and worthy to figure among the leaders of the free world.

69. If the people of South Africa were racist and the Government tried to suppress apartheid, no one would blame it; on the contrary. But the Government of South Africa is limited in its views, its reasoning and its philosophy; it is, that which is intolerable. Hence every time its Minister speaks here, despite all his efforts he will be defending a bad cause which is already lost. The speciousness of his arguments shows that his conscience is not clear. There will, however, be a separate debate on the truly pathological

aberration of South Africa, and the Upper Volta reserves its right to speak on the subject at that time.

70. Before concluding my remarks on decolonization, I should like to say a word about New Guinea. In my Government's opinion the Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian) [see A/5170, annex] is invalid, since the interested party has not been consulted and in fact has been ignored. I solemnly protest against this Agreement. I also declare that in this specific case my Government is not defending a colonialist thesis. We have never taken the side of the Netherlands. We have always understood that it was our duty to defend the Papuans. The Papuans are not Indonesians. The same reasons which justified the Indonesians in demanding the departure of the Dutch, because the Dutch are not Indonesians, require that the Papuans should not be handed over to the Indonesians, since they too are not Indonesians.

71. The very fact that the Republic of Indonesia has agreed in principle to a referendum proves that it implicitly recognizes the existence of an ethnic entity, which, in its view, ought to decide in favour of Indonesia. My Government cannot believe in the impartiality of a referendum which is to take place in 1969, when the party directly concerned will have been administering New Guinea for five years.

72. Hence I declare here that it is Indonesia which is the colonialist and which has, moreover, resorted to blackmail in the form of a threat of war, and to the "cold war" in order to achieve its ends.

73. My delegation, by abstaining in the vote on the question [1127th meeting], wished to indicate its reservations regarding the effectiveness of the action of the United Nations in that country, when the Organization's proper role in accordance with the Charter would have been to administer the country until the referendum was held. In New Guinea, Indonesia has betrayed the sacred principles of the Bandung Conference, which have always been a source of strength to us.

74. There is also the problem of the Congo. In this case my Government entirely approves the U Thant plan. It is indeed time that Mr. Tshombé, to use a vulgar phrase, stopped "trying to be funny". The time has come for him to break off his friendships and his associations which are dangerous for Africa, such as his friendship with racist South Africa and with the self-styled Federal Government of the so-called Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. The Government of the Upper Volta approves, in advance, all the vigorous steps that will have to be taken to strengthen the Congolese Central Government and the unity of the country.

75. Much has been said about the "crisis of the United Nations". It is not surprising that there should be a United Nations crisis, since some of its Members are acting exactly like the lunatic who, sitting astride the branch of a tree, is furiously sawing it off at the trunk while shouting to the four winds "stand from under!".

76. An objective examination of the question, however, shows that there will be no scapegoat. The African-Asian group has acted in conformity with history and with its vocation. For that reason the world is in most advantageous posture for the inauguration of true co-operation between the nations. The activities of the African-Asian group have purified and reformed the closed and therefore impotent club constituted

by the United Nations of San Francisco. An objective examination of the question shows that those who are undermining the prestige of the United Nations are those who, for undisclosed reasons, refuse to participate honestly in the responsibilities they should bear for the Organization's various operations. The United Nations would not be in a dangerous or critical situation if the Soviet Union agreed to pay its share of the Congo expenses, for example; there would be no United Nations crisis if South Africa restored South West Africa, which it has stolen, to the Organization, and if it decided to abide by the principles of the Charter in its governmental policy instead of trying to transform the United Nations into a club ruled by complicity and compromise; there would be no United Nations crisis if Portugal ended the criminal massacres in Angola; there would be no United Nations crisis if the Arab States agreed to meet the State of Israel for a discussion of their differences, so as to settle them by negotiation; there would be no United Nations crisis if the peoples' right to self-determination was scrupulously respected, and if the Organization were not compromised by dubious operations like the agreement on West New Guinea; there would be no United Nations crisis if the Korean people and the German people were allowed to hold plebiscites; there would be no United Nations crisis if the United Kingdom were to revert honourably to democratic practices in the Rhodesias. Lastly, there would be no United Nations crisis if the United States and the Soviet Union decided to comply with the resolutions requesting them to cease atomic testing immediately and to disarm without delay.

77. It is not because the small countries, which are longing for peace and justice, scatter denunciations at the United Nations that there is a United Nations crisis; it is because the great nations consistently refuse to listen to those countries.

78. The Government of the Upper Volta, while refusing to join any bloc, and indeed because it refuses to be aligned, undertakes to defend the sacred principles of justice and freedom wherever they may be threatened.

79. Our independence is not an accident which can tempt us into complacency and thoughtlessness. Our independence was deliberate and conscious; for us it is a magnificent instrument. For this reason we have not been infected by that childish illness of independence which consists in fraternizing recklessly and indiscriminately with everyone, without reflecting whether what is involved is positive international co-operation or irresponsible propaganda in a world in which our responsibilities are limited. We do not enter into relations with any country unless we are ready to co-operate with it fruitfully for peace, without ambiguity. The Upper Volta, thank God, is still free to organize its international life as it wishes, and will always defend that freedom.

80. Various speakers here have assumed the mantle of directors of conscience, or shepherds, and have addressed warning cries of "wolf, wolf!" to the African countries which have opted for association with the Common Market. Let there be no illusions on either side. Our countries are no longer children who can be frightened with old wives' tales and bugaboos. We shall continue to be associated with the Common Market as long as it suits us. I say "associated" advisedly, for words have their meaning. The word "association" clearly indicates a share in the activi-

ties and responsibilities of the operation. We do not need directors of conscience, or guardian angels, to tell us what is good for us and what is not. Everyone should realize that. This awareness of our responsibilities compels us to advocate African unity.

81. The Government of the Upper Volta was glad when the illustrious leader of democratic Guinea—a great African, respected throughout the continent—stated here a few days ago [1148th meeting] that the achievement of African unity did not mean that the small nations, the small African countries, must quarrel among themselves, as the imperialists and colonialists of all kinds have always hoped that they would. President Sékou Touré, when stating here what he has always thought, at the same time expressed with great eloquence what has always been the profound conviction of his African brothers who, like him, are responsible to peoples that they must lead to the great gathering of African democracy. When the eminent leader of Guinea emphatically stated from this rostrum that Africa had no need of imported ideologies and doctrines, he was speaking as the true spokesman of Africa today, whose own personality must develop and express itself in contributions to world civilization. No one was more qualified than he to do so.

82. My Government hopes that the colonialists and imperialists have taken note, and are thus warned, that on the day of the great gathering for African unity which is not far distant there will not be a square inch of ground on which they can carry out their mischievous and sordid attempts to divide us.

83. This is how the Government of the Upper Volta views the various problems of the present-day world.

84. Mr. WACHUKU (Nigeria): I should like, through you, Mr. Vice-President, to extend my delegation's congratulations to the President on his election to a post from which he will guide the deliberations of the present session of this great Assembly. I should also like to convey to his predecessor, Mr. Mongi Slim, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Tunisia, our appreciation for the successful way in which he discharged his duties during the last session.

85. I should like to take this opportunity too to extend my delegation's congratulations to all the Vice-Presidents of the Assembly and to the Chairmen of the various Committees. We hope that during this session they will do their best to strengthen the United Nations by piloting the Assembly's activities to a very successful conclusion.

86. I should like to say how happy we in Nigeria are when we remember that during the last session we participated in the final acts of liberation of Rwanda and Burundi. We are happy that at this session Rwanda, Burundi, Jamaica, the State of Trinidad and Tobago and Algeria have become full Members of the United Nations. This is important to us because three of the new States are African States and two—Jamaica and the State of Trinidad and Tobago—are States in which Africans and peoples of African descent all over the world are interested. On behalf of the Government, delegation and people of Nigeria I congratulate those States on achieving their independence and becoming Members of the United Nations. We are confident that their small but sensible voices will help to strengthen this Organization in the interests of humanity.

