8th Session

448th Plenary Meeting, 28th September,1953

by MR. V.K. KRISHNA MENON

It is my happy privilege to offer Mrs. Pandit the felicitations of our delegation and our country on this happy occasion when she is presiding over the deliberations of this Assembly during this year. While we are sad that we should be deprived of her wise guidance and counsel from within the ranks of our delegation, we are happy that she has been offered this greater opportunity of service to the world community. It is a tribute that this Assembly has paid to her person, to our country and to the womanhood of India and of the world in general. The Assembly stands to profit by her wise guidance and by her genial personality.

I should also like to take this opportunity of expressing our appreciation of her immediate predecessor, a world statesman of quality whose friendliness, objectivity of judgment and genial capacity to reconcile points of view in private conversation have contributed greatly to the progress of international affairs during his tenure of office.

I would not want to conclude these introductory observations without making a similar brief reference to our new Secretary-General-not really so new, but still new. He has already brought into the precincts of this building and into the context of our work the impact of his personality, and we owe him a great deal in respect of the re-creation and recovery of confidence in and within the Secretariat, and of a new atmosphere wherein the Secretary-General is making contributions to implementations of the Charter in the realm of administrative politics. We shall

greatly look forward to his taking his place as the first public servant in the world.

After these few observations I shall now address myself to the thought that is uppermost in the minds of all in this Assembly-the problem which overshadows every discussion-on which all our other problems centre, and the solution of which-that is to say, the beginning of the solution of which-is essential if we are to see daylight at all in the affairs of mankind. I refer to what is popularly called "the tension that prevails". One need make no apologies for prefacing these observations with a reference to world tension. We are today in the eighth year of this Assembly, very nearly ten years after the conclusion of the Second World War and very nearly twelve years after January 1942 when the United Nations was first planned and born soon after the Atlantic Charter. The great hopes that were cherished at that time and the purpose for the implementation of which this Organization was founded are far from the realm of achievement. That is not to say that we have not made great progress, not only in the political field arisen in consequence of such conflict, are part of the remedy to overcome tension.

It is therefore quite apparent-from these statements and from the situation with which we are faced today-that the remedies which have been sought, the institutions which have been created, the approaches which have been made, whether or not they were intended to lead in the direction I have referred to and described, have certainly not had that desired effect. What conclusion must we draw from this fact? Making use of our experience, drawing inspiration from wherever we may find it, we must make further and other efforts.

It is true that, in implementing any attitude of that kind, the past very largely dominates us. There are fears and suspicions,

the thought that proclamations may prove to be deficient in content while full enough in words, the idea that willingness to negotiate might be construed as fear or weakness. All of these things still dominate us and stand in the way of the reconciliation of nations. Our task, however, remains unchanged. That task is to resolve tensions in order that the United Nations may become what it was intended to be, in order that it should not take the path of its predecessors of the nineteenth century. Breaking with the past is part of the task now before us.

Some contributions to this effort have already been made by the leaders of the great nations of the world.

On 15 March, the Chief of State of the Soviet Union, Mr. George Malenkov, stated: "In the present and in the future, there do not and will not exist troublesome and unsolved questions that cannot be resolved by peaceful means. Any country, including the United States, can be assured of the firm policy of peace of the Soviet Union."

That statement was followed, chronologically speaking, by the declaration made on 16 April by the President of the United States:

"None of these issues, great or small, is insoluble given only the will to respect the rights of all nations."

Then, on 8 August, Mr. Malenkov said:

"We firmly maintain that at the present moment there is no

disputable or outstanding issue that cannot be settled in a peaceful way on the basis of mutual agreement between the countries concerned. This refers also to those issues under dispute that exist between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We stood and stand for a peaceful co-existence of the two systems."

It is easy enough to argue that these are mere words, without content. What I have quoted, however, are the statements of heads of powerful States, and there is no need for them to make use of words unless those words have a social purpose. It is our business in this stricken world-and this applies particularly to those of us who are not riveted to great Power blocs-to see in such words the hopes of a future settlement. In so saying I come to the main purpose of these observations.

The time has come when it is necessary for us to move away, perhaps, from the lines of action that have been followed by the great Powers. Of course the responsibility really lies upon the shoulders of the great Powers. There can be no real settlement of world problems except by agreement between the great Powers which alone have the material strength and in whose hands largely lies the power of decision. Hence, we should like to submit to the Assembly, at the appropriate moment, that it is necessary for the heads of these States-or whoever speaks for them at the highest level-to meet together in the context of an informal gathering, the kind of gathering that made possible the emergence of this very body. There were no rules of procedure when the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and the President of the United States met somewhere in mid- Atlantic and drafted the Atlantic Charter, which became the basis of the United Nations. There were many of us who thought at the time~that the Atlantic charter was very largely verbiage; it was and is possible to construe it in that way, because almost everything that humanity wants can be found within the pages of the Atlantic Charter. But there is no

one today who will deny that, vague-perhaps eclectic-as those words were, they formed the basis of this great Organization, and that the formulation of those thoughts and ideas and the fact that they became the basis of a world charter were possible only because there was a meeting of minds outside the context of procedure, outside the context of technicalities, outside the context of preparatory material which can always cause one to become bogged down in details. In this Organization we are in serious danger of not seeing the wood for the trees.

In this connexion I should also like to quote from a telegram which the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom sent to Stalin in 1945, and which he read to the House of Commons on 11 May, 1953:

"There is not much comfort in looking into a future where you and the countries you dominate, plus the Communist Parties in many other States, are all drawn up on one side, and those who rally to the English-speaking nations and their associates or Dominions are on the other. It is quite obvious that their quarrel would tear the world to pieces, and that all of us leading men on either side who had anything to do with that would be shamed before history. Even embarking on a long period of suspicions, of abuse and counter-abuse, and of opposing policies would be a disaster hampering the great developments of world prosperity for the masses which are attainable only by our trinity. I hope there is no word or phrase in this outpouring of my heart to you which unwittingly gives offence. If so, let me know. But do not, I beg you my friend Stalin, underrate the divergencies which are opening about matters which you may think are small to us but which are symbolic of the way the English-speaking democracies look at life."

