

Fourteenth Session

823rd Plenary Meeting, 6th October, 1959

by Mr. V.K. Krishna Menon

Mr. President, my delegation had opportunity earlier during the course of this session to offer its felicitations to you on your unanimous election to the high office you hold. Today, we have the pleasure of being able to congratulate you indeed and wish ourselves well upon your return here after your brief indisposition. The Assembly would not be as fruitful without your guidance and without your presence with us here.

My delegation would also like to take this opportunity of expressing the feelings of our Government and country at the tragic death of the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Mr. Bandaranaike. Many representatives have spoken here of his qualities of statesmanship and his personal qualities of wisdom and courage, and it is not necessary at this late hour for me to engage the Assembly on this sad matter. Ceylon is our closest neighbour. Its late Prime Minister was a personal friend of many of our statesmen and people. We have been often encouraged by the example of the great courage he displayed in times of difficulty in his own country and by the leadership that he gave often in regard to policies fashioned by himself and with neighbouring nations.

My delegation participates in this general debate at its late stage. Some seventy-nine speakers, not including those who exercised their rights of reply, have spoken for nearly sixty hours actual speaking time on the various problems that concern the world. This is not a large number of speakers, nor is it an unconscionable amount of time, when, as my delegation feels, we

have here this opportunity of the general debate, not only to discuss world problems as such, but also to get some glimpse of each other's countries. It is one of the main contributions in the open sessions of the Assembly which makes for greater international understanding.

This fourteenth session of the General Assembly opened, in its early stage, with an address by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR [799th meeting]. It was one of the great events of our sessions and of our time, more especially in view of the pronouncements he made and the policy proposal he communicated to this Assembly. To these my delegation will address itself in after stages of our proceedings.

There has been a degree of criticism and, on the part of the Secretary-General, what sounds somewhat like an apology for the development of events outside the United Nations. So far as the Government of India is concerned, we do not look upon this though we have to suffer it because we must, or make the best of a bad position. We think that the developments that have taken place in what is called "outside the United Nations" in so far as they are developments which contribute towards the progress of humanity towards world peace and co-operation, are "inside" the United Nations, in that the United Nations is not bound by the limits of this Organization, but Secretary-General has already pointed out the constitutional and other reasons which justify this kind of negotiations on world problems.

We think that it is very important, wherever possible, that who are in a position to negotiate, who are in a position to deliver the goods, those between whom there are greater suspicions than amongst some others, should take advantage of every opportunity to make direct contacts and to confer. We in the United Nations should wish them well. We are equally anxious that our anxieties

or our concerns in these matters should find a response in these others who are concerned, that we should be kept informed, that we should be enabled to educate ourselves, and instruct our judgements, and that we should be able to make our contributions as from places where we stand.

The large number of speakers that have preceded me had as their main themes the central problem of our world, namely, the tension that exists. But their speeches have also been characterized by a degree of, or at least a desire to hope. I think it would be far too optimistic to say "by a tone of hopefulness" because that is hardly characteristic of the Assembly. The Assembly consists of a large numbers of "hard-boiled" representatives of Governments and it is not as though they permit themselves to take a romantic view of problems. But right through these speeches, except where intimate problems concerning their own countries and their relations and such other factors come in, there has been in these speeches such a desire, such an anxiety, such a passion, that we may dare to feel hopeful in regard to what may happen in the future.

There is very profound concern about the enormous increase and development of armaments and the fact that after ten to fourteen years of discussing disarmament, the world today stands more armed than it has ever been in history. What is more, the various proposals that have been debated from time to time, though they have engaged the attention of people and have certainly led to the development of the consideration of various aspects and difficulties of the problem, have not yet led to any positive solutions.

Therefore, looking at the world as it is, we find today, at a time when this Assembly meets, that we are, on the one hand, confronted with hope, and, on the other hand, with anxiety. It

brings to my mind the romantic-or is it not so romantic ?-fantasy, of a famous historical novelist, Charles Dickens-who, in one of our time but of a previous century-who, in one of his historical novels portraying the period when the British Crown received a communication from some of its subjects across the seas, in the American colonies, wrote in this way about the era of 1778:

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us ...'"1

The world is very much in that state and it largely reflects the states of

development of our times, that we are confronted with problems about which we really have inadequate experience. Therefore a pragmatic approach, dealing with problems as they arise, and not being committed too far beforehand as to what side one should take, is necessary in the interests of the relaxation of world tensions.

My country has been committed to this position for a long time. In that connexion, we welcomed the statement of the representative of Iceland [820th meeting] the other day-not about fishing rights in the North Pole about which he spoke with passion, in which we do not want to participate, but in regard to the formation of blocs, not the blocs of the cold war, but the blocs inside the Assembly. We ourselves belong to various groups, and I think that groups, in so far as they seek to offer to the Assembly their collective wisdom, are a constructive force. But if, on the other hand, blocs surround themselves with walls of isolation, then we shall divide the unity of this Assembly. A

degree of neighbourliness, a degree of the coming together of people who have common problems and common backgrounds, is to be expected and welcomed.

But my delegation shares, with the representative of Iceland, the concern that our attempts to cooperate with each other should not result in our isolating ourselves from others or from the whole of the United Nations.

This present period is also one of considerable scientific advancement, including the proximity of human discovery to finding the origins of life itself.

We have also had placed before us at this session for the first time, although it had been mentioned so many times in speeches by a less notable delegation, the proposition that disarmament alone is not what we need if this world is to survive and prosper, but really a warless world. When the time comes and in the course of our observations at this Assembly, then my delegation would like to draw a distinction in content between the two proposals that are before the Assembly, one really concerned with disarmament and the other concerned with a world without war.

We have before us the Annual Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization [A/4132], which is not entirely of the usual character. It deals with questions of political philosophy and theory; it deals with problems that have to do with the development of this Organization in the future. And I say, in all humility, that I do not think that our organization has given proper attention either to these problems or to the report itself. The Secretary-General's report is received as a matter of course, and we are inclined to think that our

responsibilities are over when we pay him his meed of thanks.

We are grateful not only to the Secretary-General for this report. In his person, he embodies the whole of the Secretariat. At the end of this general debate, we should like to offer the thanks of our delegation and, if I may presume to say so, the thanks of all of us, to all those person who make up the Secretariat, who make the functioning of the Assembly possible, who prepare the large amount of material and the considerable number of documents which we receive, and some of which we do not receive. For all these things, we are grateful to the Secretariat-to the administrative staff, to the interpreters, and to every-body concerned. Most of them are people whose names do not appear in the newspapers and do not even appear in official records. Without their diligence and their devotion to duty and the hard work they have to put in, often after office hours, it would not be possible for us to function here. May I therefore take the liberty of asking the Secretary-General to convey to the Secretariat, in an appropriate way, this expression of appreciation.

It is not possible for me to study this report publicly, because some of it is obviously debatable, and I do not want at this stage of the Assembly to enter into a controversy in that field. However, one may be permitted to refer to various points in the report.

The Secretary-General has referred to the universality of the United Nations. I am sure that, as things stand, all delegations but one in this Assembly would vote for universality as far as membership is concerned. But the observations of the Secretary-General go a little further, when this universal conception has a bearing upon function in such a way as though the concern of every Member of the Assembly or of some of them has to be

demarcated in one form or another. I do not say that this is altogether a proposition that should not be considered, but it has its pitfalls. It is one of those things that I do hope will engage the attention of the Assembly in the future-that is the development of the Organization, to what extent the United Nations has become synonymous with the entirety of its Members and the Governments represented- and, even where the results are good, to what extent, for the time being or for all time, some or all Member States have to keep out of certain matters and certain contexts.

The Secretary-General has also referred, expressly or by implication, to certain constitutional procedures, where, again, there are certain aspects which one would welcome and other aspects which one would want to study. We will all admit that as the work of the United Nations grows, becomes intensive, becomes more a day-to-day affair, the functioning of the representatives of Governments at Headquarters who are accredited to the United Nations would become more and more important. But my Government has always taken the view that, whether it be in groups, the Africa-Asian group of representatives, whether at a particular times at an Assembly or otherwise, could, in the present circumstances of the world, in the absence of a world constitution and world law, become de facto a world government. Policies are to be made by chancelleries. Therefore, while we are fully aware of the importance of day-to-day consultation, this Organization will carry weight with public opinion in various countries, will have the conscious and enthusiastic support of Governments, only to the extent that, in activities from day to day, the Secretary-General's personality, the Organization itself and the scene of the changing functional context are more and more in touch with Governments and chancelleries. Mr. Hammarskjöld is fully conscious of this matter and, during the considerable time that he has between sessions of the Assembly, he takes care to visit capitals. Unfortunately, he has to do a certain amount of sight-seeing, but not included in these sights are the statesmen of

those countries who are the essential part of his programme.