87. I also wish to express the satisfaction of the Government and people of Nigeria and of my delegation at the fact that Uganda has now become another independent nation of Africa and very soon will be joining us in the Assembly, adding more feathers to Africa's cap—to use an African expression. Uganda will become the one hundred and tenth Member of the United Nations. Nigeria is very gratified at that fact. When we became the ninety-ninth Member we were the baby of the family, but in the space of two years we have acquired younger brothers and can now pride ourselves on being more or less grown up; perhaps we are now in a position to talk with a grown-up voice.

88. On 1 October—that is, about two weeks ago—my country celebrated the second anniversary of its independence. My Prime Minister made it clear when he spoke here—and I have done so myself on many occasions—that our policy is one of non-alignment. When I look back at these two years, I think I may say that we have demonstrated in no uncertain terms that to us non-alignment is not just a word but a fact. Many times Nigeria has made definite statements and taken definite stands on the basis of decisions arrived at in the light of its own knowledge and experience and of the truth as it sees the truth—and not merely because it has wished to please someone. As a country we have religiously tried to relate our actions to the United Nations to which we belong, and to the continent of Africa, where we are situated. We have done everything within our power to be worthy of the obligations that we undertook under the Charter and to be worthy of the principles by which we acceded to independence.

89. Nigeria believes in the United Nations Development Decade. As I said from this rostrum on another occasion, we are a people in a hurry. We must scale the centuries. Africa wishes to achieve in ten years what others who had more time at their disposal achieved in 100 years. We cannot afford to waste time. The advances in technology and science cannot wait for us. We must move with great rapidity in order to catch up with the world.

90. We strongly believe that most problems are human problems. Since we are human beings, we create our problems, our environments, and the circumstances that give rise to the problems. Since these are human problems, it is possible to find solutions to them by adopting human means, by discussing with others and by persuasion. We do not believe in achieving our objective by force. This is shown by the fact that, immediately after it had gained its independence and consolidated its political position within its own territory, Nigeria directed its attention to achieving economic independence. Thus, Nigeria took on the responsibilities of planning how best to make its independence a worth-while thing for its nationals. As I have already said from this rostrum on behalf of the Government of Nigeria, Nigerian independence is a means to an end and not an end in itself. We shall not rest until every square inch of African territory has been liberated from imperial forces. We shall not rest until the humiliation of people of African descent throughout the world has been eradicated from the face of the earth.

91. Consequently, our six-year development programme is geared to creating a welfare State, and not a warfare State—one which will be of service to the people of Nigeria, to Africa and, in our humble way, to the world community to which we belong. Anyone who is acquainted with our development pro-

gramme will see that we lay great emphasis upon the development of agriculture—the wherewithal of existence—and of our educational institutions, because, with knowledge and trained personnel and a thorough understanding of our material and mental and moral environment, it will be possible for Nigeria to play the role which history and circumstances have called upon it to play on the African Continent. We cannot do that with empty minds. Man is not purely a material being.

92. Most of the States that have existed, that have risen and fallen, have been warfare States. Their whole future has been built on war, on conquest, on domination of others. Nigeria has no intention of going on war escapades to dominate anybody. Nigeria rather expects that on the African continent, by peaceful and orderly development and co-operation with its neighbours, big and small, rich and poor, we shall be able to create a new Africa, a new society that Africans can be proud of.

93. I say this because we have listened to people telling us about the European Economic Community and about the great things it holds for us. I have no doubt that that Community has some great things for us. But Nigeria, as an African country, cannot, in the circumstances of its own existence, overnight change itself into a European country. Nigeria is not a European country, and therefore the European Economic Community cannot be relevant to Nigeria in the sense of her tying herself to it. But surely Nigeria can negotiate with that Community, deal with it as an independent State, in a bilateral sense and in a friendly manner. We do not think that what is good for us is good for everybody, and therefore we have a sympathetic understanding with regard to some of our sister countries that had institutions closely linked to other institutions: they must have time to adjust themselves to the changing environment, and it would be unfair for anybody to bulldoze anyone else into altering an institution in such a manner that it would produce chaos. Consequently, while Nigeria reserves the right to take its own decision, to fashion the course of its own destiny, it also concedes to others the right to take decisions in the light of their own understanding, knowledge and appreciation of all the circumstances that lead to effective, constructive and realistic decisions.

94. We in Nigeria have tried, in conformity with the policy enunciated by the Government and people of Nigeria, to see that the greatness of Nigeria will depend on its greatness on the Continent of Africa. And its greatness on the Continent of Africa will depend on its relations with its own sister African countries. Consequently, we have made it clear in our African policy that any African State, big or small, rich or poor—it does not matter whether the population is only twenty, thirty, forty, two hundred, three thousand, so long as such a country exists—is equal to any other African country. Nigeria will not tolerate any black imperialism on the African Continent. We have gone through domination by others. We cannot tolerate and we will not support any attempt by any African country—it does not matter how powerful it is—to bully any other African country. Consequently, for the last few years Nigeria has been in the forefront, in collaboration with many other African countries, of fashioning and realizing in fact what has been so much spoken of in words: African unity.

95. I have emphasized this point because under the Charter we have assumed certain obligations, and, if every Member of this Organization were to observe the Charter not only in words but indeeds, I think that many of our problems would be solved peacefully and amicably. I have tried to say that it is because this is what we have been able to do in the two years of our existence, and, if we are allowed to continue to pursue our policy as we want to pursue it on our continent, I think that when we are five years old Africa will be a better place than we found it when we became independent. We sincerely hope that people will let us carry on our business as we want to do. I say this because, even within these two years, we have discovered that it is possible for countries that are Members of this Organization to be instruments of subverting fellow Members of the United Nations. Some of them will encourage young and irresponsible nationals, promising them certain favours, training them in practices that under normal circumstances they would not find their way to do, with the primary purpose of subverting States that are supposed to be members of a world community to which all of them belong. And what is the objective? Why should one Member of this Organization plan to disrupt the institutions of another Member?

96. I am not lodging any complaints with this Organization, because we are capable of taking care of our own system. I am only saying that there is no need to come to the rostrum and preach wonderful ideologies or hifalutin idealistic rhetoric, only to go home and do something different. The time has come, now that the small Powers are in a majority in the Assembly, when we should begin to cultivate the moral aspect of human society and human life and living. The small Powers are small when it comes to material power, and so on, but I think they are powerful when it comes to making man's more lasting contributions in this world and bringing them to the surface. And, whenever we see those things that make for disruption, things that create problems unnecessarily, we must not hesitate to point them out firmly and truthfully. And the African countries would be playing a very great role in the Assembly if they pursued the course of their new independence by forgetting power politics.

97. I do not say that we should not take notice of power politics. We should take notice of power politics, but keeping it aside and concentrating on service politics—service to our populations, our peoples and our continent and the development of our continent, so that we can become a show-piece to the world if necessary. I think that in this field we can contribute something.

98. I have devoted attention to this because since we came into existence two years ago it has been possible for at least twenty-one of the then twenty-eight African States to come together, to reason together and to agree on fundamental principles, on things that are common to them. Indeed, as the result of their agreement and their decisions on matters, we see now that very soon—a speaker from this rostrum has hinted this, and I believe it is possible—all the independent African States may find that they have an organization which will cater to their common interests in mutual respect for one another. If we succeed in bringing that to pass I think that we shall be qualifying under the provisions of the Charter in that we shall have shown our capacity to contribute

to the maintenance of international peace and security, because if all the African States can come together and solve their problems on their own continent with mutual respect and understanding, the United Nations will not have an area there to have debates about each time. And so the Organization of African and Malagasy States, which met in Monrovia and later on in Lagos, sooner or later will become a factor to reckon with on the African Continent for the maintenance of peace and security and the creation of human understanding in that very ancient continent.