The substance of that telegram is this: some of our difficulties were foreseen at the end of the war. At the same time, the

statesmen who helped to found the United Nations at a time when war was still raging envisaged the joining in it of people who were then enemies. It is that spirit which we must try to recapture. If we cannot recapture it, we must at least learn through that experience that, despite the difficulties which we face, we must make the effort. There must be a meeting of the people who have the responsibility, of the people who have the effective power in their hands, of the people who, in the words of Sir Winston Churchill, would stand "shamed before history" if they did not render by performance what was expected of them.

I would therefore once again quote the words of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. On 11 May this year, speaking before the House of Commons, he said:

"I feel exactly the same about it today.

"I must make it plain that, in spite of all the uncertainties and confusion in which world affairs are plunged, I believe that a conference on the highest level should take place between the leading Powers without long delay. This conference should not be overhung by a ponderous or rigid agenda, or led into mazes and jungles of technical details, zealously contested by hordes of experts and officials drawn up in vast cumbrous array. The conference should be confined to the smallest number of Powers and persons possible. It should meet with a measure of informality and a still greater measure of privacy and seclusion. It might well be that no hard-and-fast agreements would be reached, but there might be a general feeling among those gathered together that they might do something better than tear the human race, including themselves, into bits.

"For instance, they might be attracted, as President Eisenhower has shown himself to be, and as Pravda does not challenge, by the idea of letting the weary toiling masses of mankind enter upon the best spell of good fortune, fair play, well-being, leisure and harmless happiness that has ever been within their reach or even within their dreams.

"I only say that this might happen, and I do not see why anyone should be frightened at having a try for it. If there is not at the summit of the nations the will to win the greatest prize and the greatest honour ever offered to mankind, doom-laden responsibility will fall upon those who now possess the power to decide. At the worst the participants in the meeting would have established more intimate contacts. At the best we might have a generation of peace."

This proposal by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom was applauded and supported by the Prime Minister of India, who said, three days after it was made:

"I am very glad that the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom has recently suggested a conference on the highest level between the leading Powers of the world, to meet informally, in privacy and without a rigid agenda, to tackle the problems that afflict mankind and to make every effort to rid humanity of the fear of war. I would earnestly commend this suggestion. The stakes are the highest that the world offers, and a war-weary and fear-laden humanity will bless those who will rid it of these terrible burdens and lead it to peace and happiness."

This was followed, even more recently, by the Premier of the USSR, who said:

"In our days, the government of any country, if it seriously cares for the fate of its people, is obliged to take measures to promote in actual fact the settlement of controversial international questions. No small part, of course, can be played by talks among the great Powers. Naturally, for this, suitable pre-requisites must be created."

So that this idea, which did not come out of one brain but is what humanity cries for, is a thing which the great leaders of the world, the heads of nations with power in their hands, could, without being over-burdened by detail, bring to the discussion of peace and, by means of it, reach a solution of our present difficulties. And, as it has been rightly pointed out, even if any important result does not emerge in the way of a formula, still, not only can there be no harm, but it would perhaps help to clear the air to a considerable extent even in the immediate context of the situation in regard to Germany and Korea.

Nothing could be more desirable than that the heads of the four great Powers should meet and hammer out some sort of approach to the problem. My delegation, if it finds that the renewal of this idea-at this time and here-receives sufficient response from the General Assembly, will propose that the Assembly make a request of this kind to those Powers concerned, so that there can be no feeling whether it is that one or the other who is initiating it. As I have pointed out in these extracts, each one concerned has not only not opposed the idea, but endorsed it.

There are precedents, and remarkable precedents, to show that meetings of this kind are the way to resolve the difficulties that we face at present. It is not the intention of my delegation to propose before this plenary meeting of the Assembly any

resolution of this character. We put this forward as an idea so that, at the appropriate time in committee, it may be possible for us to consider collectively whether it may not be the wisest thing to do in present conditions. For the Assembly, with all the weight of public opinion, representing sixty nations of the world-a great many of them without the power to make these decisions, but to make only their own contributions-may make an appeal in that direction if only so that the heads of these great States concerned may have the feeling that they have behind them the voice of humanity as articulated in the General Assembly.

There may be those who will argue that these problems before us are so complex that a meeting of the kind proposed is no remedy alone and that there are no magical remedies. We subscribe to that but we say that the situation we face is such that no way should be left unexplored. It is necessary for us to approach the problem of tension from the point of view of detail, from the point of view of particular issues, such as Korea, Germany, Austria, or disarmament, or anything else; equally is it necessary for us to attain some release and relaxation in regard to the supervening pervading factor which stifles our thinking and the adoption of any measures. While one cannot talk in terms of priority of time, this matter must certainly engage the priority of attention. It does not mean that any other schematic devices we may have, any other technical solution which we may be attempting, have to be put on one side. This proposal does not supersede anything, but is one of those things that will perhaps restore confidence to stricken humanity. Its main consequences will be that world public opinion will begin to join more effectively in support of the idea of concrete attempts towards peace, that peoples will gain greater confidence in the United Nations itself, and that they will work more ardently, and a greater sense of the responsibility of and faith in their leaders will be created.