The same applies with regard to the voting procedures to which also the report refers. When we touch on this matter, we touch a very tender spot. While it is quite true that equality of status, as a British Prime Minister once said, does not mean equality of function, it is also true that, the less the capacity for and content of function, the more a person is conscious of his status! Therefore, when we touch on this problem, we shall be touching on something which requires a great deal of consideration.

Each State here has one vote. All are equal. The very beloved country of Iceland, with a population of 200,000 is no less important than the country of India, with a population of 380,000,000. But it is equally true that a mere massing of votes-whether it is 45 to 11 with 25 abstentions or, as in the old days, 55 to 5-does not have the same impact upon world opinion as, shall we say, a vote that reflects the real views and conditions in the world.

To a very large extent, a vote in this Assembly has value in reality in direct ratio to its impact upon world opinion and the response it arouses on the part of the world. The Secretary-General has also made reference to the International Court of Justice and to the greater use we should make of it. In this connexion, may I also observe that reference was made in the course of the debate to the fact that certain countries, particularly referring to us, had taken the view that we could make decisions on matters where others are concerned, and that it would be far better if we accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. Merely as a point

of information, I should like to inform the Assembly that the

Government of India has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, and the documents in this connexion have been circulated by the Secretariat. Of course, the acceptance contains reservations, but those reservations are not unusual. They are reservations which appertain to almost all the Commonwealth countries, and others which are common in diplomatic practice. But, apart from that, we have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

It is usual at this time to look at the agenda of the General Assembly. It is one of the easiest things to do because we have looked at it for ten years. It is always the same agenda because it is the same world. But there are certain changes and developments, and then our approach to these items must vary. I do not think we should be cynical and say that we discuss the same things year after year. I suppose we discuss the same things in one sense, but we often make different approaches to these problems. Certain new items have come onto the agenda,

and the Secretary-General's report, I think, constitutes one of the not least necessary items on the agenda, and is a document which provides much food for thought. I hope the Secretary-General at some time will give consideration to placing the individual matters for consideration before the appropriate organs of the United Nations.

It is usual on occasions of this kind to refer to one's own country and the progress or otherwise therein. My delegation has given considerable thought to this practice and there is good justification for its continuance. It should be done for two reasons. One is that in our part of the world great changes are taking place. We are at present in that part of the world which in recent times has come into independence. We also represent a social and economic system which seeks to establish revolutions, political, social and economic, by and large, by consent.

But over and above that we would like to discuss briefly the developments in our own land during the last twelve months or so, because it is one way of international communication. We lay increasing stress upon sending delegations, upon receiving stress upon communication of information. Therefore I think that if delegates who are assembled here do not use this opportunity within the brevity of time that conditions us, to inform each other of our position, we shall not be doing our duty to our own country or to the Assembly as a whole.

It may be that in some cases our national aspirations, our national considerations, our national prejudices and traditions, may import into this an inevitable imbalance. In India the main theme about which one may speak is its economic and social development under conditions of a planned economy. Various five-year plans have been in progress and we find that this progress has maintained its schedules, and while progress is slow-at least slow having regard to our low standards of living and our hopes-it has still been maintained.

From somewhere about \$17,300 million in 1948 the national income of India has risen in 1958 to somewhere about \$22,600 million. Also the standards of life of our people have gone up, but very slightly, because while the national income, to which I referred now, has gone up, the per capita income in India has not gone up in the same way because of the increase in population is proportionately higher than anywhere but the aggregates are larger, So from an income of \$49.4 per head ten years ago, it has gone up to only \$57.8 per head of population.

Since independence in our country there has been an increase in population to the extent of 67 millions. That is larger than the total population of many countries represented here. This comes about from the fact that, while the birth-rate has gone down one

point per thousand of population, the death-rate has gone down eleven points. Fewer people are born, but even fewer people die. Infantile mortality has also gone down from 146 to 108 per thousand of live births in the last ten years. That results in the fact that the number of mouths to feed which press upon the means of subsistence is greater than can be catered for by the increase in wealth itself.

Food production in India has increased in the same way. As far as my recollection goes, in pre-partitioned India- that is, when India and Pakistan were one country- the total production of food grains in that India was about 47 million tons. In a smaller India, which is about three fifths of the previous area, last year we produced 73.5 million tons food grains and we are still hungry. The rise in the first five years has been 15 per cent, and the following three years about 11 per cent. The production of food in the country, which may sound a rather flat proposition to put forward, is really the basis of all prosperity and peace and, indeed, is the substratum of our international peace and co-operation.

Side by side with the advance in food production there have also been advances in social development. I would not take the time of the Assembly by going into every item. There are a great number of them which may interest me as an Indian national, but I think the development of co-operatives in India is one of the outstanding features. In our country the position is different from that of Western Europe, from the point of view of our political and social evolution in the recent past or in current revolution, whether violent or otherwise, conferring political power upon the masses, came after the Industrial Revolution. We have the reverse process.

In India, we have had full-fledged political revolution. We have

placed political power in the hands of every man and woman of adult age, whether literate or illiterate, whether rich or poor, whether tall or short, and the industrial and economic progress has to come thereafter, with all the social consequences that follow from such a situation.

I mentioned co-operatives. Ten years ago there were in India somewhere about 5.7 million co-operative societies. Today there are 13.8 million of them. A few years ago 115,000 of our villages were covered by co-operative; today over 179,000 of them are so covered. But still there remain some 450,000 villages to be covered. There is another project where there is much to interest the United Nations. Indeed, it figures in the report of the Secretary-General in the part concerned with community project developments. India today aspires to cover herself with this form of village democracy and planning, economic and social, right from the bottom. Sixty per cent of our villages are covered by these projects, and 56.6 per cent of our population, somewhere about 165 million.

Then we come to a larger development which has international bearings. In a country like ours, which has come into the field of modern development only recently and with a standard of life indicated by the figures I have given with regard to per capita income, modern development, which requires capital goods from highly-advanced countries, and what is more, different factors which are and have been conditioned by the economy of other countries, is therefore to a large extent conditioned by our capacity to buy in foreign lands. That is, external assistance becomes of great importance. In this sphere the United Nations itself has taken part, although only on what the Secretary-General would, at least in private, call a laboratory scale.

The amount of external resources as far as India is concerned has

come most from the United States totalling some \$1,800 million in the last ten years. Out of this \$490 million is outright aid, the remainder being loans repayable in dollars or Indian currency, with some \$200 million so reserved for expenditure by the United States Government itself. Therefore, in the way of outright grants, for which we are grateful, there has been nearly \$500 million pumped into the Indian economy.

From the Soviet Union, machinery, projects and assistance in loans or otherwise, amounted in all \$670 million. Then we have a series of other projects which are of a more co-operative character, largely in the Commonwealth group, as indicated by the Colombo Plan, out of which Canada has been the largest donor and helper. Canada is a comparatively small country in the way of population, but it is a rich one in resources current and potential. India has received up to 1958-1959 \$176 million, mainly in the field of machinery and atomic apparatus.

From the smaller country of New Zealand, with a population of two and a half million or so, has been poured into India, largely through UNICEF, some \$67 million in the last ten years. Australia, one of our neighbours, has contributed to the building of hydro-electric projects and other works to the extent of \$23 million. The United Kingdom, in the same way, has contributed considerably towards equipment, apart from accommodating us by way of short-term loans. From Norway and various other countries has come assistance to India. Fortunately for us, either in the technical field or in the field of money, aid has not been a one-way traffic. India has in the same way extended either aid or loans to the extent of tens of millions of dollars to other countries whose names I do not want to mention here, since I have not asked their permission.

In addition to this, into our country come students-trainees, factory hands, from all parts of the world, more particularly

from Asia-nominated either by the Colombo Plan or under various transfer schemes; and in this way, not only are we being helped by the increase of our own technical capacities, but also a degree of international co-operation in the field of technical development is built up. Neither political ideology, nor distance of other countries, nor racial, religious or other differences have played a part in this.

India has also contributed to the United Nations Technical Assistance Programme up to \$3,5 million, and today the Government of India has announced that it will contribute \$2 million to the Special Fund if the other figures given out come up to the expected levels.

The index of production in India has gone from 87 points in 1948 to 142.7 points. But no country today has any chances of survival, either by a political philosophy or even by a long history, if it does not have at its disposal considerable engineering and technical abilities, and we are glad to think that, while in 1949 we had 2,900 engineers and technicians in the country, today we have 9,300, all trained in India. There are also about 400 foreign students on scholarships in India and altogether about 3,500 students from other countries. We regret to say that the scholarships offered to various Trusteeship Territories have not been availed of fully. Of the 42 scholarships offered to trust Territories, only twenty-seven have been utilized. There are some 10,000 Indian students in various parts of the world, the largest number being in the United Kingdom, the United States and Australia.