99. Coming to the United Nations, I think that at this seventeenth session we should all reflect on the past, the present and the future of this Organization. To my delegation the United Nations is a unique Organization. It is the only Organization of its kind in the world. Those who created it created it for a purpose, and I am sure that the big Powers expected that they would control it and direct it as they wished. But like human beings, who are the most unpredictable of all creatures in the world, this Organization does not seem to be working strictly according to plan. It is growing like a human being and given the diversity that it naturally has, it will draw inspiration from diverse sources. And, because of its heterogenous composition, when it forms an amalgam then, just as in the case of any other amalgam, it will be found to be quite different from what those who created it thought it would be. Already we find, as the result of this, the realization that the United Nations is getting out of hand and out of the control of the big Powers. All of us have been reading in the newspapers, in books and so on, that there have been very serious complaints that the United Nations has been bastardized. They say that it is no longer what it was meant to be. If bastardization means that the collective wisdom of man has begun to have a forum in which it can play on the minds of men, I like it and my delegation likes it. As for those who do not like it, I will only tell them that they have missed the boat.

100. So, reading the Charter and watching the development of the United Nations, my delegation, the Government of Nigeria and the people of Nigeria still have very great faith in the Organization, and I sincerely hope that all Member States, in spite of the difficulties, trials and tribulations of the United Nations, will do everything possible to prevent anybody from weakening it and will endeavour, rather, to strengthen it. In that connexion we have to show our appreciation for the effort that is being made to settle disputes under the aegis of the United Nations. At the last session and at the session which preceded it we heard so much about Laos and Korea and New Guinea. Today the question of Laos has been settled. Laos has a government, and nobody is lobbying anybody else to decide one way or the other with regard to Laos. Laos has settled down as a Member of the United Nations, peacefully contributing its own quota to our deliberations here.

101. An effort has been made also in West New Guinea. It is imperfect, but the fact is that situation that might have meant calling on the United Nations for an emergency force, for funds and for all that goes therewith, has been contained, and perhaps within five years we may see a new situation working out to the satisfaction of all. But human organizations and human enterprises cannot be predicted so completely that one can be sure of what is going to happen at every stage of development; so, however, imperfect it may be, I think that we have to show some

appreciation of the effort of the United Nations to contain that situation.

102. I should like now to touch on a very explosive and inflammable topic which has been deliberately kept out of this Organization. It is the question of Berlin. For some reason best known to the great Powers, they have carefully and skilfully taken the Berlin question out of the Assembly. They do not want to bring it within the competence of the United Nations. Either they are afraid of the truth, or they do not want anybody to look into the problem and examine it critically. They want us to wake up one morning to find that they have started a third world war over our heads. I want to sound a note of warning. The time has come when the Assembly should try to find out what is happening in Berlin. We hear and see in pictures that a wall has been built; and people are escaping, people are shot. One plane buzzes another plane. One of these days an atom bomb may be dropped somewhere and, before we realize what has happened, there will be a third world war—a conflagration which will engulf everybody. Why do the big Powers want to keep Berlin out of this precinct? Why do they not want to bring it in? What is going on? In Europe we have had two world wars originating from that area. Will the Assembly keep quiet and allow a third world war to start from that same area which will engulf our world and destroy everything we have hoped for?

Mr. Muhammad Zafrulla Khan (Pakistan) resumed the Chair.

103. I said here from this rostrum that there was a suggestion made some time ago that Berlin should be handed over to the United Nations to be occupied by the United Nations so that the warring camps would be kept out of that danger zone. This suggestion may be unpopular with some people. We find that in West Germany the three Western Powers that have occupied the area have assisted that part of Germany to develop according to their own ideas of democratic and free institutions, and that section has established its own capital at Bonn. The other section was occupied by the Eastern Powers and it has established another system of government which they also tell us is democratic and socialistic. The fact remains that there is a government in that area. But there is this tangle: it appears that the capital of that part of Germany is in Berlin. May I ask: would it not be possible to persuade that section of Germany to transfer its own capital to one of the cities and leave Berlin a free city under the control of the United Nations so that when tempers cool down and if the German people wish it, the two sections may federate into one federal State or a number of federal States if you like, with Berlin as the federal capital? You have a federal capital in the United States; we have a federal capital in my country.

104. This is most interesting because we have been told from this rostrum about coexistence. We have the Eastern bloc and the Western bloc. The nearest example of coexistence is the question of Germany; the two ideologies are facing each other. Would it not be a nice thing to work out coexistence within that area? If we succeed in seeing that the two systems can work in harmony, then we may have found a solution to our problem on the question of coexistence, and that may help us to test the sincerity of all those who are preaching coexistence, whether they believe in it or not. I am saying this because

the ideological war that is going on may one day precipitate a third world war before we realize what is happening. I have thrown out this thought because, after all, Berlin is in the world; it is not yet on the moon and whatever happens there will affect us. We in Africa would like to be left in peace and not in pieces. We should be allowed to have some time to develop our continent.

105. The representative of Upper Volta talked about the curious and strange object that fell on the territory of that country. These days jets are moving at a terrific rate and they are trying to perfect planes that will travel at a speed of 1,200 miles an hour, piloted by human beings. Somebody has now travelled at the rate of 1,7,500 miles an hour and he felt quite comfortable up there. I am not so sure that we are safe at all at any point in the world or at any point of the compass.

106. So I make this suggestion with the hope that the Powers that have been playing hide and seek in Berlin may have a second look at the problem in question, and I sincerely hope that the German authorities on both sides will help the world to help them, if need be, to bring this subject within the competence of the United Nations so that all aspects of the problem may be discussed dispassionately, fearlessly, firmly and without any attempt to please or to favour anyone.

107. As I have said, we have confidence that the United Nations can achieve great things if it has wholehearted support. At one time the Organization was controlled by the big Powers because of their right of veto. Now the numerical strength of this Organization has made it possible for us to be able to sidetrack the veto in most matters, except in those that are strictly within the competence of the great Powers, through the Security Council. So we have been able to achieve quite a lot.

108. The other means of control of this Organization is financial, and we have noticed how some Powers have tried to cripple the Organization by refusing to meet their obligations under the Charter. As a result of this, the Secretary-General was compelled to introduce a new system of financing, that is, issuing bonds. After all, a bond is a loan; you lend the money and later on you have to pay it back. The question now arises: what are we doing about financing the United Nations so that no Power, however powerful it may be, can cripple the Organization by its refusal to contribute its share or to contribute what it has promised to pay? I am saying this because we have been very lucky that some of the great Powers, like the small Powers, still believe in the United Nations and have gone out of their way to fulfil their financial obligations. But suppose a situation arises in which all the great Powers would team up, particularly those who are financially better off because they have had an earlier start in the economic race, and suppose they were not going to fulfil their financial obligations, that they held us for ransom and that the price was that we should not be able to say what we wanted to say even though we knew it to be the truth. Well, that would mean the end of the United Nations. Consequently, it becomes a very serious problem, one of primary concern for all Members of the United Nations, to think how to finance the Organization itself. We have the contributions which are made by Member States, and then there are the bonds which may be issued and which have to be paid for.

109. May I suggest another avenue that may be explored? The people of the world are beginning to realize that the United Nations exists; various institutions are beginning to take an interest in the Organization.

110. Can the United Nations not set up a body that will actually try to sell the United Nations to individuals, to institutions and to financial bodies that believe in what we believe in, so that there will be various channels through which it may draw its resources? In that way it would not be possible for the Organization to be held to ransom, because there are people who do not believe in the good work which it is doing, particularly in liberalizing society and making man freer than he is all over the world. I would like such avenues to be explored.

111. Leaving the question of the United Nations, there is one problem that confronts us, namely, the question of disarmament. This is being discussed elsewhere and, therefore, as my country happens to be one of the members of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, I do not think that I can go into this in detail. Nigeria has played a role in the Committee and is willing to continue to play a role, but we would be failing in our duty if we did not make one or two comments on our observations.