I will restate, however, the view of the Government of India as expressed by the Prime Minister: it is that this should not only be a conference where there is no inhibition because of detail, but that it should also be a conference not of sections, not of a group of like-minded Powers making up their minds beforehand in order to bargain with Powers of unlike minds but-to use a word which I am afraid will create another contest-a round-table meeting, that is to say, a palaver, a discussion, a conference in the real sense of the term. So far as we are concerned, when we speak of this high-level conference we mean a meeting of those who are most likely to bring about or help a solution; a meeting which will not exclude those who differ, but will attempt to bring together those who now differ, where both sides would make up their minds beforehand not to adopt a priori attitudes which would bar the way to peace. We regard this as the most immediate step. We recognize its limitations; we recognize that it arouses hopes. But without hope there can be no action, especially in times like these. Therefore this is the first proposal to which we seek to draw attention, and which we hope we shall, in due course, bring before the Assembly. Side by side with this other steps will become necessary.

While tension is the all-pervading factor that rules us, its "dread arm" is rearmament. As the representative of Iceland pointed out [444th meeting], arms are piled upon arms -for what purpose? The energy of the world is, to a great extent, concentrated in the building up of defences. Most certainly a situation exists in which the world is divided into two armed camps. We recognize that the Disarmament Commission has been sitting for a long time; we recognize the progress that has been made in regard to its work. Speaking on behalf of my delegation last autumn, in the First Committee, on the resolution on disarmament, I pointed out that advances had been made and that it would be a mistake to be cynical about those advances; the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Canada and others had come together on such issues as

simultaneity and the continuation of the Disarmament Commission itself. Nevertheless, technical problems still remain and we are still faced with this question of what takes place first: whether you count the arms and then disarm, or disarm first, and soon.

The General Assembly is familiar with these problems, but we have this year in the autumn of 1953, reached a position in which, from either side, we hear expressions which must create not only awe in our minds, but the realization that a newer phase of the already ominous situation has developed.

Listen, for example, to the words of Mr. Casey, the distinguished representative of Australia, who said [436th meeting]:

"We must face, before very long, a situation in which both sides will have reached saturation point in the possession of atomic weapons, saturation point being the point at which both sides possess a sufficient quantity of bombs to destroy all the major defences of the other side. The approach to this saturation point makes international agreements for control, through an effective system of inspection of manufacture of atomic weapons, not only urgent but imperative. It is something to which the great Powers which possess these weapons must set their minds if the world is not to be destroyed by itself. They must realize the deep anxiety of all the peoples of the world that the ever-present fear of complete destruction should be removed.

"Apart from the direct destructive effect of atomic bombs-and more so of hydrogen bombs-the poisoning effect on the world's atmosphere of the explosion of these weapons must be taken into account. It might well be that all the population of very large areas of the world would be killed by atmospheric poisoning, by

the explosion of any considerable number of these dreadful weapons."

That is the unhappy prospect which our great technical skill has produced before us, but the statement of Mr. Casey arouses new thoughts in us that a further attempt, which is complementary and will perhaps assist in the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission, must now be made.

The representative of Iceland, speaking on disarmament, said [444th meeting]:

"One of the most important items before us, or, more correctly, the most important question, is disarmament. Again, we must admit this has been treated in all previous sessions. Or, rather, no treatment has been found possible since 1946, when the ice-cold winds of the cold war began blowing. No result has been reached. Resolutions have, however, been passed-a whole bunch of often high-sounding resolutions. Some of them-those which were naive enough-have even gained unanimity: 60 votes in favour, none against. And speeches and words have flowed year after year. All kinds of words-friendly words, warning words, angry words-have flowed. To no avail. The production of armaments has flowed, too-incessantly and ever increasingly; all kinds of armaments, from small ammunition to the most destructive weapons-those intended for individual killing, for mass murder, for wholesale slaughter, to the point of the complete destruction and extinction of huge areas of land and human life. All kinds and all sizes of ammunition are available, to suit any place and any congregation of human beings.

"And who wants this? The United Nations was founded 'to save

succeeding generations from the scourge of war'."

If I may interpolate here, I think we should always say to ourselves: "The United Nations was founded 'to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war'." Unless we are prepared to subscribe to the doctrine that the more arms, the more peace we should seek to reduce and scrap arms and take such other steps as must be taken.

The representative of Iceland went on to ask:

"What has it done to slow or call off the armaments race? Nothing. It has proved to be entirely unable and impotent to do anything in this vital matter. No wonder some people talk about the United Nations as merely a debating club ... And what will happen if armaments production should reach which the distinguished Foreign Minister of Australia called the saturation point?"

And then comes the ominous thought: "When the toys pile up, does not the child want to play with them?"

These are statements, not by what are called the great Powers, but of people from far away in the Pacific and from Iceland, a country which is not identified with any of the great Power blocs, and genuinely seeking the reconciliation of all points of view.

We have also another statement, which comes from Mr. Dulles

himself. Mr. Dulles stated [434th meeting]:

"Physical scientists have now found means which, if they are developed, can wipe life off the surface of this planet. Those words that I speak are words that can be taken literally. It is, indeed, a destructive power inherent in matter which must be controlled by the idealism of man's spirit and the wisdom of his mind. They alone stand between us and a lifeless planet. There are plenty of problems in the world, many of them interconnected. But there is no problem which compares with this central, universal problem of saving the human race from extinction."

Therefore, I think it is useful for us to remember that what we are faced with today is not merely the adjustment of some minor difficulty, of saving the face of one nation or another, but really of saving humanity from total destruction.

Referring to the armament race, the President of the United States said on 16 April 1953:

"The best would be this: a life of perpetual fear and tension; a burden of arms draining the wealth and the labour of all peoples; a wasting of strength that defies the American system or the Soviet system or any system to achieve true abundance and happiness for the peoples of this earth. Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies in the final sense a theft from those who are hungry and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its labourers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children."

My own Prime Minister, in his speech of 18 September, said:

"In fact, if, by any manner of means, it could be laid down that the atomic and hydrogen bombs are not going to be used anyhow, that itself would bring tremendous relief to the world."