The most modern of the developments in India are in the field of atomic energy. I am happy to communicate to the General Assembly, as I have done before, that it is not only part of our policy, but a policy which is fully insisted upon and implemented and

which has been testified to by Dr. Davidson in the World Survey Report-the same scientist to whom Mr. Khrushchev referred as "Davidson" -that, while the developments were of a very high order and we should soon be capable of becoming self-sufficient in the field of atomic technical equipment, there was no indication that India would venture into the field of atomic weapons. The atomic energy establishments in India employ 970 scientists and also take into training nearly 200 trainees every year from India and elsewhere. There are two reactors in operation, completely built in India itself and a third being built by co-operation between Canada and ourselves.

India is the country in the world using the largest amount of thorium for the production of atomic fuel. It has also gone into the development of uranium metal plants and of various other things that are required for this purpose, such as rare ores and metals. In view of the lateness of the hour, I do not intend to go into details in this connexion.

Alongside progress we have had, at the same time, our own share of natural calamities in addition to all other concomitants of an adverse character in developments that must happen in a democratic society. We have had devastation by floods. The worst floods in history occurred in the State of Jammu and Kashmir and recently in Assam, and also in Bengal and Bombay, causing losses of tens of millions of dollars and rendering large numbers of people homeless. Fortunately, the capacity of our people to adapt themselves to these circumstances has made these calamities less tragic than they otherwise might have been.

Among other developments are the irrigation developments of India, notably the Rajasthan Canal, the longest canal in the world, projected as an idea a long time ago when the British were in India and which would supply water to part of the Punjab and

Rajputana and convert them into food-producing area for the future.

From these matters we must now go on to various other questions which have been raised here specifically. I should like to deal first with question with which we are intimately concerned.

The Secretary-General, on the one hand, and various delegations, on the other, have referred to United Nations peace forces; that is to say, to machinery, the instruments, for applying sanctional powers or carrying out police duties, or whatever they may be called. We, as a country, have participated in this development, and continue to do so and to carry some of its burdens. The Government of India is not at present prepared to participate in a standing force of the United Nations as such and we do not think that it is a practical proposition. We are surprised to find that some countries have proposed that certain unit of national forces should be allocated and demarcated for United Nations purpose. But if they are so allocated, what do they do when the United Nations does not want them? It is not practical, in the defence force of any country, to have troops allocated and demarcated in this way.

Secondly, for political reasons, we think that, with the present state of development in the world and in the absence of world law and of the universality of the United Nations, and in presence of the fact that we as an Organization are far from free from group politics or yet capable of taking truly objective decisions, we do not think that it would be right to place at the disposal of such an organization forces which may be moved in without individual negotiations and the consent of the people concerned. The time will come, in a disarmed world, when war is no longer regarded as a machinery for the settling of disputes, when some kind of forces organization may be required to deal with those

who break the world law; but we think that it is premature at the present time to speak in terms of a United Nations force or to expect countries to shoulder the responsibility from the point of view of personnel or of money or political acceptances.

In this connexion I am sure that the Secretary-General will expect us to say that units of the Indian army today in the Gaza Strip are there as a peace force; and that we feel privileged to participate in this venture. But it imposes considerable burdens upon us, to a certain extent recompensed by the fact that these men, not diplomats, not university men, not men trained in the arts of peaceful operations, but in the arts of defence, have been the best ambassadors our country has ever sent out anywhere. They have no quarrels; they have left no social problems behind them, as occupying armies often do. They have created no difficulties in the places where they have gone. And this has been our experience in Korea, as well as with the officers who went to Indo-China, with the officers whom the Secretary-General asked for in a hurry for the United Nations Observer Group in Lebanon, and those who, for two or more years have stood as a peace force in true Gandhian tradition on the Gaza Strip between Israel and Egypt, giving unfortunate evidence of the fact that there is an armistice line and that the two countries are not at peace.

Then we come to another matter which my delegation wants to deal with as carefully and as gently as possible, namely the question of Laos. We would not have entered into a discussion of this matter except for the fact that we carry a certain responsibility in connexion with it. As the Assembly is aware, India is the Chairman of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos.

In 1954, largely under the initiative and the constructive

statesmanship of the then Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, Sir Anthony Eden, an agreement was reached whereby fighting in that part of the world stopped and for the first time in twenty-five years, on 11 August 1954, the guns of war were silenced in all the world.

As a result of those negotiations and preliminary to a cease-fire in those area, after many years of very sanguinary warfare in which hundreds of thousands of lives were lost, agreements were signed by the parties which are called the Geneva Agreements of 1954.

I hope the Assembly will pardon me if I feel it part of my Government's duty to communicate to the Assembly the actual position. We have no desire to apportion blame, but, in view of the matter and we are part of the United Nations, I think the Assembly should be fully seized of this matter. India is the Chairman of the Commission, and the other members are Canada and Poland. Decisions were reached by majorities, except on certain major issues ,but were almost always, with one or two exception, unanimous. There are three agreements-one on Laos, one on Viet-Nam and one on Cambodia. The parties to the Geneva agreement on Laos are the Royal Government of Laos, the French High Command and the High Command of the Pathet Lao, that is of the dissident Forces, and of the People's forces of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

The Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, France and Laos subscribed to the Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference. All the Governments represented were also parties to the Geneva agreements. The Royal Government of Laos made two declaration with reference to articles 3,4 and 5 of the Final Declaration regarding political integration and non-involvement in military alliances, and foreign military aid. The period stated with

reference to the latter was the period between the cessation of hostilities in Viet- Nam and the final settlement of the country's political problems.

The responsibility for the execution of this agreement was placed on the parties, that is, the signatories, under article 24 of the agreement.

The Commission, of which India was the Chairman, was made responsible under article 25 for control and supervision of the implementation of this agreement. The special tasks for which the Commission was made responsible included the supervision of the implementation of the agreement regarding the introduction of military personnel and war material and the rotation of personnel and supplies for French Union Security Forces maintained in Laos. The Commission was also charged with the duty to see that the frontiers of Laos were respected.

Article 25 states:

"An International Commission shall be responsible for control and supervision of the application of the provision of the Agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Laos. it shall be composed of representatives of the following States: Canada, India and Poland
...,"

The political procedures of the agreement are those given in Article 14 and 15 read with the two declarations made by the Government of Laos at Geneva. These are the articles that deal with the responsibility of the Royal Government of Laos in this matter, because it was said that pending a political settlement,

the rebel forces had to be grouped in certain areas. Under article 15, the parties undertook to refrain from any reprisals or discriminations against persons or organisations for their activities during the hostilities and also undertook to guarantee their democratic freedoms.

It is true that the political settlement was delayed for a long time. That is to say, the Pathet Lao people who were concentrated in the two places according to this agreement, took a long time before they achieved unity with the Royal Government. Without attempting to apportion blame to either party, the Government of India wishes to point out that the Commission and the Commission Chairman materially assisted with their good offices in helping the parties to reach a settlement, as stated by the Prime Minister of Laos and the representative of the Pathet Lao forces in a joint letter dated 29 December 1956. That is to say, though perhaps it was not strictly the essential duty of the Commission, the Commission brought about a settlement among these people, and at the end of it the Prime Minister of Laos issued communique in these terms:

"Besides the signature of this communique has been facilitated by the attentive interest the International Commission has taken in the settlement of the Laotian problem, interest which in particular is proved by the opportune and correct report addressed to the Co-Chairmen"-Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd; at that time Mr. Molotov and Sir Anthony Eden-"of the Geneva Conference, a copy of which has been forwarded. Moreover, the International Commission and especially Your Excellency"- that is, the Chairman of the Commission -" did not spare their efforts to help the happy success of our talks. The results thus reached contribute in a good measure to the strengthening of peace in the Laotian Kingdom, in South- East Asia and in the world. We therefore avail ourselves of this opportunity to forward personally to International Commission and to Your Excellency our

most sincere thanks as well as those of the whole Laotian people."

Now the representative of Laos has said here:

"The International Control Commission, a body established by the Geneva Conference of 1954, saw that it no longer served any purpose and, considering that its task had been completed, left Laos in July 1958," [815th meeting, para. 132.]

We have no desire to enter into a controversy about this, but we want to put the facts historically correct. The Commission did not leave in July 1958 because its work had been completed but it only adjourned sine die with a provision to reconvene in accordance with normal procedures", and the Co-Chairmen also acknowledged this position. These documents were the subject of considerable correspondence between the Co-Chairmen, Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd at the time. The Government of India sent the following communication:

"The Government of India have in their previous discussion with the High Commission ... stated that" (with regard to) ... "the Geneva Agreements on Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam respectively, the three International Commissions have to continue till political settlement is completed in all the three countries, namely, Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam. The articles referred to above provide for reduction in the activities of a particular Commission in the light of the development of the situation in the other two countries, but there is no provision in the Geneva Agreements for the winding up of any of the Commissions independently of the completion of political settlement in the other two

countries ... "

Apart from the position of the Government of India on the general question of the inter-connexion of the three Commissions, given in paragraph 1 above, the Government of India would like to point out that there were two parties to the Geneva Agreement on Laos; one party signed for the Commander-in-Chief of the forces of the French Union in Indo-China, from whom the Laotian Government derived their authority, and the other party signed for the Pathet Lao and for the other party signed for the Commander-in-Chief of the fighting units of the Pathet Lao and for the Commander-in-Chief of the People's Army - of Viet-Nam. The second party, namely the one represented by the Vice- Minister of National Defence of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, do not accept the proposal to wind up the Royal Laotian Government, viz., the United Kingdom, which supports the view advanced by one of the parties to the Agreement on Laos, viz., the Royal Laotian Government and with which the other Co-chairman Government, namely, the USSR, and the other party to the Agreement, viz., the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam do not agree, means the unilateral denunciation, by one of the parties, of the Geneva Agreement on Laos, which is bound to have serious repercussions on the working of the Geneva Agreements not only in Laos but also in other parts of Indo-China ... "

While the Government of India cannot, in view of the position stated in paragraphs 1 and 6 above, support this resolution, they would like to point out that a resolution of this type which proposes to amend not only the Geneva Agreement on Laos but the Geneva Agreements on Cambodia and Viet-Nam as well, requires unanimous decision in the Commission and the concurrence of the other two Commissions."