112. In the first instance, while the big Powers and the various factions into which the world has been divided talk of disarmament, one has the impression that there is no serious and genuine desire to disarm. The big Powers are playing hide and seek with us. If they would only be sincere with us we could find solutions. But there is always the element of suspicion and fear of each other, and that makes the problem rather difficult. I sincerely hope that it will be possible, through the United Nations to persuade the two camps that control matters to have more confidence in this Organization and to have more faith in humanity and in each other. Once they develop that and do not use these discussions as centres for propaganda, I think that we can make a start, and perhaps in the near future we shall produce some concrete and long-lasting results.

113. The other day we were addressed by the Head of a State whose problems have been brought before the General Assembly. This is another explosive spot in the Western Hemisphere. I refer to Cuba. As I said earlier, the Cuban problem is a human problem and, whether we like it or not, Cuba and the United States must live together within the Western Hemisphere. I would not have commented on this but for the fact that, for some reason or through some accident of history, Nigeria, as indeed the other African countries, has an interest in these two countries. The United States has among its citizens millions of people of African descent, and Cuba also has among its nationals people of African descent. Therefore, we from Africa cannot be completely indifferent to the problems and the difficulties that have arisen between the United States and Cuba. One is a very great Power; the other is a yearling. But it would be a dangerous thing to allow little Cuba to be used as a pawn on the chessboard of power politics.

114. I would only say that my country and my Government—I have not been delegated by the other African countries to speak for them—would be quite willing, if we were invited, to look into this matter and see what can be done to find a solution to the problem

that has arisen between Cuba and the United States, so as to prevent the big fellows from using Cuba as a pawn on this international chessboard of power politics. I would not like to hear one of these days that an atomic bomb had been dropped on Cuba, nor that, from Cuba, someone had sent a rocket to the United States. We have people of African descent there and, in any event, they are all human beings. Therefore, we have an interest. We would like the two countries to live in peace and not to fall to pieces. Therefore, I take this opportunity to appeal to the two countries to think in terms of peaceful settlement and not to slam the door in the face of one another.

115. I think that what the representative of Upper Volta said represented the general reaction of all of us who come from Africa. Although it is not strictly a matter that should come before the Assembly, since it is an internal affair, as far as we in Africa are concerned, it affects us fundamentally. I refer to the history that was written in Mississippi. I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to put on record its appreciation and that of my people of the effort that is being made to remedy a situation which, to put it very mildly, is rather atrocious. I do not need to say more than has been said before. The fact that the weight of United States authority could be used to see to it that the rule of law obtained irrespective of who was affected, and that the right of an individual, a person of African descent who had been denied the right to which he is entitled under the laws and the Constitution of the United States, was upheld, the fact that the Administration had the courage and the boldness to carry that out, I must say, made very refreshing reading to us. And I would say here, rather than castigating that country, that we shall always have a sympathetic understanding of the problem involved, knowing the historical and sociological factors that gave rise to such a situation. As long as there is a move forward in that direction, the Government and people of Nigeria will always have a sympathetic understanding and will give the United States encouragement in eradicating the situation as rapidly as possible.

116. Now I should like to touch upon some political issues affecting Africa very intimately. As everybody here knows, my delegation, my Government and my people are committed, right up to the neck and up to the top of the head, to the complete abolition of all forms of colonialism, imperialism and domination of peoples on the African Continent or anywhere else.

117. And so I start from the lighter problems; they are problems, but they are lighter. I am looking forward to being able, by next year at the very latest, to come to this rostrum to welcome Kenya into the family of nations. I sincerely hope that the United Kingdom Government and the leaders of Kenya will do everything possible to see that this becomes a fact at the next session of the General Assembly. I will not make any further comment on that.

118. I want to say from this rostrum that I sincerely hope that the United Kingdom Government, right now, before it is too late, will consider very seriously the resolutions that have been adopted by the General Assembly, one at our last session and one recently. From this rostrum, we put forward a compromise proposal which we expected the United Kingdom Government would by now have weighed very carefully. This is the barest minimum that any African State can consider. It will not satisfy us to think that the

nited Kingdom, which has maintained such a very good record, will fall when the really crucial test comes in Southern Rhodesia. The situation in Southern Rhodesia is very bad, and the United Kingdom Government cannot divorce itself from the responsibility of seeing that justice is done to the people of Africa in that unfortunate land.

19. We sincerely hope that what has happened here at the United Nations, when one of the United Kingdom's representatives finds it impossible to continue to accept the position as it is now, will be a reminder to the United Kingdom Government that something which should be done ought to be done before it is too late. It is quite clear that whether the minority likes it or not, the people of Southern Rhodesia must be independent, the majority must rule that territory. You know that must be so, why not start doing it now? Do you want them to begin to murder each other, as they have already started to do? Three million people cannot be held in bondage for any length of time by three hundred thousand people. This is the jet age.

20. We have been very mild in our attitude towards them, but I want to say that we cannot go below the compromise which we have offered, and if this is ignored, I am afraid that the choice of the people of Nigeria cannot be in doubt. If it is a question of casting a vote for the obdurate and stubborn minority it is going to save or casting a vote for the rule of law, justice, good government, order and clear conscience, then I think we will vote for the latter. It is not our habit to embarrass our friends, but we have always adopted the attitude of giving a firm opinion and expressing ourselves honestly and sincerely in the honest belief that those who are concerned will reflect very carefully on what we have to say.

21. With regard to the question of Angola and Portugal, we have begged Portugal to do three things: to recognize the leaders of Angola; to introduce measures that will transform the society which they have kept in thralldom for five hundred years without doing anything to improve the lot of the people, and to get rid of that archaic, decrepit, disused and untenable notion that any part of African territory can be a province of Portugal.

22. The rulers of Portugal are still stubborn; they do not want to see the red light. It is a fact that there are leaders of established authority in Angola, whether the Portuguese authorities like it or not, and if the Portuguese do not heed the warning, I have no doubt in my mind that the African States, which have pledged all moral, financial and other support, will in time ledge more than moral support. It would be a sad day if a holocaust raised its head in that area.

23. We appeal also to the members of the Assembly who are members of NATO to stop assisting Portugal to use deadly weapons against the defenceless Angolans. We do not solve a problem by being violent about it, but we can solve a lot of problems by being reasonable about them, by discussing them and by trying to be sensible about them. Portugal should heed the warning. The African States may be patient for awhile, but they cannot be patient indefinitely. The time will come when our patience will dry up, and instead of a few Angolan nationalists fighting against overwhelming odds, we may have in the forests and villages more effective forces applied to repel the stubborn imperialists who do not yet realize that

their time is up, that the days of imperialism in Africa are numbered. They are not over yet but they are numbered, and I sincerely hope that instead of producing to us here in the Assembly curious individuals who are supposed to be Portuguese Africans, the Portuguese authorities will do their homework and create a situation that will give confidence to the members of the Assembly, so that harmonious relations may be established between the future rulers of Angola and the outgoing imperialist authorities of Portugal. Portugal is a small, poor country, and I believe that economic and trade relations and cultural ties between that country and the future Angola will result in their mutual benefit. Why does Portugal want to sacrifice the future for the past and the present, which is impossible?

124. They say we are savages and they are men of wisdom. I do not understand that at all. It looks as if Portugal is living in the stone age. They have not realized that we are in the twentieth century. I would like the Portuguese delegation to understand—we do not count South Africa as an African State—that when Uganda becomes a Member of the United Nations we shall be thirty-one independent African States. With the development that is taking place, there will be more independent African States. The movement is in that direction. Therefore, why not prevent the avalanche from tumbling on Portugal's head? Why they cannot see this I do not know. They have a long history and have had a long association with Africa. Why they cannot learn from their experience I do not know. At this seventeenth session—and we say this with all sense of responsibility—I would sincerely hope that Portugal will learn the lesson before it is too late.