It is on the basis of this last statement which I have just read that I want to suggest to the General Assembly that the time has come when we must think in the terms of "if, by any manner of means, it could be laid down that the atomic and hydrogen bombs are not going to be used anyhow" and "that itself would bring tremendous relief to the world." The time has come for the General Assembly to declare itself in favour of the non-use of these weapons of mass destruction, that this release of material energy discovered by the genius of man shall be used only for industrial and constructive purposes. Therefore, in the course of the proceedings of this General Assembly, and without any prejudice to the work of the Disarmament Commission, without any claim that we would thereby be solving the problem, we should make and appeal to the great Powers to subscribe to a declaration on the non-use of these~weapons for destructive purposes, which they should immediately follow up by the work of the Disarmament Commission in that direction.

I want to make it quite clear that we are not in any way simplifying the issue or taking a very elementary view of it in thinking that a mere form of words would solve anything, but it would certainly bring an attitude of the non-use of these weapons. What is more, it would make people begin to realize that with the use of such weapons it would be not only the enemy that would be destroyed, but that the whole of humanity would stand in the face of destruction, and that coupled with these beautiful bombs are other weapons which have introduced in modern warfare the medieval methods of torture by burning people slowly in order

to annihilate the enemy. There are such things as the napalm bomb and various other weapons and inventions, by means of which human beings are gradually tortured and burned to death. These instruments could be banned or, at any rate, a declaration could be made to this end. Some people might call it a pious declaration, but even that would be the beginning of an approach of a different and wholesome character.

Here, again, we are not without precedents in this matter. There are, for example, the conventions relating to gas or bacterial warfare. The prohibition of, or rather the agreement not to use, chemical warfare goes back towards the time of the First World War, when an amount of gas was used. The convention which came after the war proved a deterrent to the use of gas.

It may be that the appeal made by the General Assembly, this proclamation of its will, of the conscience of humanity, may lead to the formulation of a convention for the abandonment of these weapons as instruments of war.

I do not for a moment say that an agreement, even if it be an effective agreement, for the non-use of atomic weapons or other weapons would by itself be disarmament. I suppose that destruction can be brought about by what are called the "conventional weapons" of war, but in this stricken world any remedy, any step that we can take towards reducing arms and, what is more, any step which we can take to deal with a situation which the representative of Australia and Mr. Dulles have described as tending towards the elimination of humanity from the face of this earth, would be a step in the right direction.

When the time comes for us to discuss this matter in the

Disarmament Commission, I hope it will be possible for us in our collective wisdom to find a form of words which would proclaim our desire to express the wide-felt feeling of the peoples of the world that these terrible weapons shall not be used for their destruction, for these weapons would operate not only against the combatants but against the people. There would be no neutrals in this kind of war. There would be no human beings, no life of any kind. The war would be waged against the whole of creation, and, what is more, there would be created a world where re-creation and reconstruction would become impossible. We should be releasing forces which we could not control. In the meantime we would be hardening our hearts to accept a situation where, instead of using the genius of mankind, the effects of its labours or the powers of its discoveries for the purpose of serving its needs, we should be using them for its destruction.

Before I leave this subject, I want to lay particular emphasis on the elements of torture involved in all these weapons. I suppose that all kinds of killing are to be condemned, but killing people by torture and by burning is about as bad as any one can think of.

I should like to say that any expression of this kind by this distinguished body, by this world assembly, would have the effect of reorientating our whole views on this question and perhaps of speeding the work of the Disarmament Conference; that is, the Disarmament Conference would perhaps have an encouraging set of "marching orders", something to work up to and something which perhaps would prevent it from getting lost in the technicalities of the present time. I am not for a moment saying that the differences which obtain between the two schools of thought on effective ways of disarmament are not genuine, but let us get an agreement that the banning of these weapons, the placing of them outside the armoury of modern warfare, is desirable.

These are two sets of problems which, in the main, we present to the great Powers, and I make no apology for doing so. They have a great responsibility because of their vast and effective power, and there is no sense in our avoiding this issue. It is quite true we each have one vote, large country, small country, powerful country, neutral country, or combatant country, but in effect, the power of decision rests in the hands of the great Powers and more particularly in the hands of the United States and the Soviet Union.

While I have stated this frankly and starkly in respect of the role of the great Powers, it is also necessary for us all to try to make our own individual and collective contribution towards relieving the tension, even in the proceedings of the General Assembly. Would it be possible for us in the debates to abandon the luxury of epithets and superlatives? Could we, for example, give up using such words as "satellites", and such words as "imperialistic warmongers" in describing anyone else? Could we not generally introduce a sense and atmosphere of parliamentary discussion? Would it be possible to create in this Assembly a degree of human relationship where private discussions are possible more than they are now? I am not for a moment suggesting any kind of secret diplomacy or anything of that kind. But I think that this Assembly rather suffers from the fact that we are always thinking-I hope we are thinking-but thinking very much aloud, and often more aloud than thinking. Therefore, if perhaps we could have a vocabulary which would abandon such words as "satellites", which would abandon such words as "imperialist warmongers" and all of that family, on either side, it would be of some help. The English language is full of very nice words and, I am sure, so are the Spanish language, the Chinese language, the Russian language, the French and all others.

It would also be of very great help if it would be possible for the so-called small nations of the world-I do not quite know how they become small-I think the definition of smallness has some direct relationship to the quantity of arms they possess and the degree of aggressive intention-if it would be possible for the small nations of the world to have a greater degree of freedom so that the basis of the United Nations, as it was founded, of sovereign nations and of sovereign governments each one acting equal to the other, would become more effective. It is true that there will be lobbies, there will be groups, there will be whips and there will be ganging up, and one thing or another of that kind, that is inevitable, but we should seek to reduce it. After all this is not a "parliament of men"; this is an assembly of sovereign governments. Sovereignty lies in our own governments and in our own parliaments.

In this sovereign assembly, therefore, if we are to have freedom of discussion, and if we are to have the advantage of collective wisdom and the contribution which each one can make, it is necessary that the voice of the small shall be capable of being influential, and its influence must be measurable in terms of the content of its opinion, and contribute in terms of the results which its impact can bring to bear upon others.