Therefore, we took the view that the Commission could not be

wound up unless there was a unanimous decision and the three Commissions had agreed. I continue:

"The Government of India are of the view that the unilateral denunciation of the Geneva Agreement on Laos and the winding up or immobilisation of the Laos Commission, which are bound to have serious repercussions on the working of the Geneva Agreements and on the working of the International Commissions in the whole of Indo-China, involve a serious threat to peace in this region."

One of the charges that were given to us was the safeguarding of peace in that area.

Then in their reply, when we placed this position before the United Kingdom Government, the United Kingdom Government said that the reply that it had given was without prejudice to the view that the Government of the United Kingdom held that the decision in this matter was on that the Commission itself was competent to make. Then, after that, this reply was communicated to the Co-Chairmen-and this is a very important matter. The two Co-Chairmen, namely, Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, wrote to the Government of India in these terms:

"The two Co-Chairmen took notice of the clarification of the Indian Government that this resolution does not affect the legal status of the Commission and does not reduce the competence of the Commission in implementing the tasks and functions assigned to it by the Geneva Agreements. The Co-Chairmen agreed that the resolution of the Commission of 19 July 1958"- that is, to adjourn sine die and to be reconvened in accordance with normal procedures-"was a procedural decision taken to adjourn sine die and having no connexion with the question of dissolution of the

Commission. They were agreed that no question of abrogating any of the articles of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Laos relating to the International Commission, in particular article 39, was involved."

So the position was that, as a result of this and in order to have some practical arrangements, the Commission withdrew from Laos with this provision for reconvening. Unfortunately, the Government of Canada did not find it possible to appoint members to it. We have always said that, when things had developed badly in Laos, the international authority that remained there should be available.

So, to go on with the story, when the Commission adjourned on 19 July 1958 there was every prospect of the political settlement being satisfactorily implemented in detail by the Government. The need for supervision and control could be satisfied by occasional meetings in future, if necessary. The position changed later, and was reported to the Co-Chairmen.

When the Commission adjourned, the unity and sovereignty of Laos had been established, and peace prevailed in the whole country. The details of the political integration were being worked out. The present position of armed clashes within Laos is a reversal of the process of settlement reached with the help of the Commission-and this is the important point.

The Royal Government of Laos has alleged aggression and subversion by the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. Whatever may be the motives of the Democratic Republic in working for resumption of the activities of the Commission, it is clear that the Commission helped in achieving political integration and in

the establishment of the unity and sovereignty of the Royal Government of Laos over the entire territory of Laos. The Commission has also been specifically directed under the agreement to see that there are no violations of the frontiers of Laos. That was one of the functions of the Commission.

India's view is that the present trouble is due mainly to the by-passing of the Geneva agreement procedures and the aggressive attitudes that have prevailed since the Commission adjourned.

Basing its attitude on its experience during its independence struggle, India believes in the pacific settlement of disputes. It is vitally interested in the maintenance of peace in South-East Asia and in the World. It undertook special responsibility in connexion with the maintenance of peace in Indo-China at the request of the Co-Chairmen and, while not wedded to any particular procedures or interested in apportioning blame to parties, would like to see the adoption of procedures which would secure the cessation of fighting in Laos and the restoration of peace both inside and along the frontiers of Laos.

In this connexion, I should like to quote a communication made by my Prime Minister. I have already referred to the fact that the two Co-Chairmen had taken notice of the adjournment motion, which was only for an adjournment sine die with a proviso to reconvene. Since the Secretary-General had very kindly taken it upon himself to use his good offices and had been in touch with us, my Prime Minister wrote to him on 30 June 1959:

"The Agreement for the Cessation of Hostilities in Laos was a part of the resolution arrived at in Geneva in regard to the Indo-China settlement. In the agreements made in 1954, the

Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet- Nam was a signatory on behalf of the Fighting Forces of Pathet Lao and these agreements were accompanied by a number of Declarations, including one by the Government of Laos, indicating in general terms that Laos would remain outside the activities of the Power blocs. Again, as a signatory of Geneva on behalf of the Pathet Lao, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam is interested in the various agreements later arrived at between the Royal Government of Laos and the Fighting Forces of Pathet Lao... We are not justified in assuming, and it would be unrealistic to assume, that the conclusions of these agreements render the problems there, which have become increasingly ominous, solely the internal affairs of Laos. The International Commission, despite its adjournment, stands charged with the responsibilities assumed under the Geneva agreements. This kind of development and situation which obtain at present were investigated when the Geneva agreements were made and these were brought within the authority and the functions vested in the International Commission and the arrangements arising there from to which the Royal Government of Laos is a signatory.

"We have consistently taken the view that the territorial integrity and unity of Laos is basis to the Geneva Agreements in respect of Laos. Any problem of a 'territorial conflict' between the different political groups within Laos is not envisaged by the Geneva Agreements. If, however, the 'conflict' relates to the dispute between North Viet-Nam and Laos, it will be in the nature of a border problem which can well form the subject of discussion and of mediation by and through the Commission."

In regard to the raising of the Laos issue in the United Nations, the Prime Minister of India informed the Secretary-General that:

"It is clear to me how any effective action can be taken through

the United Nations against a country such as the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam which is not a Member of the United Nations ... In fact, any reference to the Security Council would bring these questions into the region of great Power conflicts and put an end to much of the good work that has resulted from the Geneva Agreements."

I want to assure the Assembly that we do not claim any vested interest in this matter, but our country, along with Canada and Poland, has struggled for four long years to keep the peace in this part of the world. So far as we are concerned, it has been a considerable strain, and the conditions that prevail have been the subject of communications between our two partners and the Governments of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union and, latterly, the Secretary-General, all in the hope that what was accomplished in 1954-when, as I said on 11 August the guns were silenced -could continue.

For twenty-five years war had reigned in the world, since Japan made its incursions into Manchuria. We think if that international body-whether established by the United Nations or not, it was within its competence, it was there merely for the purpose of peace-if it had continued its functions, perhaps, and only perhaps, the present situation could have been avoided.

Over and above that, we would like to make this submission. Because a country is independent, and this includes our own, and because it is a Member of the United Nations, there is no authority in international law-indeed it would be a very bad precedent-by which it can therefore repudiate agreements it has previously made. This would be denunciation of a treaty, and it would remain a denunciation of a treaty.

We were among those who not only supported but made such contributions as we could towards obtaining the admission of Laos into the United Nations. The action taken by the Security Council in its wisdom is a matter for the Security Council. There was no evidence either that the presence of the Commission was not regarded as sufficiently objective or impartial or it was not considered competent after five years to be able to observe what was going on. It is our view that, if

they were there and if there were arms going into the territory, that could have been detected. If North Viet-Nam was at fault-as has happened in the last four or five years in regard to the parties to the agreement-the erring party could have been called to account. It is our good fortune that, though there have been difficulties, the parties have, after some time, come to some international code of behaviour in these matters.

All we should like to say is this. The basis of the position of Indo-China is the Geneva agreements. There is no fighting in Cambodia, but the Cambodian Government does not want the Commission dissolved. It is kept there in an attenuated form. Viet-Nam stands divided, at the seventeenth and a half parallel, into the North and the South. Neither of them is the Member of this body, on account of this decision. We believe that it is largely the Geneva agreements and the presence of the Commission, and its objectivity, that have been able to maintain peace in that area. It should not be forgotten that, far away as this part of the world may be from the headquarters of the United Nations, small countries as they may be three, inhabited by people on a lower standard of life, and however some may regard them as outside the centre of so-called civilisation, any conflict in that the centre of so-called civilisation, any conflict in that area would disturb the stability of South-East Asia.