125. I come now to South West Africa. I shall not bother to discuss this question here, but again this is a matter which requires very serious consideration. It will be considered in the Committee to which it has been allocated for discussion. But we sincerely hope—although our expressions of hope have never had any effect on South Africa will not continue to import aliens into South West Africa with the hope that they will be able to outnumber the indigenous population in order to have a majority when a plebiscite is held. If that is their intention, they are just deceiving themselves. Unless South West Africa is handed over to the United Nations so that that Territory may be developed in the interests of the people concerned, any exercises that South Africa may perform will never be recognized by my Government. As far as we are concerned, South West Africa was a mandate of the League of Nations and it would normally have come to the United Nations as a Trust Territory. South Africa refused to hand it over. As far as we are concerned, on the African Continent, whether it is decided one way or the other, there will be no question of legality or illegality about it. Our law is clear. South West Africa is an African territory. The minority in South Africa cannot do anything to change that.

126. I shall not waste my time on South Africa, except to make one comment. My Government is very much concerned over the new legislation that South Africa has introduced to repress and suppress the people of Africa in that area. We sincerely hope that nothing they do will in any way result either in the death or destruction of some of the South African nationalists who, we know very well, have been seized under this so-called new law against sabotage. We

would never forgive them if any one of these leaders is destroyed by bogus trials as a result of trying to exercise their political rights. The perennial question of South Africa is being discussed in another body, and when the matter comes before the Assembly we shall deal with it in greater detail.

127. This brings me to a question that has been before us since we became Members of this Organization, namely the question of the Congo. I shall not go into any details of the Congo question, except to say that my country is not very happy that the question has not been settled up to this moment. We hope that the time has come when the African countries will take more interest in handling the affairs of the Congo in order to settle the question. For a long time we have left this question to be handled by everybody. When a matter of this nature is handled by everybody, it means that it is nobody's business. My delegation feels that the time has come when the African States themselves, in co-operation with the United Nations and the Secretariat, should set up a body that will examine the question of solving the problem of the Congo once and for all. We have been told that the finances are running out and that it would be a tragedy if we left the Congo as an unfinished job. It would certainly not be to the credit of the United Nations. I believe that the African States themselves must play a more positive role in dealing with the settlement of this question. They can do this in co-operation with the Assembly, the Secretariat and the Congolese authorities themselves. I say this because each time we hear "Katanga", "Katanga", "Katanga", as if Katanga were the only area in the Congo. Under the present set-up there are six provinces, and there may be more later on. But the Central Government has effective control over five and a half of them. I think we can make a good deal out of the five and a half and make it impossible for the remaining half to continue to defy the established authority of the Republic of the Congo. In this respect, the African States can be of great help to the Secretariat.

128. I feel, my delegation feels and my Government feels that we cannot stay indefinitely in the Congo. We do not agree with certain proposals that we should pull out in one month. But certainly we must have some time-table for finishing our job in the Congo, for getting out and for allowing the Congolese to govern their country. We cannot sit down in the Congo and appear to be fairy godmothers and not allow the Congolese to take up responsibility for their future and direct their own destiny.

129. I do not want to go into the details of this subject, but I am submitting these views because time is running out and money is running out too. It would be a disaster if we did not tie up the loose ends before the two run out completely.

130. This brings me to the question of African representation in the essential organs of the United Nations. This is a problem which is very difficult. In this respect, I want to bring to the notice of the Assembly a resolution on the United Nations which was adopted at the Conference of Heads of African and Malagasy States and Governments meeting in Lagos from 25 to 30 January, 1962. The resolution reads as follows:

"The Conference of Heads of African and Malagasy States and Governments, meeting in Lagos from 25th to 30th January, 1962.

"While recognizing and anxious that they should co-operate as far as possible with other States and Governments on matters that may come before the United Nations from time to time . . .

"Decides that in the best interest of African and Malagasy solidarity and unity:

"(a) The African and Malagasy Members of the United Nations Organization should constitute themselves into a distinct and independent group in dealing with all the problems, particularly those that are peculiar to Africa and Malagasy, that may henceforth come before the United Nations;

"(b) This group should strive strenuously to obtain a revision of the Charter in order to have a fair and equitable representation of African and Malagasy States on the Security Council, Economic and Social Council, Secretariat and other organs of the United Nations."

131. At least twenty-one States met and decided that the African representatives in the Assembly must carry out this injunction. Broadly, it was said that as the Organization stands today, and considering the numerical strength of the African States, Africa does not have a fair representation in any of the organs of the United Nations. Therefore the question of the enlargement of these organs becomes very urgent. We have been told by a certain Power, a Member of this Organization, that this will not happen until after certain occurrences. As far as we know, the provision for amending or altering the Charter does not envisage such amendment or alteration as being a rider, and the African States will consider it an unfriendly act for any nation, however powerful it may be, to stand in the way of the African States in their effort to achieve effective representation in the various organs of this Organization to which they belong, in other words, for any nation to use—to deprive the African States of their legitimate rights under the Charter—the powers that have been given it to exercise with a sense of responsibility. I take this opportunity to reiterate once more that the African States still demand the reconstitution of the various bodies so as to give them representation commensurate with their number and the contribution they are expected to make under the obligations they have assumed under the Charter.

132. When this matter came up, we argued on the question of the gentlemen's agreement of 1946. We were told that nothing could be done, that the Charter would have to be amended. In spite of that, nothing has been done. At first we challenged this agreement, to which we were not a party, and by raiding the frontiers of Western Europe when we found that Portugal was available as a candidate, we succeeded in establishing our right to occupy a seat in the Security Council. But in spite of that warning the view has persisted that the gentlemen's agreement cannot be altered, and the African States have decided, at this session, while reserving their rights and pressing for the re-allocation of seats so as to enable them to have seats on the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and other organs of the United Nations, to contest the election at this session under the gentlemen's agreement, in order to test the sincerity or insincerity of this agreement, and to find out whether we are justified in hoping that the so-called gentlemen's agreement is really a gentlemen's agreement. I say this because at first, for some reason or other, we were not given to understand the full

implication of this agreement, but we have been able to do some research to find out about it and to learn how it was concluded.

133. For the seats on the Security Council, the gentlemen's agreement grouped the Members of the United Nations into the following: the British Commonwealth, Eastern Europe, Western Europe, the Middle East and Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and America. That was in 1946. At that time there were only two States of Africa geographically below Senegal that were members of the League of Nations and that became founding Members of the United Nations, namely Liberia and Ethiopia. Since 1946 these two African States have never occupied this seat for the Middle East and Africa group. These facts were published in The New York Times in connexion with the candidature of Nigeria.

134. Now, at first Nigeria wanted to contest the election on these broad principles, challenging the gentlemen's agreement. But the African States decided to contest the election on the basis of the gentlemen's agreement, and they came together and selected Nigeria to contest the election on their behalf. Ethiopia and Mauritania withdrew in order to make that possible.

135. So that in the United Nations now these gentlemen who made the gentlemen's agreement will either honour it or not honour it, I say this because we have examined the representation in the Security Council since 1946 in respect of the Middle East and Africa seat. The Middle East and North African countries which occupied seats in the Security Council since 1946 are as follows: Egypt in 1946, Syria in 1947-1948, the United Arab Republic in 1949-1950, Lebanon in 1953-1954, Iran in 1955-1956, Iraq in 1957-1958, Tunisia in 1959-1960, the United Arab Republic again in 1961-1962. At no time during all these years was Liberia or Ethiopia elected to occupy this seat.