Equally, I think it is necessary for us to bear in mind in the proceedings of this General Assembly that there are certain rules which we have made. They may be called conventions. Those conventions may not be changed just because their effects or application go against one. There is a saying in English that it is not fair to change the rules of a game when the game goes against you. Therefore, if we have views about geographic distribution, if we have views about generally arranging our affairs in such a way that all points of view are expressed, then, for an immediate gain, we should not sacrifice this principle, because, apart from everything else, there is no

telling whether it may not boomerang one day!

Therefore, in the composition of our committees and in our discussions, we should bring about a degree of accepting the inconvenient, and the toleration of opposite views. We should not, if I may put it more bluntly, have the United Nations deteriorate into a Holy Alliance in which the gospel and the truth were the monopoly of the three sovereigns. Indeed we should not go back to 26 September 1815, or to the earlier date of August 1814. We must not become a quadruple alliance where legitimism was the rule and seek to suppress all colonial liberation movements taking the name of "communism," or label every attempt to alter things as a "doctrine of rebellion" and, by dealing with them in this way, promote the power of militarism and imperialism; nor must we have the ganging-up on people and groups, or the exclusion of minority views or, on the other hand, the attempt of a minority to dominate the majority by continuous repetition of its own views and the abuse of processes and procedures. If these could be overcome and if thus we really become the United Nations as contemplated, it will be of great advantage to us. In aid of that particular prospect, not only the great nations, but the small nations like ourselves, the new nations, the less effective nations from the point of view of no material power, can make their contribution.

Next on the list of things which we ourselves could do is a problem which has become a hardy annual, and which perhaps would be regarded as merely the rehashing of an old proposition. That is, the bringing into our ranks of those who are not here. This particularly affects us, because those who are standing outside represent the vast and teeming populations of our Asian continent.

I do not want to anticipate the discussion on the report on the

admission of new Members, but would it not be possible for the General Assembly to find devices whereby at least the fourteen States which at one time or another have been agreed upon by all those concerned could be admitted en bloc? It is not very convincing if one speaks as though this is against the Charter or says that this is an arrangement which is called a package deal. I believe that we are not entirely averse to deals in this place! But it will be possible for a non-permanent member of the Security Council, for example, or a group of them, to make a suggestion, not necessarily of admitting some in return for the admittance of others, but of having a whole group presented in one resolution or by a number of resolutions on the same day, with the understanding that they would not be vetoed by anybody.

There are fourteen of those States which for the last five or six years have been knocking at our doors and which are qualified, according to the terms of the Charter, that is, they conform to all the canons of international law that are to be satisfied for the recognition of States.

I do not want to reopen this problem in any great detail, or to anticipate the discussions in committee. But I would submit that~the bringing in of new States-more especially when the particular composition and character of the States in question does not alter the balance even of blocs in the General Assembly-would be of great advantage. There again the Assembly could take a hand and leave the splitting of hairs upon the technique of it to other people. If it were possible to make a beginning-I do not say that this is a perfect end, because there are still large States that would be outside the Security Council and the General Assembly-it would still make a breach in this wall of opposition to the newcomer. The exclusiveness like that of a club, and the psychology of blackballing, would begin to disappear.

Therefore, again, if it is possible to discuss the report on the admission of new Members in this light, it should be possible for us to get away from legalisms and the textbooks of international law of a hundred or two hundred years ago and apply ourselves to modern conditions and recognize that a political decision is being made. The keeping away of some people because other people are kept away is as much a package deal as the other deal. If it is right to exclude someone because someone else is excluded, how can it be less right to include someone because someone else is included?

I am not at this moment referring to the position of China. I propose to do that a little later. I want to repeat, however, that the enlargement of the General Assembly in this way would, to a certain extent, make its representation reflect more the composition of the world's populations. The United Nations depends in the main on world public opinion. It is quite true that only accredited representatives speak and vote, and it is true that the committees alone can pass resolutions, but without the mass opinion of the world, which in every country is far more considerable than is ordinarily realized, it would be impossible for us to go forward.

Any step that we take in this direction of making it clear to people that our intention is to enlarge the scope of the General Assembly as much as we possibly can and as far as the Charter allows, will be a step in the right direction.

I next want to refer to two or three other items regarding the United Nations, in the same connexion. Article 28, paragraph 2, of the Charter, provides that the Security Council shall hold periodic meetings at which the heads of governments or the ministers concerned shall meet. I read the language of this paragraph carefully and there is nothing merely permissive about

it. It says "shall hold periodic meetings".

I think, in my comparative ignorance, that I may probably be overstating it-that the Security Council has tended to be a body which meets when it has to meet, that is, when it is obliged to do so by some reference to it. If it is the executive part of the United Nations-I do not say it is a world government-if indeed it is the Security Council, and if we are working towards removing the scourge of war and creating neighbourliness between nations, and towards the evolution of a world community, it is necessary that world leaders, especially those with effective power-the foreign ministers of States-should occasionally meet each other. That would, to a certain extent, pave had this high-power conference before now. Therefore, a proper interpretation of, and a greater adherence to, the spirit of Article 28, paragraph 2, of the Charter, is of great advantage.

This matter has been brought before the Assembly once before. The President of the French Republic, speaking on this matter, said [sixth session 333rd meeting]:

"... if the distinguished men towards whom all anxious eyes are now turned were ... to establish human contact with each other, to exchange ideas personally, to consider their differences without any agenda or public debate, and to try within the scope and in keeping with the principles of the United Nations jointly to reduce the disagreements which paralyse the world-if this should happen, we would welcome them with a joy which, I am convinced, would become world-wide."