We all breathed a sigh of relief when, as I said, largely due to the efforts of the then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom, ably assisted by the representative of the Soviet Union and, I must say, by the Prime Minister of China and by the Deputy Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and by all other parties-the Pathet Lao, the Royal Government of Laos and everyone else-and with the statesmanship of the former Prime Minister of France, Mr. Mendes-France, an agreement was reached and it brought about and kept the peace until recently. Our Government had the responsibility of supplying the greater part of the personnel for maintaining communications. The French Government had the responsibility of supplying the greater part of the personnel for maintaining communications. The French Government also carried a great financial burden. The Government of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom made financial contributions in order to keep the machinery of peace going. It is a great pity if international agreements are disregarded, and if in some way any action taken by the United Nations tends to support such disregard. There is nothing in the action the United Nations has taken that would necessarily be inconsistent with the Geneva agreements, and I am sure it is the desire of the Secretary-General to see a restoration, not necessarily of the Commission or anything of that kind-that is up to him to decide-but an attempt made to re-establish the position of the Geneva agreements.

The second matter that concerns us is China. I do not intend to speak at length on this matter because I do not want to stress the question of the admission of China here now; but my Government does not believe that by evading issues we enlighten ourselves or the people. Our position with regard to the participation of China in this Organization is well-known. It is a matter of great concern to us and a matter of resentment to our people that a country with whom we have been very good friends, a country which is one of our close neighbours and which has more than 2,500 miles of land frontier with us, with which we have had

no troubles in the past, has taken it upon itself to commit intrusions into our territory and to proclaim that some 40,000 square miles of it belong to them.

We want to make our position clear in this matter. On the one hand, we subscribe to the principles of the Charter and to the set of ideas that were put forward at the African-Asian Conference held at Bandung in 1955 and by our own treaty relations with China based upon what are popularly called the "Five Principles". What is more, we shall strive as hard as we can to reach settlement on every problem by peaceful negotiation. But there are no individuals in India and there is no responsible body of opinion prepared to be intimidated, prepared to take aggression lying down. We cannot negotiate with the Chinese until they vacate the territories which they have occupied. These may be small places, they may be mountaintops, but they are our country. Therefore I say this not only officially but also with the hope that my humble voice will reach the Chinese people, with whom we are good friends: I myself have participated in these matters, and we hope that the friendship of our two great countries, which is necessary for the stability of Asia, will not be jeopardised by thoughtlessness on the one hand or by arrogance on the other, and that China will find it possible to make amends for what it has done, through the withdrawal of every Chinese soldier from our soil-and if they can find any of our soldiers on their soil we shall readily withdraw them.

Regarding those areas where boundaries are not marked by posts or pillars that can be seen, sometimes there may be difficulties arising from one party's going into the territory of the other. We have not violated their space, we have not violated their peace, we have not inflicted violence upon them; and what is more, we have not come and talked to the world, or even to our own people, very loudly, even though things have reached the present stage. The purpose of my saying this, on the hand, is to

point out that we are not a war-minded people and that we believe settlement of all these problems must be achieved by peaceful negotiation. We would equally like the Chinese to know that a peaceful approach does not mean a submissive approach; that our country is not prepared to accept a violation of our frontiers, or, where there is a dispute over conditions established over a hundred years ago at least-and sometimes much more-to allow our territory or our frontiers to be altered by unilateral decisions. It may well be that after we have had negotiations some adjustments will have to be made, but our Prime Minister has made it very clear that there cannot be negotiation on the basis of a prior surrender of territories.

This brings us to the matter of other questions before the Assembly. The first of these is the question of colonial empire. It would be impossible for any delegate from any of the former colonial territories-or indeed, I believe, any Member of the United Nations -to participate in these debates without referring to the colonial problem. We are this year in a position to congratulate ourselves to a certain extent and to feel relieved over the fact that the problem of Cyprus-and I hope the delegation of Greece will not mind my saying that we have always regarded it as a colonial problem-has been solved at least for the time being. It looks as though, as a result of this solution, Cyprus will become an independent nation in 1960. We also would like to lay stress on the fact that it was only through recognition of the nationality of Cyprus and by recognition of the problem as a colonial one that a solution was found. There is no way of suppressing these national aspirations, either by an attempted division of a country or by playing off one Power against another. The problem of Cyprus was solved very largely by the impact of public opinion, channelled through this Assembly.

I would like to express our appreciation to the Government of the United Kingdom as well as to the parties in Cyprus and to Greece

and Turkey, for their recognition of the Cypriot nationality, as a result of which Cyprus is well on the way to becoming a Member of the United Nations.

The United Kingdom can also take credit for the impending independence of the territory of Nigeria, a large portion of colonial Africa which in a few months will become an independent country and, I hope, take her place among us at the next session of the Assembly.

We are also pleased to hear from the new Foreign Minister of the Belgian Government [809th meeting] about the project of the Belgian Government for the establishment of independence for her Congo territories. I am not referring to the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, but to the Belgian Congo, which is several times larger than Belgium itself, and one of the richest parts of Africa. It is not for my Government to express any views as to the kind of constitution they should have, or its content or the character of their independence, but as in all things, we take these matters at face values. We have got a public declaration made with enthusiasm by the representative of Belgium before this Assembly that his Government has, of its own volition and in recondition of the right of peoples and the readiness of the Congolese people to shoulder the responsibility of self-government, decided to establish self-government in this area. We shall therefore look forward not with feelings of doubt and suspicion but with hope and confidence, to seeing the Belgian Congo also take its place among the African territories that have come to freedom through the action of the Assembly.

Our own position with regard to colonial empires is what we remain unrepentant in our opposition to colonialism. We do not think that there are any peoples who should be debarred from self-government, or that there are any particular people who,

regarded as especially competent to govern other people. Therefore our country takes the position that, while we shall take no part in underground revolutions or in exporting revolution, we stand in firm solidarity with all those peoples in Africa, Asia and everywhere else who are fighting for their own national liberation. We recognize that nationalism properly channelled is a great constructive force, and, what is more, that if it is suppressed it is likely to go in other directions, affecting the peace of the world as well as the stability and progress of peoples and territories themselves.

In this connexion we should like to refer to the Non-Self-Governing Territories under Article 73 of the Charter. I have no desire to say anything that might raise a controversy and evoke the right of reply prolonging our proceedings tonight, but I would like to refer to the fact that the United Nations can claim some credit in this matter, because when we started in this business under Article 73, some seventy-four Territories were submitting information. This is an occasion when

what we look forward to is the cessation of this information in a wholesome way. Out of the seventy-four Territories, seven have become independent; fifteen have ceased to send information because those who were responsible for their rule thought they were ready for independence, that they required no further examination by us. There are other Territories on which information is sent, although they come under Article 73 of the Charter. In this connexion one would like to say that if arguments are put forward in order to relieve these territories of the necessity of supplying information, then all the dependent territories would have come under this justification and would not have the benefit of justification in the demanding of their freedom either before this body or anywhere else.

A colonial territory is one where the majority of the population

can make no impact upon the policy of the Government, which is by another country and people, and where economically, socially and otherwise, the majority is exploited. There are large parts of Africa in this condition, and there are small portions of Asia in this condition. The Portuguese representative pointed out here the other day [821st meeting] that Portugal had no colonies, as they were all part of the metropolitan territory. Portugal's reply to the Secretary-General on 8 November 19562 stated that it did not administer any territories that came under Article 73 of the Charter. That Article is very clear on this matter, and we shall discuss it in detail in the Fourth Committee.*

There are 779,000 square miles of Portuguese territory in Africa, apart from other area, and the territory of Portugal, of which the representative of Portugal has spoken of as part of the Portuguese Republic, consists in Europe of the mainland, Madeira and the Azores, which I suppose are an integral part of Portugal. The territory of Portugal in West Africa consists of the Cape Verde Islands, Portuguese Guinea, Sac Tome, Sac Joao Batista de Ajuda, Cabinda and Angola. In East Africa there is Mozambique; in Asia, so-called Portuguese India, Macau; and in Oceania, Portuguese Timor.

These are territories which are not self-governing and which are inhabited by people who make no impact upon the Central Government of the country and which, in a very classic sense, are colonial territories. We request the Portuguese Government to fall into line with other territories, irrespective of any demands or complaints that may have been made, to assist the United Nations in the propagation of the idea that these territories are held in trust for human beings organized into nations or into territorial units in order to establish their national independence.

These territories are known, under article 134 of the Portuguese Constitution as provinces. Article 135 states that the Overseas Provinces, as an integral part of the Portuguese State, are united as between themselves and with metropolitan Portugal. Of course, that is how a colony is united. Prior to 1951, these territories were known as "colonies", but the new terminology of "provinces" was introduced by the amendments of 11 June 1951, that is, after the establishment of the United Nations.

Article 33 refers to "the classic mission" of Portugal to diffuse the benefits of civilization, which suggests the presence of non-self-governing peoples within the meaning of the Charter. What the Charter asks for is a record of this diffusion of the benefits of civilization. If the benefits of civilization are being diffused by educational and social progress, then that information should be sent. There is a limited measure of decentralization and financial autonomy, but the legislative power remains in the hands of the metropolitan National Assembly.