136. Now for the first time the African States are saying that it is time for them to occupy that seat. We have been told, with regard to our occupying this seat, that Ghana is a member of the Security Council and the Commonwealth. Now under this gentlemen's agreement we have the British Commonwealth. That is a distinct seat. That does not represent Africa at all. It is not even possible for Nigeria or any other of the African countries to occupy that seat next year, after Ghana has vacated it, because Cyprus and, I understand, Malaya and others want to contest it as members of the Commonwealth. Australia, New Zealand, India and Canada are entitled to contest the seat. Therefore, to say that this seat can by any stretch of the imagination, under the gentlemen's agreement, be considered to be an African seat and that Ghana is standing for Africa is simply a deliberate attempt on the part of someone to deceive the Assembly.

137. I am saying this because I read in The New York Times of a certain attempt to suggest that Nigeria will automatically succeed Ghana. That is not true. Somebody must have sent out that propaganda to deceive people.

138. Then there is the suggestion that the African nations have split. As far as I know, there is no question of anybody splitting. What follows from this is the decision of the African States to contest this particular seat. This is quite obvious. With regard to the gentlemen's agreement and those who said that

we did not want to observe the gentlemen's agreement, and that is the reason why they oppose Africans having the seat, may I say that the Africans themselves have decided now that they want to observe the gentlemen's agreement.

139. Since 1946 the various members of this group have been put to occupy this seat. The time has come when the African should occupy this seat. It may be argued that of the names that I read out here there were three African countries, in the northern fringe of Africa. I remember that we all co-operated to elect the United Arab Republic in 1961-1962. At that time the Algerian question was very real and very hot. Consequently, it was only fair and right that one of the States which was close to that problem and knew it intimately should be able to speak in the Security Council on that particular matter. But now Algeria, happily, is a Member of the United Nations and is no more a problem in that area to threaten international peace and security.

140. The problem which is now facing the United Nations is in Kenya, the Congo, Angola, Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Bechuanaland, Mozambique, South West Africa, Basutoland, Swaziland and South Africa. In all those areas the majority of States, which are contiguous to this territory and have intimate knowledge of the problems involved, have decided and agreed that now is the time for them to have representation in the Security Council in order to be in a position to speak more effectively and represent the interests involved in that area.

141. In order to make it absolutely clear, I state that Nigeria today is no longer a candidate just by itself. It is a representative candidate of the African States. And if we consider it strategically, Article 23 of the Charter of the United Nations says the following with regard to the basis of the election of the non-permanent members:

"The General Assembly shall elect six other Members of the United Nations to be non-permanent members of the Security Council, due regard being specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization, and also to equitable geographical distribution."

142. If it comes to a question of a contribution to international peace and security, the African candidate qualifies, because the Assembly and the Secretariat know the role which Nigeria has been playing in the Congo in terms of contribution of forces, police and also money. Geographically, one finds also, whether it is a question of population or area, or numerical strength or resources, that those States occupy the dominant areas on the African continent. Surely if those States decide they have a candidate, it is a question that could be simply settled.

143. I have decided to say this because I listened to some strange arguments that were being put up. The argument was that we did not want to observe the gentlemen's agreement. The African States now want to observe the gentlemen's agreement. In other words, it has always been said that we were threatening the Latin American seat, that we were threatening the Western European seat, that we were threatening the Eastern European seat. None of them have been threatened. What we want now is our own seat, which

we have not occupied since 1946 because of the numerical inferiority of the African States. There were only two of them in that area and consequently they could not muster a sufficient number of votes.

144. But now, as a matter of principle, we are asking the gentlemen to honour the agreement. I sincerely hope that our Middle Eastern friends will see the reasoning in our arguments. It is a simple matter. Our Western European friends will find that we are not after their seats. As regards Latin America, we are not after their seats. We are after our own seat. It will be noticed that a majority of those people in that area have already occupied the seat at least once or three times, and that none of the Charter Members have occupied it even once.

145. I sincerely hope that the facts which I put before this Assembly will show the justice of the cause we are pursuing and that it will be possible for all concerned to come together and get this matter settled because of the mischievous article that was written by one person called Sam Pope Brewer in The New York Times.

146. I want to take this opportunity to warn the Afro-Asian group that this is an invidious means of causing a rift in our Organization—and the African group, too. When President Sekou Touré of Guinea spoke here, he spoke of African unity. It is now time to demonstrate that African unity. Surely, when by a democratic process the majority of States decide that they have a candidate, it is a contribution to African unity to acquiesce to the wishes of the majority; or they should all get together and have the matter settled so that the Africans can have one candidate and one candidate only. I believe the good sense of our Middle Eastern friends will make them realize that they have been occupying the seat for so long. And since we are entitled to it, as they are, it is only reasonable—the first time we are making this request—for them to yield to our legitimate request.

147. I have brought this up because this is very serious as far as the African countries are concerned. We want to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security. We believe that if we in Africa—the African States—using the methods which have been adopted now can help to solve the problem which is tickling the United Nations and if we are able to have peace and security in our continent, we should be helping the United Nations to solve the problem and to maintain peace and security in the rest of the world.

148. As I said at the beginning of my statement, my delegation, my Government and the people of Nigeria have infinite faith that with good sense and mutual understanding this Organization can continue for many more years to serve humanity. We must now begin to reform our thoughts, to think in terms of the standard of greatness. What constitutes greatness? Is it the ability to go to the moon? Is that the only thing? What of making our world a better place to live in, making our respective populations happier, making humanity get to know itself better? If the United Nations does nothing else I think it does this, because this is the one international and inter-racial club which meets once a year, with all races of mankind, with all the faults and character of man. We meet here and exchange thoughts without any fighting, without anybody's breaking his head, except that once in a while somebody bangs his desk with something

because there must be some excitement to make the place lively.

149. I have put these thoughts before the Assembly in the hope that we will all do our best to contribute to the building of the United Nations and to making it more effective in dealings between States.

150. Mr. PADILLA-NERVO (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, my delegation has already expressed at this session of the General Assembly our congratulations to you on your election to the Presidency, but I think that the friendship between us which has lasted for so many years justifies my voicing, once more, my satisfaction that the Assembly has appointed you to conduct our debates and to lend us your wisdom and your guidance towards the attainment of the lofty goals to which all Members of the United Nations aspire.

151. Since the end of that murderous period of the Second World War, the General Assembly of the United Nations has brought here, year after year, in 1945 fifty and now 109 States, all having the same objective—to free every people of the earth from fear, insecurity, enslavement and poverty.

152. Each of us, spokesmen for our Governments and peoples, has proclaimed in this forum his determination to pursue social justice in peace and freedom; each has affirmed the supremacy of right over might; each has spoken out for the peaceful settlement of disputes, respect for fundamental freedoms and human rights, the self-determination of peoples, non-intervention in domestic affairs, and international co-operation to raise levels of living and to combat the poverty, disease and ignorance which still afflict man in every region of this planet.

153. Who could rightly claim that the conduct of Governments has been in keeping with the preachings of their representatives? Oral faithfulness to the loftiest principles is daily belied by conduct and deeds. Action and practice, departing from the principles and goals of the Charter, daily strike a note of propaganda and polemics, in which not even theoretical lip-service to concord and peace is paid. Recriminations and threats resound on all sides. Actions are based on mutual distrust and fear.

154. We know that no people is ignoble or given over to evil. Yet the policy of recrimination, which keeps mistrust alive, tends to give the impression that there are such peoples, and fosters in nations continually exposed to arbitrary denunciation a feeling of rancour and inflexibility. What people, what nation, what Government can honestly affirm that it has a monopoly of justice and truth? What unclouded mind can believe that error and evil exist only in our opponents?

155. The world is not divided into good peoples and bad peoples: the peoples as a whole constitute a world of nations which respond to different spiritual impulses, have different histories and are characterized by different trends of philosophy.

156. Instead of persisting in judging each other one-sidedly, we should strive to learn to understand one another and to recognize, in the voice of each nation, the universal voice of man, the common essence which belongs to the heritage of mankind. Only in this spirit shall we be able to create a climate favourable to negotiation, agreement and the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

157. This General Assembly, as the parliament of mankind, has as its paramount duty the exercise of this function for peace and concord, as the essential condition for the achievement of all the lofty purposes set forth in the United Nations Charter.