The representative of India, Sir Benegal Rau, whom most of you know and have a great respect for, speaking at a plenary meeting

of the sixth session said [344th meeting]:

"I speak with great diffidence, but the subject is so important that I cannot refrain from making a suggestion or two. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France all are present here."-that was in Paris-"Could they not meet and discuss or rediscuss at least the most outstanding matters of disagreement between them? Could they not have something corresponding to one of those periodic meetings of the Security Council which are prescribed in Article 28 of the Charter?"

The obvious method has also the additional advantage that a foreign minister can probably speak to another foreign minister without always having to explain to his Parliament what actually was said in the context of informal conversation.

My delegation, and a great many other delegations, have been rather sadly impressed by the fact that during the third part of the last session of the Assembly, when the Assembly was reaching a juncture in regard to taking decisions, we were told that the fifteen belligerent Powers in Korea, inferentially, had a status which appears to supersede the position of the Assembly.

The Assembly is the body which makes decisions in the form of recommendations. The Assembly speaks for the United Nations. That is a position which must stand unaltered. I have no desire to labour this point because, no doubt, it will reappear when we are debating the Korean item.

I now refer to another great organ of the United Nations, the

Secretariat-the Secretary-General and his staff. Here again, we shall have the opportunity to discuss this matter on the agenda in relation to this specific item. I would like to say that the position of my delegation with regard to this is, as has been stated before, that we stand for the independence of the Secretariat and the international civil service. We do not recognize a difference between a host country and another country. We do not consider that the municipal law of any country should stand in the way of the obligations of an international civil service except in the sense that an international civil servant owes loyalty to his own country in the context of municipal affairs.

In other words, the international civil servant is very much like a servant of an embassy, or the staff of an embassy, entitled to a diplomatic position, always provided he obeys the law-should it be the municipal law-i.e., the sanitary laws or the traffic laws, of the country in which he is stationed. It would not be right for any country, however great or however small, to interfere in the integrity of in the development of an international civil service, which is probably one of the great contributions we can make towards world citizenship. So when the appropriate time comes, we shall look forward to the Secretary-General upholding the integrity of the Secretariat permitting no inroads upon it and allowing no construction of legalisms, except after thorough examination, to invade the individual's responsibility or the loyalty of the Secretariat to this international Organization.

At the same time, we consider it highly important that no country, host or other, shall have reason to feel aggrieved by any lack of care in the selection of people or in the scrutiny that is required, but once that has taken place the responsibility for the carrying out of the obligations must rest with the Secretary-General.

The next item on which I have to comment, which has also a rather wider implication, concerns the observations made on this platform by the representatives of two or three Latin-American countries. I have no desire to enter into any controversy on this matter, but if it is possible to remove doubts and misunderstandings one tries to do so.

Our purpose in this Assembly is not to add to the heat of any feeling or of any debate, but to try to calm it down. There were three speeches made in regard to comments made by my Prime Minister on the vote taken at the third part of the seventh session of the Assembly on a draft resolution, submitted not by us but by Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United Kingdom [A/L. 153], with regard to the inclusion of India in the political conference. At this Assembly and in committee the Indian delegation took no part in the voting at all. The views of the Indian delegation in regard to the composition of the conference are well known. I will not at the present moment enter into that, because we shall be discussing the Korean item again, but there was some suggestion that the Government of India, or the Prime Minister, had made slighting references to those Latin-American countries. Nothing is further from the desires of the Government of India or the intentions of its head, and I think I will read out to you the passage which throws light on this. Here is what the Prime Minister said:

"I have the greatest respect for the countries of Latin America. Let there be no mistake about it, but the facts stand out that nearly the whole of Europe and nearly the whole of Asia wanted one thing in this political conference, while a number of countries of the Americas did not want it. They have as much right not to want it as they have to want it."

If that is not, on the one hand, an expression of appreciation of the Latin-American States, or, on the other, an unambiguous statement as to the right of any country to vote as it likes, I don't know what it is. It is essential for us to analyse this voting and to see how, on each problem, one group of countries or one set of people votes. No one could take exception to that. That is a correct political exercise. Therefore, there is nothing in this statement which is intended to be a slight on any country. At the same time, this matter gives me the occasion to draw the Assembly's attention to the position of Asia in regard to the United Nations. Asia has a population of 1,275 million. You must comprehend the immensity of that figure. It occupies an area of 9,423,000 square miles, and the whole of this territory, with the exception of less than 500,000 square miles, and some 14 million people,' is represented here.

Taking for this purpose the representation of China by its present delegation out of the issue, China is entitled to be represented here. Without including present Chinese representation, on the Security Council, out of eleven places, Asia has two places. On the Economic and Social Council, out of eighteen places, Asia has three places. On the Trusteeship Council, out of twelve places, Asia has two places. On the International Court of Justice, out of fifteen judges, two are Asians. In the Secretariat, out of a very large number of persons, taking all grades and excluding the personnel of Nationalist China, there are 150 Asians.

That is the position of Asian representation in the Assembly. While we make no complaint, and we are not advocates of divisions into continental compartments, as we believe that the Assembly has to be built on the basis of national sovereign States; while any group of people which comes together for specific purposes

may promote what it regards as a right purpose, we have no desire to divide the world into further compartments or to create the kind of pan-Asian or other feeling which would jar world unity. At the same time, it is not possible to bring about equilibrium with a background of disproportionate representations.

Therefore, when the Prime Minister refers to these matters, it has to be borne in mind that he speaks within the context of the Asian people, and of Asian thinking. Also, this Assembly has to realize the fact that Asia is no longer a slumbering continent. We are a group of nations independent and free, determined to make our contribution to civilisation and to world purposes. May be it is true that we have emerged only in the last five, ten, fifteen, twenty, twenty-five years from colonial rule, but nascent nationalism today is as energetic as it can be, and the United Nations could still serve the cause of world unity and the purpose of liberation, if these nationalisms did not at the outset suffer from a feeling of frustration because their places in the councils of the world are limited and not proportionate to their importance and size.