Portuguese citizens alone may vote or stand for election. "Natives" do not have the right unless they meet certain prescribed educational, religious, financial and social standards. Since Portugal regulates these standards, the "natives" who qualify for citizenship are kept in manageable proportions. Out of a population of ten and a half million, only 35,000 people have any citizenship rights at all.

By any reasonable test such as the application of the factors established by General resolution 742 (VI11) it can be established beyond doubt that they are Non-Self-Governing Territories. Moreover, Article 4 of the Portuguese Constitution states that in the international field it recognizes only those limitations which are derived from conventions or treaties freely entered into. The Charter is such a treaty and Article 73

applies.

I have taken care not to bring the Indo-Portuguese question into the present consideration, but merely raise the whole question of colonies as such and I request, I do not demand, the Portuguese Government to provide this information under Article 73.

With regard to colonial territories as a whole, there are twenty colonies under France and twenty under the United Kingdom in each of which during the last few years there have been policies which will lead to self-government. But these colonial areas cover 50 million people under France and 63 million people in the case of the United Kingdom. In each case, they are twenty times as large as the metropolitan countries. My delegation does not suggest in regard to either of these two metropolitan countries that progressive policies are not the rule. If there are violations of them, or complaints about them, they are inherent in the colonial system. We hope, however, that more territories which are dependent, whoever may rule them, will come under Article 73.

I should like to deal for a moment with the position in Africa. To anyone who has spoken about the colonial territories, Africa stands in a category of its own, and my delegation has been delighted to notice that year after year for the last three or four years the Secretary-General has paid special attention to Africa, and the establishment of the Economic Commission for Africa is a great measure of progress about which my Government would like to express its appreciation.

Africa has an area of about 11,250,000 square miles and a population of 193 million people. Out of these, 5 million are Europeans, 600,000 are Asians and the rest are Africans. Of this

total, 103 million are under colonial rule and 6,200,000 square miles of territory are more or less under colonial rule. It is to be noted that this Africa, which is regarded as unfit to govern, which consists colonial territories, supplies a great part of the world's very precious resources. Africa supplies the world with 98 per cent of its diamonds, 94 per cent of its columbite, 84 per cent of its cobalt, 55 per cent of its gold, 41 per cent of its beryllium, 33 per cent of its manganese, 29 per cent of its chrome, 22 per cent of its copper and 13 per cent of its tin. All this comes from what is called the "Dark Continent". Unhappily it is dark only to its own people, it is very much a light to others.

Uranium is Delivered to exist in very large quantities, and there are large deposits of iron ore, manganese and bauxite. Two-thirds of the world's cocoa comes from Africa and three-fifths of its palm oil.

So here territories occupied by small numbers of people compared with the rest of the world, covering a very large area and containing an enormous amount of mineral wealth, which it supplies to the world, territories in which the peoples are strangers in their own country.

This brings me to other part of the colonial empire, which presents another picture -Algeria and West Irian. The Indonesian delegation in its wisdom decided not to request that the question of West Irian be placed on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly. The Government of India considers West Irian as unfinished business, that is, that part of Indonesia which, as is the case of Portuguese Goa, still remains under alien rule. I do not desire to go into the technical and legal questions which have been discussed so many times. Time after time the General Assembly has appealed to the Dutch and Indonesian Governments to

negotiate so that West Irian may be united with the rest of Indonesia and so that the liberation of the former Netherlands colony will be complete.

I would like to say, on behalf of our Government that has very friendly relations with the Netherlands Government, that any policy of this kind would make the Netherlands Government much more appreciated in the Asian continent, establish friendly relations between Europe and Asia, and be a blow to the doctrines of racialism and imperialism which are likely to endanger world peace. A progressive though small country like the Netherlands, with a great technical and industrial capacity which must survive very largely by the help of a clientele from the large populations of the world, in its own interests and, in addition, as a response to the appeal we make, will, we hope, find it possible without any pressures from anywhere else and perhaps of its own volition, to enter into negotiations with the Indonesian Government so that this problem may be solved forever.

Then we come to the question of Algeria. I am going to say very little at this moment because the item is on our agenda and no doubt it will come up later for discussion.

My Government and delegation will support the demand of the Algerian people for full national unity and independence, and in due time for their taking their rightful place as an independent nation in this Assembly. We do not subscribe to the allegations made by one side or the other because we are not in possession of these facts. But to us, it does not signify whether a place is well governed or not so well governed, ill-governed or much worse governed even than it may be. People are entitled to their independence. Colonialism must end even if the colonialism is a benevolent one. Therefore, we shall support the claim of Algeria for independence. We hope that the recent pronouncements made by

General de Gaulle, coupled with the position that under his regime a country like Guinea has been able to become independent may lead to a position where the French Government and the President of the French Republic will find it possible to initiate negotiations with the people who are fighting them. After all, if there is to be peace in Algeria, the first step is a cease-fire, but you cannot negotiate a cease-fire except between people who are engaged in firing. Therefore, the necessity of negotiating logically follows and all the political questions may come afterwards, when negotiations for a cease-fire have begun. There is no use negotiating with a number of Algerians who may be in France or in New York or somewhere else, in order to stop the fighting in the mountains or elsewhere in Algeria. Therefore, direct negotiations with the Algerian National Liberation Front, that is the Government that is in control of a great part of the territory, with a view to finding a way out. I am not here for a moment saying there may not be matters to discuss; we are not prepared to reject out of hand the approach made by the French Government and we certainly do not question their motives. But it is difficult for us to accept as self-determination for Algeria, self-determination in which the whole of France participates. That would be very much like an equality in the sandwich that was sold by a person who was mixing horse flesh with the sandwich. He was asked, "What is all this?". He said, "It is only a fifty-fifty proposition, one chicken to one horse."

Then we come to the Trust Territories. This is a sphere in which the United Nations can congratulate itself, and we are happy to think that Western Samoa, under the very enlightened administration of New Zealand, will now pass on to independence. We should like to pay our tribute to the Visiting Missions, to the New Zealand Government and to the Samoan people who have all co-operated in this development. We hope that there will be no hitches and that in a very short time Samoa will take its place among us as an independent territory and decide the nature of its

own association with New Zealand.

We have Trust Territories of the Cameroons and French Togoland. The Cameroons is being discussed in the Fourth Committee; I do not wish therefore to go into this problems here. We hope that the Territory of Togoland will take its place, in the same way as Ghana, with us next year.

We have another and different kind of problem in regard to South West Africa. South West Africa was a C Mandate under the League of Nations and ought by rights to become a Trust Territory. The World Court has expressed different opinion on certain aspects of the questions referred to it in this matter, but the United Nations has always taken the view that South West Africa ought to come into trusteeship. We hope that the Union Government, in spite of all the positions it has held so far, will recognize sooner rather than later that it is more in harmony with its own position, with the contribution the Union Government has made to the founding of this Organization, with the principles that it, apart from "apartheid," often exposes in this Assembly, to come to some position whereby South West Africa, in the view of the overwhelming majority in the Assembly in accordance with the principles of the Charter and the obligations which it had undertaken in the league Covenant, will come under trusteeship.

There is one other thing I should like to say. As large numbers of Trust Territories become independent, the Trusteeship Council has to do less and less. But the Charter provided for this Trusteeship as a new way of treating colonial Territories. May I take this opportunity to make an appeal on behalf of the Government of India and say that one hopes that the enlightened Administering Powers will now find it possible to place other Territories that are Non-Self-Governing under Trusteeship so that they may become independent very soon. That is what they may

become independent very soon. That is what is provided for in Chapter XII of the Charter, because that would be the best way of proclaiming what they have constantly proclaimed on this platform: that Trusteeship is the intermediate step and an enlightened one provided for by the United Nations and by the League of Nations. We may hope that in this way Territories may be placed voluntarily-nobody can force them-under the provision of the Trusteeship Council.

I should like to take a much briefer time than I would otherwise have done as regards the question of race relations. There are items on the agenda of the Assembly to be discussed on Committees. Therefore, I do not wish to go into this at great length. However, I have to because the Foreign Minister of the Union of South Africa on this rostrum [811th meeting] not only merely made an attempt to defend the policy of the administration in regard to race relations, but he also expounded a policy which he thought should be accepted by the world. Now it is quite true, I entirely agree with him, that there is not a country in the world, including my own, where there is not social discrimination based on race, caste, creed or colour or whatever it may be. There is not a country in the world which can say, "we are free from this". But equally, there is not a country in the world except the Union of South Africa which is not trying to get away from it. The difference between the "apartheidists" and the others is that the latter recognize it is evil and recognize their weakness and error in that they are still tolerating it. But in the other case it is out to us as a kind of historical pattern of Africa that must be followed. In support of this, we are told that the Dutch went to South Africa before the Bantus. But who went there before the Bantus: the Hottentots and the Bushmen? They are also human beings. If the Union Government is prepared to bring the Hottentots and the Bushmen to self-government, that would be even greater contribution.