158. A few days ago, Pope John XXIII, speaking in the Sistine Chapel to the diplomatic representatives of eighty Governments, urged the statesmen responsible for the fate of the nations to heed the anguished cry for peace arising from all parts of the earth, and said:

"May this thought of the reckoning that they are to face spur them to omit no effort to achieve this blessing, which for the human family is a blessing greater than any other.

"Let them continue to meet each other in discussions and reach just and generous agreements that they faithfully observe. Let them be ready to make the sacrifices that are necessary to save the world's peace. The nations will then be able to work in an atmosphere of serenity; all the discoveries of science will assist progress and help to make life on this earth, which is already marked by so many other inevitable sufferings, ever more delightful."

159. These concepts, and others parallel in spirit expressed by persons in high places whose authority and influence over the minds of millions of men constitute a moral and political force, are useful in the present hour of peril, to orient the behaviour of Governments and peoples towards international concord and co-operation.

160. The General Assembly, wherein so many States are represented, can and must serve as a centre to harmonize the nations' efforts for the achievement of those purposes, which are also those that we proclaim in the preamble and in Chapter I of the Organization's Charter.

161. In the introduction to his Annual Report, the Acting Secretary-General tells us:

"I have faith that the United Nations will survive this 'crisis' and emerge stronger than before as a force for peace. In restating my faith in the United Nations I am moved by one more consideration, and that is the increasing tendency to involve the United Nations in the process of combating want and poverty and disease and in helping the advancement of the developing countries." [A/5201/Add.1, p. 5.]

In order that these noble goals may be attained, it is necessary to preserve peace in freedom.

162. The survival of the human species and the continuity of our history require, above all, that the arms race, the continuance of which will inevitably lead to a nuclear conflict, be halted. The present scene is not entirely gloomy. At this session, we have welcomed the admission of new States and their accession to independent life. We have also witnessed the extraordinary undertakings of contemporary science and technology, which have opened outer space to man's curiosity and enterprise.

163. I have already had occasion to say that we men of today are taking part in the bringing to birth of a new era, characterized by two equally impetuous and encouraging forces: the irresistible impulse towards freedom and the liquidation of colonialism, and the scientific and technical potential which opens man's

way to outer space. The first of these forces is a revolutionary and unifying one, born of the irrepressible yearning of individuals and peoples and effectively brought to bear, with compelling urgency, in despite of political and ideological differences and international conflicts.

164. Our fraternal welcome to the new States has already been expressed at this session. We share their present joy, and shall co-operate with them in the arduous task which independence and sovereignty lay upon them. History teaches us that the attainment of independence is not the end of the struggle, but the beginning. To reach independence is to reach the point of departure, the start of an endless battle to defend sovereignty, territorial integrity, social justice and human rights. Freedom's defence lies in the exercise of freedom.

165. Mexico wishes all the new Members of the United Nations a happy destiny. Our people has unceasingly demonstrated its devotion to freedom; we proclaim and defend the right to self-determination and the right of every nation, in the exercise of its sovereignty, to opt for the structures best suited to it. Our people rejects all injustice and every form of foreign hegemony, and its voice has been raised in defence of every just cause. From the time of our birth as an independent nation, we have linked the concept of equality between States with the no less generous idea of equality between men. We condemn the unjust and despicable practice of racial segregation and discrimination, as being in absolute conflict with our faith in human dignity, our national feeling and our history.

166. The exploration of outer space, made possible by the formidable progress of technology and science, is, together with the impetus towards freedom and decolonization, an essential characteristic of our age.

167. In order that the use of outer space may be truly peaceful, it must become an international co-operative venture, legally regulated in the common interest. Otherwise, competition in the conquest and mastery of space cannot be peaceful, any more than nuclear competition at present is; one attempt at competition will soon give rise to another, and it will then be impossible either to separate or to restrain them. The exploits of the colonnauts, while admirable in themselves, increase the seriousness and urgency of the need for the Powers to put a permanent end to their nuclear weapons tests.

168. The rockets propelling space-craft may in the future be fed by nuclear fuel, and this would completely change our present concept of international inspection and control.

169. The most urgent problem of our time, the most urgent problem facing this session, is that of halting the arms race.

170. The most serious manifestation of this race is the competition in nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapon testing. We want all tests to be suspended, and we want the suspension to last and to be reinforced by a legally binding obligation contained in a treaty. We also want nuclear competition to cease and a date to be set as the final limit for all tests. We do not want our atmosphere to be contaminated with radioactivity, or any more explosions to take place under water or in outer space. When and where should we begin? We are not unaware of what to do; whatever we can do, we should do now.

171. The nuclear Powers are unleashing upon the nations forces of which they are not the masters but the slaves—forces beyond their command and control, which will ultimately destroy both them and all others.

172. There is a clear and deep conviction in the minds of scientists and statesmen, and in world opinion, that general and complete disarmament is an illusion unless an end can first be put to all nuclear weapon tests. To seek disarmament while the nuclear competition which whips up the arms race continues is just as illogical and useless as it would be to seek factual confirmation of theoretical astronomy and of the scientists' findings and conclusions without special rockets or vehicles for that purpose.

173. The peoples wish to live in perpetuity not simply as long as the nuclear Powers will allow; and they want to live without the continual poisoning of the air they breathe. By what right do those Powers act? Who has given them the title-deeds to the high seas, the atmosphere and outer space? The only title-deeds they can produce are those of right based on might, which is not quite the same as might based on right.

174. Universal requirements, and duty of stopping this deadly competition, should not be subordinated to the wishes of a single Power. No single Power, we believe, has the right to choose between the path of explosions and the path of their cessation. No Power has the right to prescribe life or death for its own people; far less does it possess that right in respect of the other peoples of the world, and even less does it have the right to destroy our civilization. Who has given the nuclear Powers the right to do as they please with mankind, to annihilate it or to allow it to continue its progress?

175. Life is a process of movement and change. Nothing on this planet remains static and immutable. This inviolable law governs the constant flow of international life, which is never stemmed in its inevitable process of growth and transformation.

176. The longer the nuclear Powers delay their agreement, the more time and opportunity is allowed for other Powers to compete in the arms race. With each new entry into the nuclear "club", the national security of each of its members and the security of the world as a whole are irremediably diminished. Every series of nuclear tests carried out by each Power will make it scientifically and politically necessary for the Power which tested previously to analyse the latest tests and in turn to reply with new tests, on the pretext that it has been compelled to carry them out for reasons of national security or military balance, with an eye to reprisals, or because it is entitled to the last turn, and so it will go on. How long?

177. The reasons now advanced to justify answering one series with another will, in the opinion of the nuclear Powers, still be valid next year and the following year, and every year thereafter until the end of the twentieth century. We do not think this is possible, since no one is unaware that, if there is not a change in direction soon, the danger of a cataclysm of ravaging destructiveness—the only possible outcome of this suicidal struggle—will increase day by day.

178. One of the greatest obstacles to a treaty banning nuclear weapon tests is the fear that the Power which tested last night, as a result, have gained some military advantage or made discoveries and completed

experiments marking a significant advance in the nuclear field. The Power entertaining that fear would not readily be disposed to sign a treaty prohibiting tests until it, in turn, had attempted to re-establish the military balance regarded by it as having been upset by the tests of the rival Power.

179. World opinion is weary of listening to bad arguments in defence of a worse cause. Where the testing of nuclear weapons is concerned, the great Powers are governed by one another. They say: "We shall not carry out any more tests unless we are forced to do so", and what happens is that one party continues to force the other and is forced by the latter in turn.