We are also asked to address ourselves to the problem of Charter revision. We do not either support or reject the proposition as it stands at present. The proposition, however, is stated merely as one for study. Under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the revision is due in a ten-year period, but we would say that is one of those things where wisdom would dictate the course of hastening slowly. Also, one's attitude is determined largely by the purposes for which the revision is intended.

It would be a disaster if the United Nations were to repeat the example of the League, where those who disagreed went out, one by

one, and ultimately catastrophe resulted.

We should look back also on the history of international organizations right through the nineteenth century, when, with a background of high-sounding phrases, the concerts of Europe were born and ultimately lapsed into balance-of-power groups. Once again I say that it would be a sad thing if the United Nations, willy-nilly, began to deteriorate into the position of the Holy Alliance or of the holders of legitimist conceptions of those days.

If I may say so with great respect and humility, what we perhaps require even more than the revision of the Charter is a greater adherence to the spirit of its provisions. That greater adherence comes about only by the resolving of the tensions to which reference has been made, by a more sincere and prompt adherence to such decisions as are made. The allegiance, the support and the moral backing that the nations and the peoples of the world give to the charter are far more important than any kind of revision.

I think that we have made no secret of the fact that our Government is fully committed to the position that the United Nations must reflect the conditions of the world-and one of those conditions is that it is not possible now to have an Organization in which, by majority vote, decisions are imposed on a great Power. Therefore, while we would be the first to complain against the misuse of the veto, we are, in the present conditions of the world, supporters of the doctrine of great-Power unanimity.

At this stage, having referred to these political matters, it gives me some relief to address myself to another aspect of the

United Nations-its economic and social functions. The newspapers, the radio and all other instruments of publicity give a great deal of space and time to our political achievements or the lack thereof. But we do not hear a great deal about all the more solid achievements of the United Nations through its specialized agencies, its various committees and so forth.

In pursuance of Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter, the Economic and Social Council is pledged to devote its energies to raising the standards of living for people in under- developed countries and bringing about general world economic and social equilibrium. It must be realized in this connexion that, out of the 2,300 million people in the world, the vast majority lives below the subsistence level. As long as the vast majority of human beings lives below this level, consequences of a physical, moral and political nature will follow, and any kind of world stability, any march toward a united world of greater equilibrium, of understanding and of prosperity, laying the foundations of peace on an enduring basis, is impossible.

At the same time, we would be the first to admit that the raising of the standards of living in what are called the under-developed countries must depend primarily upon the efforts of the people themselves. Just as there can be no export of revolution, so can there be no export of prosperity. Ultimately, this must depend upon the efforts of people themselves.

But we have to take into account the handicaps from which these territories suffer. The under-developed countries are largely regions which until yesterday were colonial empires, where the populations were hewers of wood and drawers of water-regions whose role in the economy of the world was to provide labour and raw materials for the metropolitan countries. There is no doubt that there were differences in the tempo of this exploitation;

there were paternalistic imperialisms and there were less paternalistic imperialisms. But the net result is that the nations of the ex-colonial and colonial areas have backward economies, their industries are less advanced, they subserved the purpose of the powerful industrial economies of the metropolitan countries. In order to make headway and to remove this handicap, it would be necessary, for some time, to provide assistance. In our view, this should come largely by way of technical assistance.

We are happy to pay our tribute to, and express our gratitude for, the work of the Technical Assistance committee and the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. In 1952, India received 136 technicians, and 105 fellowships were received by Indians who were going abroad for technical training.

From UNICEF, since its inception, India has received a total aid of $9,500,000. The Assembly will be interested to hear that a considerable part of this UNICEF aid, along with such other aid as comes from the Colombo Plan and other arrangements, is going not into temporary relief of any kind, but into large-scale enterprises such as anti-malarial and antitubercular and other projects which are attempting to eliminate the causes of disease and of infant mortality. The relief that is being received, as far as India is concerned, is being diverted to the manufacture and distribution of penicillin, to malarial control, to BCG campaigns, and so on, and in all this we have been assisted very considerably by the Colombo Plan. In Indonesia and Thailand the disease known as yaws has been brought under control and, I understand, is likely to be completely conquered.

In this connexion, I think it is only fair to say that, so far as India is concerned, technical assistance has not been a one-way traffic; it has been reciprocal. India has sent eighty-four

technical experts abroad under this scheme. We have also trained ninety- three others who have been sent to India fortraining. I think that is a very healthy situation and contributes to self-respect in the relationships that must exist in all sound schemes of social amelioration, and to the mutuality of such schemes. We are happy that we have been able to make this contribution, and we bring to the Assembly the conception that these technical aid schemes are not merely a one-way flow.

It is the view of our delegation that UNICEF should be placed on a permanent basis.

On the larger issue of economic aid, the delegation of India supports the international organization of aid through an international fund and corporation, because it is more likely to bring about equitable distribution, it is more in keeping with the temper and purposes of this Organization, and certainly it contributes more to the building up of self-respect and of mutual understanding between nations. We shall therefore support, when the time comes, the establishment of these two units.

On the larger question, it is the view of my delegation that greater attempts must be made to reach and establish increased economic equilibrium in the world. We of the non-dollar areas are continually in debt to the dollar area, and what is called the dollar gap has to be bridged. We find that, although the gap is not considerable in terms of the wealth of the dollar area, it is considerable for us. If, however, we were to import about 0.5 per cent of what are the rýÿÿÿ,

One of the things required in this world is greater freedom in the movement of trade, greater liberalisation and a removal of

barriers and of economic nationalism.