So I do not think there is any use going into the history of who came there first and who did not. My Government has not, and I hope never will, argued that people should be returned out of Africa because of their racial origins. We regard these territories as multiracial societies where many races must co-exist. That would be so in the case of Algeria, that would be so in the case of South Africa, and in other cases too. So when the Foreign Minister of the Union of South Africa tells us "we are today strangers in the lands of our immigrant forefathers" and that the United Nations wants to turn them out, it is not historically or politically correct. No one has suggested that "apartheid" in reverse should be practised. What we have said is that there is nothing scientific or defensible on any grounds in racial discrimination. Indeed, UNESCO appointed a committee to examine race problems. it produced a report.³ I am not going to quote from that report as I do not have the time. The Committee examined this question in great scientific detail, the question whether there is a scientific basis for racial discrimination. The Committee came to the conclusion, on scientific grounds, that there are no reasons whatsoever for the practices that obtain politically, socially or otherwise. If I may, I will commend this scientific investigation to the notice of the South African Government.

We stand fully opposed to the whole doctrine of "apartheid". If the Foreign Minister of the Government of the Union of South Africa tells us: "What is there to complain about, we are going to have a white Africa and a non-white Africa," then we say that is not the whole story. If there was a white Africa and a non-white Africa and if the former stepped out of non-white Africa there might be something to be said for it. But a white Africa and non-white Africa are to be under white Africa. Therefore, "apartheid" only goes to a certain extent. It is not a complete "apartheid". I am not supporting it even if it were to be so. Therefore, the argument that is put before us in defense of "apartheid" is a position totally contrary to the principles of

the Charter, totally contrary to the investigations made in the scientific field, totally contrary to the sense of human dignity and, what is more, is a position that is likely to lead to racial conflict in Africa of a character which can only be inferred by people if they would just look at the numerals: 193 million people as against 5 million. That is the hard logical fact to be faced when the time comes. What is more, the industrial development of Africa, all that I have spoken about a few moments ago is not possible without the manpower of its populations. If they are good enough to produce wealth, they are good enough to enjoy political power.

I propose, in view of the time, to deal with economic development problems in Committee. The most outstanding experience of Our time has been the visits of great personalities as between their respective countries. If I may say so, it began with the so-called "iron curtain"-a word not permitted to be used in correspondence or otherwise by the Government of India-and we think its abandonment will be a small contribution to the lowering of tensions, just as the abandonment will be a small contribution to the lowering of tensions, just as the abandonment of the words "running dogs of imperialism" would be in the other side.

The first of these visits started when Mr. Bulganin, then Prime Minister, and Mr. Khrushchev visited India three or four years ago. Later followed the visit of our Prime Minister to the USSR, and then that of Mr. Khrushchev to the United Kingdom and then that of the British Prime Minister to the Soviet Union. The United States Vice- President went to the Soviet Union, and later the Soviet Prime Minister visited the United States.

In as far as it merely concerns Soviet-United States relations, it would not be my place to comment upon them, but there are world problems involved in the matter. We have at all times

stated that we believe in direct talks between the United States and the Soviet Union. As early as 1952, speaking before this Assembly, my delegation said that there are two great Powers in the world. The peace of the world depends upon them and we would subscribe to any proposal to have direct negotiations between them. There is no dignity, no face-saving, involved in this matter. The only way that the problems of this world can be settled is by direct negotiation between countries who are so powerful, who are so strong and who have the capacity to make decisions.

I will not quote the statements. There are statements made year after year from 1952 to 1957 where we have made appeals in this Assembly for direct talks between the Soviet Government and the United States Government. It is not for us to speculate about what has happened between these heads of State. But there is no doubt that we all recognize that when they see each other face to face, one thinks that the other fellow is not so bad as he thought he was. At least it does that much good.

But this has been a political visit and, so far as the United Nations is concerned, it is very important for the statement made by the Soviet Premier before this Assembly [799th meeting], followed by observations by other delegations subsequently. The Soviet Premier's statement, to the mind of my delegation, falls into two distinct parts. One is a proposal for disarmament which belongs to the same category as the discussions that have gone on here for what is called the balanced reduction, limitation and so on of armaments. The other is an entirely different proposal-for a warless world, the kind of thing that a Government like ours, which has not the economic or political power or the power to influence has constantly appealed for-that is, disarmament alone cannot bring about peace or settlement in our world; we must have a situation where war is outlawed.

We regard the proposals put forward as proposals not of a visionary character, as they are called, but as reflecting vision. My Prime Minister, when he heard of this, said:

"It seems to me as a proposal, a brave proposal which deserves every consideration. Whether humanity, that is various countries concerned, is brave enough to put an end suddenly to armies, navies and air forces, I do not know. But the time will come, will have to come, when something of this kind will have to be adopted because in this era of atomic and hydrogen weapons and ballistic missiles, war has become an anachronism."

Therefore we were happy when the General Committee, without any dissenting voice, admitted the item put forward by the Soviet Union with regard to general and complete disarmament [A/4218]. On the face of it, it may look like the same item put down by two different parties, but we think that the two different propositions are: one the balanced reduction of armaments and the other the abandonment of war as a manner of settling disputes; and what is more, the community of the world is established society where force has a municipal character and a municipal character must necessarily, as a corollary, come under world law. Therefore, this is the first great movement towards a world State or towards the congeries of people who are characterised by so many differences. We make no reservation for ourselves in subscribing to this objective. It is not an objective which means something that will not happen now, but something which we hope we will work for and, for that reason, speed up the course of disarmament.

We are happy to think that the Secretary of State for the United

States also supported this, saying:

"... it did echo sentiments that are very widely held, that, if it were practicable and if it could safely be done, the type of disarmament that Mr. Khrushchev has spoken about is a highly desirable thing for mankind. From that point of view it must be taken very seriously."4

Members of the Assembly will be aware that it is not always that the Soviet Union says of the United States or the United States says of the Soviet Union that the other party "must be taken seriously". From the West German Defence Minister also comes a similar statement when he says that the proposal was a wonderful, excellent idea and that he shares the opinion of Mr. Khrushchev.

The Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom told us that [798th meeting] it was important to make a fresh start with disarmament. Similarly, other countries in uncommitted area like Burma, Yugoslavia, my own country and Afghanistan welcome it, especially in under-developed areas, not merely because of its economic consequences, but because we do not see a world surviving in the context of modern war where it is possible to annihilate not only vast populations but even kill the character of the populations, if any did survive, for the future with all the genetic consequences of an atomic war. Therefore, my delegation will support the priority consideration being given to the discussion of the item.

We shall also approach it from the point of view of a warless world with all its implications. At the rate that the world is going, we do not share the view that, because a four-year period has been set, it is impractical. On 4 October 1957, the first

Russian "sputnik" went up, followed by so many United States bodies of the same kind. Two years later, another of these things went round the moon. We did not think in 1957 that these great things could happen so soon. Indeed, we are moving in the world of scientific advances as from 4 October 1957, in a manner, as my Prime Minister once said, which makes the Atomic Age look like the Stone Age.

The progress of the world cannot be measured merely in the terms of the calendar. Einstein quite rightly in his relativity dissertations points out that time is event, so we may say that events must measure time. Time by the clock is not always what calculates or what conditions the consciousness of human beings, nor must it be the ruling factor in this matter.

On the other hand, the Soviet Prime Minister or those who have followed him have not ruled out the other problems, namely the immediate problems for limitation of armaments, My Government stands fully committed and publicly proclaims the view that there cannot be any limitation by agreement except with control. We have never been able to understand this argument about which comes first, the chicken or the egg. You cannot have control without disarmament or disarmament without control. We think the plans on this should be simultaneously developed so that when the agreement to disarm is reached the control machinery will have been agreed to, and the control apparatus should also be agreed upon in the same way. We are glad to think that both in the East and the West, so-called, there have been advances in the consideration of the problems of control and the problems of surprise attack, and we are also told that there may be some agreement in regard to outer space. In this connexion, may I say that time after time less significant delegations like ours have put forward suggestions in this way which have not found favour so far as the votes, to which

reference was made, are concerned. Some years ago, the United Nations rejected. believe by 3c, votes to 22. or something of the kind. the proposal 5 made by The delegation of India that technical examination of the methods of controlling nuclear explosions would be the way out. But we had the pleasure of hearing the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom say a few days ago [798th meeting] that this had been put forward by him - not in terms the proposal we put forward by him -not in terms the proposal we put forward, but at any rate the idea the use of technical criteria for this purpose-and therefore they had reached agreement.

We have asked for a long time, from the year 1949, for an armaments truce, and also the secretariat to start what they call the blueprint for a disarmament treaty so that the arguments would be in regard to particular details and merely to phrase juxtaposition.

I would not like to leave this rostrum without referring to two other matters. One is in regard to the Suez Canal. I refer to the Suez canal not because something I say will make a difference in this problem, but because, as I have said repeatedly, the problem is not the Suez Canal, it is something else. I do not intend to tread where angels fear to do so, but I would like to point out the position of my Government in this matter.