180. It is hardly to be supposed that the studies which scientists make of nuclear tests by the opposing party lead them to conclude that such tests have been repetitive, useless and negative and have given the enemy no technical advantage. On the contrary—every study which one party makes of the tests carried out by the other will yield evidence, or at least a reasonable scientific presumption, that technical improvements and a nuclear advantage have been secured. So long as a date for the final ending of tests is not established by mutual agreement, no Power will find it desirable to drop out of the nuclear weapon testing race or see any scientific or political reason for doing so.

181. So long as the Powers remain free, juridically speaking, to carry out tests with a view to perfecting their nuclear weapons and trying to obtain a military advantage, mutual fear will persist and it will be hard for the Powers to find a suitable moment for ending the nuclear competition by a treaty. But if a date for the final cessation of nuclear weapon tests, acceptable to the parties, was established by mutual agreement, the fear that one of them might disturb the existing balance would be removed, and it would then be less difficult to reach agreement on the nature of the control, functions and powers to be exercised by an international scientific body of the type suggested at Geneva in the eight-Power memorandum of April 1962.^{5/}

182. It must be recognized that the nuclear competition is a race leading, not to security or the maintenance of peace, but to negation and nothingness. It is a race in the dark between the abyss and the tempest. Human intelligence and the instinct of self-preservation should be capable of finding another solution and preparing the future of peace and progress merited by mankind. From this standpoint, the President of Mexico, Mr. López Mateos, and the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, in a joint communiqué issued a few days ago at New Delhi, stated as follows:

"The President [of Mexico] and the Prime Minister [of India] agreed that the preservation of world peace is the most important task before mankind if the human race and its civilization are to survive. They believe in the abolition of war as an instrument of national policy and in the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means.

"They are resolved therefore to continue to work for the early realisation of agreements to achieve general and complete disarmament under international control and a total ban on all nuclear tests"

^{5/} Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for January 1961 to December 1962, document DC/203, annex I, section J, 16 April 1962.

183. In these circumstances, we feel that it becomes daily more urgent and essential to work out an agreement for fixing forthwith the date for the ending of the tests, even if it unfortunately proves impossible to achieve this before the conclusion of the series of tests now in progress.

184. A final date must be set to the test programmes of both parties, and that date must be established forthwith in a treaty, because it is dangerous to wait until the completion of both series of tests in the hope that an effective agreement, setting a final date for the end of the nuclear race, can then be negotiated. If we postpone the negotiation of a treaty until both series of tests are concluded, it is very unlikely that either party will refrain from advancing, once again, the same reasons of military balance which they have now advanced in justification of the present tests.

185. When the scientists and military leaders of one Power discover that the opposing Power has gained important information or made technical and scientific progress in the direction of perfecting nuclear weapons or defence against them, and when they argue that this entails a nuclear imbalance or a military advantage, the Governments of both Powers will be unable to resist the scientific and military pressures which impel them to answer tests with tests, and so on ad infinitum.

186. Who or what would then be able to halt them in their downward course?

187. We have repeated time and again that we denounce the tests of both parties, and we regret that the clamour of world opinion has not yet been able to prevent them; but if the nuclear Powers have persisted in ignoring the passionate demands of all peoples and in snapping at the bait of a lasting military advantage, we Members of the General Assembly must all strive to help those Powers to fix by mutual agreement a date—here and now, before the series of either party is completed—on which, this year or early next year, a final and definitive end will be put to the senseless competition in nuclear weapons.

188. The statesmen and rulers of both the conflicting groups have said, at one time or another, that a nuclear war would mean the end of civilization as we know it, the destruction of mankind and of all life on this planet. We have been told that existing nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, and the means and vehicles for delivering them to the intended targets, are enough and more than enough to wipe from the face of the earth absolutely everything that is worth preserving—the treasure accumulated through the efforts, the sufferings and the spirit of man down the ages, since the dawn of his history. Why, then, try to "perfect" existing weapons which are already so diabolically effective?

189. The delegation of Mexico believes that the General Assembly, echoing world opinion, must express its ardent desire and its conviction that nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapon tests should cease at the earliest possible moment.

190. With the aim of contributing to this end, the delegation of Mexico is prepared, at the appropriate time, to submit in the First Committee a draft resolution, which might be in the following or similar terms:

"The General Assembly,

"Concerned at the continuation of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests,

"Bearing in mind that the cessation of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapon tests is urgently necessary, since radio-active fall-out causes grave damage to present and future generations.

"Considering moreover that the effects of such fall-out range beyond the national jurisdiction of the State which produces the explosions and encroach upon other jurisdictions, entailing serious peril to the health of other peoples and of mankind in general,

"Considering that nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapon explosions are the most dangerous manifestation of the arms race which, if continued, can have no other outcome than war;

"Decides:

1. To call on the nuclear Powers to suspend all nuclear and thermonuclear weapon tests—underground or at sea, in the atmosphere or in outer space—as soon as possible and in any event not later than 1 January 1963;

2. To call on the nuclear Powers to continue, as a matter of urgency, negotiations for the conclusion of binding agreements which will prohibit all nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapon explosions for ever."

191. The cessation of nuclear weapon tests not later than 1 January 1963—the date we suggested at Geneva—would have salutary effects on the international climate and would help to solve other related questions on the agenda of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, such as the question of halting the spread of nuclear weapons, the question of denuclearized zones, the problem of how to avoid a war by accident, error or break-down of communications, the problem of the peaceful use of outer space, and so forth.

192. We have noted with interest the observation made by the chairman of the Brazilian delegation in his statement of 20 September last to the General Assembly. Mr. de Melo Franco said:

"Brazil also favours, in principle, the establishment of denuclearized zones in the world, provided that proposals to that effect are not merely made for the purposes of the cold war, from which we have always held aloof. Latin America might form such a zone." [1125th meeting, para. 25.]

193. I wish to point out in this connexion that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mexico spoke at Geneva as follows:

"In our view, denuclearization can and must be carried out—while world agreement is being sought—by spontaneous decisions of States. Thus, the Government of Mexico has decided neither to own, nor to admit to the national territory, nuclear weapons of any kind, or vehicles which might be used for their delivery."

194. As we have said before, we regard the establishment of denuclearized zones as a temporary and partial measure, because we are opposed to nuclear weapon tests wherever they may take place and what ever Power may be responsible for them.

195. The world views with alarm the prospect of series after series of nuclear weapon explosions, of greater and greater power and at greater and greater altitudes in out space. Outer space is res communis;

the high seas are res communis; but since the start of the competition in nuclear weapon tests, the great Powers have treated the res communis as their private property and have exercised their jurisdiction in outer space and on the high seas limiting the rights of others whenever they chose to do so. We hope that this situation will change and that the great Powers, with the help of the General Assembly at its present session, will be able to reach that indispensable agreement which will ensure maintenance of peace and remove, for ever, the danger of a nuclear war.

196. The Berlin question is one of the critical problems of the current international situation. World opinion sees with disquiet the threats to peace involved in this situation, and hopes and prays that the Powers concerned can solve the problem peacefully.

197. The Berlin problem is not among the items on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly, but we believe that it would be useful if you, Mr. President, with the high authority vested in you and with the respect which you deservedly enjoy, could perhaps consider and explore the possibility and desirability of making, with the consent of this Assembly, an appeal to the Powers concerned to do all they can to solve this grave and perilous problem

by peaceful means, so that world peace may not be disturbed by this issue.

198. I have already said that the principles on which both national policies and international life are based will change. What now seems to us impossible will become practicable, and the springs of human conduct will be adapted to the new reality and necessities of the atomic age. Perhaps we do not quite grasp the importance and the implications of this new age of science and technology. The most realistic of scientists and the most imaginative of thinkers cannot conceive the limits, the speed and the physiognomy of a civilization which is developing at an unsuspected tempo, and in an unsuspected direction.

199. Our generation is a bridge and a link between two epochs. The transition from the present to the future involves painful and radical changes in thought and action. On our ability to measure up to the responsibilities of the present hour depends the future of mankind. It depends on us whether civilization will continue to hand on the torch from generation to generation.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.