Two or three years ago, when the question of the Suez Canal came here and the attack on Egypt by three countries took place, the United Nations intervened and there was all the argument about this problem also. We have always said that the right of free navigation under the 1888 Constantinople Convention must be accepted by parties. We have never moved away from that position and we were completely in favour of the development of the instrument that was deposited with the Secretary-General by the

Government of Egypt.

We therefore think that this problem is fully covered and pursuant to the principles laid down in the 1888 Constantinople Convention, paragraph 7 of which states:

"(a)... The Suez Canal Authority, by the terms of its Charter, can in no case grant any vessel, company or other party, any advantage or favour not accorded to other vessels, companies or parties on the same conditions. "

(b) Complaints of discrimination or violation of the Canal Code shall be sought to be resolved by the complaining party by reference to the Suez Canal Authority. In the event that such a reference does not resolve the complaint, the matter may be referred, at the option of the complaining party or the Authority, to an arbitration tribunal composed of one nominee of the complaining party, one of the Authority and a third to be chosen by both. In case of disagreement, such third member will be chosen by the President of the International Court of Justice upon the application of either party. "

(c) The decisions of the arbitration tribunal shall be made by a majority of its members. The decisions shall be binding upon the parties when they are rendered and they must be carried out in good faith ... "6

Soon afterwards, in order to set all doubts at rest, we are glad to note that the following declaration also was transmitted to the Secretary-General on 18 July 1957:

"I, Mahmoud Fawzi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Egypt, declare on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Egypt, that, in accordance with article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice and in pursuance and for the purposes of paragraph 9 (b) of the Declaration of the Government of the Republic of Egypt dated 24 April 1957 on the Suez Canal and the arrangements for its operation, the Government of the Republic of Egypt accept as compulsory ipso facto, on condition of reciprocity and without special agreement, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes that may arise under the said paragraph 9 (b) of the above Declaration ... "7

So that as far as we are concerned, if there is a violation of any legal rights, intra- national or international, they are today justifiable. Therefore, if the existing situation is something that militates against the interests of the parties concerned, or of international behaviour, I think that we should follow the advice of the Secretary- General and evoke the operation of the Court.

I have to race through the last part of my Statement. I express the support of my Government in regard to what may be called the warless world plan which was put forward by the Soviet Prime Minister, a plan which is the same as we have spoken about the outlawing of war. But we think that side by side with it must come other matters.

Mr. Khrushchev referred to the fact that \$100,000 million was spent in the making of armaments and that if this money was saved, it would go towards the development of the world as a whole. I have not the time nor the facts before me to detail

these matters to you. Not only do we have hope, but we must work for a warless world, a world without war. A world community would thus be established. At the present juncture it has been placed in the context of measurable time.

There then arises a new situation. Today in this world we have 2,800 million people. Whatever may be your personal views on this matter, at the end of this century there will be 5,200 million people in this world. We are increasing at the rate of sixty million a year. And arising from this, my delegation would like to put to the Assembly the fact that the Secretariat should be charged with producing the blueprints of what may be called "a world plan of development". It is not only a question of the Special Fund or the technical aid, or this or that other thing, but how we are going to subsist in this world with 5,000 million people, where, on the one hand, the per capita income of a prosperous country is somewhere about \$1800 per head, while in other places it is \$58 per head, while there are large pockets of unemployment, while there is the position that industrially and socially some are backward, and where there is the problem of feeding these vast populations. A world of peace cannot be a world of imbalance. A world of imbalance would be a world that is not at peace.

My delegation would submit for the consideration of the Secretariat that they produce the blueprints of a world plan, which should be the main concern of the Second Committee from next year onwards. It should not be a question of tinkering with this or that, but it should be recognized that the \$100,000 million that would be saved would not go to the production of consumer goods which would find their place in the under-developed areas. No under-developed country is prepared to take imperialism in reverse. It should not be forgotten that when the making of armaments in the present armed world has stopped and the producers who are now consuming the \$100,000 million in one

way or another turn to peaceful occupation, the under-developed world at the same time is also producing goods.

It is not now as in the nineteenth century where some people were hewers of wood and drawers of water and some people produced raw materials and other people produced finished goods. In the position will be that there will be a large quantity of production; Equally, there will be large populations. The problem of a balance between communities and social developments, will become the world problem, especially in a warless world, because at the present moment suspicions and fears divert the attention of people away from these problems.

This cannot be solved either by loan schemes or by charity schemes. They can only be solved in the context of a co-operative world where each party, big or small, poor or rich, makes his own contribution, where the world is taken as one picture, where there are no communities outside world law and outside the United Nations, where production has to match the requirements of the community and the conception, as regards under-developed countries, of profit-making loans, would be regarded as an anachronism. The under-developed country that at the present moment may feel very much heartened by the taking of a loan from a developed country has to carry in the years to come all the servicing of those loans and mortgage its future in that way.

It is not a question merely of technical assistance as we knew it before, but of a world plan, and the Secretariat, in the first instance, may well produce working papers so that we could side by side, as a corollary of a disarmed world, proceed in this way. Therefore, it is not as though we do not have the problem before us. The problem has been brought nearer by the picture of a warless world that is put to us at the present time. I would therefore submit to the General Assembly that this would be one

of the tasks that we could undertake. But we could not approach any of these problems if we approach them from the point of view of suspicion, from the point of view of "well, it is a vision of the future."

There is a difference between visions of the future and just being visionary. There is a difference between schemes on the one hand and dreams on the other. A world that is as largely populated as ours is likely to be, where there are populations of different types of development, can only be tackled from the point of view of world planning. With our minds on considerations of outer space, the time is fast coming when there will be the reverse of what I am told is the theological doctrine that the ills of this world are solved in heaven. Very soon the time will come when the troubles of heaven will have to be solved in this world, because the quarrels between the different countries using space for one thing or the other has to be settled terrestrially.

Therefore, this world reveals itself to us as the small planet that it is. It will take its place in the perspective of creation, and we hope that this economic aspect which we have now begun to tackle by way of SUNFED, the Special Fund, the International Development Association, bilateral loans, and so on, becomes a vast human concern, a project that arises from the principles of the Charter, from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and our conception of a warless world, and things of that kind.

But for all this, the approach to this matter has to be one where the ends and the means are not separated much one from the other. We could not move toward these projects without faith, and that faith cannot just merely be an idle hope that something would happen. It might be the realization of the truth as we have faith

in the destiny of humanity.

As we said at San Francisco, our people and our Government believe disarmament only as a means to an end. It is a means that shares the character of its end, as all means should do. But in the next decade disarmament alone will not be enough. Therefore we ought to address ourselves in the next decade to our main purpose, and if we have said it once we are prepared to say it one hundred times if necessary; there is only one way before the world, and that is for nations to renounce war as an instrument of policy. This Organization now has to address itself, as a longer-term object, to the idea of renouncing war as an instrument of national policy. Disarmament or limitation of armaments is a good thing; it is an advance on present conditions; but it is not the establishment of peace. We can establish peace only when the nations have decided to abandon war.

This will be possible, when these weapons of mass destruction and of terror are eliminated, once confidence is established and once it is possible for us in this Assembly, for example, to say, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, that errors of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat them. If we are able to trust to reason and not to passion, it will be possible to do this.

Let us therefore realize that, in the face of these great problems, it is our business to listen to the voice of destiny. History is replete with examples of the truth that the solution of problems by means that are contrary to ends always results in tragedy. That was the fate of the Congress of Vienna. That was the fate of League of Nations. One cannot reconcile great dreams with narrow schemes. If we are going in pursuit of an ideal, then we should not be obsessed by the thought of the poet who, in the

mid-war years, reflected the temper of that period of great despondency and cynicism when he said: "In this great hour of destiny they stand, each with disputes, jealousies and sorrows." But instead we should say, like the bard who belonged to the age of the Renaissance and of constructive endeavour, that "we must take the current when it serves, or lose our ventures."

Our ventures today are the ventures of peace—a world that is rid of war, a planned world from the economic and social point of view, and, what is more, not lost in idle dreams but inspired by lofty and realistic vision, harnessed to constructive endeavour by the Organization that is ours, by the ideals that are contained in the Charter. Our ventures—the venture of peace, the venture of world community — we dare not lose. This is our charge and our obligation.

1. A Tale of Two Cities, book 1, chap. 1. 2. See Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Annexes, agenda item 34, document A.C.4/331. [The speaker then read the first paragraph and sub paragraph e, of Article 73 of the Charter.] 3. UNESCO: The Race Concept (Paris, UNESCO, 1952). 4 From a speech of Mr. Herter, reproduced in The New York Time & 23 September 1959. 5. See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twelfth Session, Annexes, agenda item 24, document A/C. i/L. 1 76/Rev. 4. 6. See Official Records of the Security Council, Twelfth Year, Supplement for April May and June 1957, document S/3818. 7. Ibid., Supplement for July, August and September 1957, document S/381 8/Add.1.