We have contributed as much as we could to economic amelioration, and I think it is right that we should refer to our own efforts. The great problem of India is food. Our first necessity is to feed our population, even up to a subsistence level. India has made considerable advances in this respect, and I refer here to last year's figures. In 1952, India imported four million tons of food; in 1953, it will import only three million tons; in 1954, the imports will be one million tons. We have increased our rice production, as can be seen from these figures: in 1952-1953, rice production was 23,400,000 tons, as against 20,070,000 tons in 1951-1952, which represents an increase of about one- seventh. Wheat production for 1952-1953 is estimated to be 6,380,000 tons, as compared with 5,700,000 tons for the previous year. India has reclaimed large areas of land that were formerly uncultivable and has brought these tracts into cultivation through mechanical means. This year India will bring under cultivation, by the end of the year, 1,400,000 acres of land.

However, all this vast production is somewhat offset by the natural disasters which India has suffered. We have some unwelcome guests in the country who come to us as migrants. I believe they originate some where along the banks of the Euphrates. They settle down in Pakistan for a while, and then they come on to us. Where they go from there, I do not know. They are called locusts. Large quantities of our crops are destroyed by them, and they commit general havoc, and this invasion by locusts is more or less a normal occurrence.

This year-even while we are sitting here-the rising waters of our rivers have caused floods such as are unprecedented in our history. During the period from the middle of July to the middle of August, some 4,500,000 people in India have been rendered

homeless. It has been the worst series of flood disasters in our history. Six rivers have risen: the Imphal, the Brahmaputra, the Subansiri, the Ganges, the Kosi and the Godavri. These floods, which normally subside after a period of a fortnight, have this year chosen to remain. The area of devastation has extended to many thousands of square miles, and nearly a third of the State of Bihar is under water. Not only have this year's crops been destroyed, but the cultivation of these lands for next year has become impossible. The improvement, therefore, that has been made in the supply of food is largely offset by this disaster.

I should now like to address myself to some of the current problems on the agenda. The first problem relates to the representation of China in the United Nations Assembly. This question will no doubt come up when the report of the Credentials Committee is presented, at which time we shall challenge the report. For four years the legitimate Government of China, the government that has control of the country, the government to which the people owe allegiance and whose authority alone is able to fulfil its obligations, has applied for admission to the United Nations and requested that its delegation be received. The Assembly has not accepted the credentials of the representatives of this government. We regret that this question was again the subject of controversy at the beginning of this session of the General Assembly. In our humble view it is unfortunate that the Soviet Union and the United States fought the issue at large. It should properly be debated at the time of the submission of the credentials report. I submit, with all the deference one can have towards the Chair, that we are doubtful concerning not only the wisdom but also the propriety of raising the question at the early stage, because that is anticipating the finding of the Credentials Committee. We are unable to accept the view, subject to the Chair's ruling, that the matter has been disposed of by the resolution submitted by the United States and adopted by the Assembly-that may relate to the problem of the recognition of China or to anything of that kind. An the report of the

Credentials Committee what we are challenging is the right of the present delegation to sit here.

Therefore, I wish to restate our attitude, which is the same as it was last year. The Government of China, which has applied for representation in the United Nations for the past four years, which is the only government that can carry out the obligations in respect of the Charter, and which is the only government entitled to be here, ought to be here. When I was dealing with questions concerning Asia, I should have stated that denying this representation to the proper Chinese Government really means disenfranchising 500 million people.

I wish to state, as regards the representatives of the authorities of Formosa who take the place of the Chinese Government here, that we have no quarrel with them as persons and that we make no derogatory references of any kind to the personalities concerned. Here we are dealing with a political issue. We have due regard for those who occupy those seats. But at the same time it is our duty to point out that the present situation renders the representation of nearly a third of the Asian continent to this Assembly null and void.

The next problem to which we address ourselves is one that is in some ways related to the question of the representation of China, that is, the problem raised by Burma at the last session. At the seventh session of the General Assembly the delegation of Burma, headed by the distinguished judge who leads the delegation, presented the case of Burma in what was generally accepted as a wonderful achievement in understatement. The case of Burma was presented with a great degree of restraint and a desire to obtain results rather than to raise a controversy. On territory of nearly 50,000 square miles today there are foreign troops. As the representative of Burma stated yesterday, they are called

"foreign" troops because of the delicacy of expression that prevails in the United Nations in regard to such matters. Those troops are the troops of the Kuomintang. We have not been able to accept the explanation that General Li Mi has no control over these troops. For the past four or five years they have ravaged the countryside of Burma, they have raped and murdered. They are invaders and conquerors who ought to be sent out of the country.

The United Nations passed a resolution in which it sent an appeal to the Formosan authorities. The United States has used its good offices. Still the situation prevails.

We have no desire at the present moment to bring this discussion to the point of decision or to submit any resolution. We hope it will be possible, in one way nor another, to diminish this harassment of the Burmese Government. These troops armed from Formosa have the most modern of weapons and are supported by airplanes. They are feeding upon the countryside and leaving it desolate. If this army, equipped with modern weapons, supporting subversive forces and challenging the authority of one of the Members of the United Nations, cannot be stopped, and if it cannot bring forth proper condemnation, indeed it is a sad thing.

We hope that by the time this item comes up for debate on the agenda the Burmese Government will be able to report that quick progress has been made towards its solution. At the present moment - I can frankly say, so far as my knowledge goes-there is no indication that the invasion of the territory will be ended. As I have said before, what hurts Burma hurts us. Burma is our immediate neighbour. Its people have been linked to us by centuries of civilisation. A country that has recently emerged from colonial rule has its own difficulties and problems. That it should be harassed by foreign invaders of this type and should

have to fight on yet another front, is indeed a very sad fact.

The next item on the agenda to which we should like to address ourselves is the problem of race conflict. The item which is termed "race conflict" is, I think, a bit of a euphemism; it is really race domination. This question has been before us for six successive sessions, that is, in the form of the "Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa", or, more recently, the question of apartheid itself. For six sessions, one or the other of these problems has been before us. the General Assembly has passed five resolutions in regard to the matter. It offered the Government of the Union of South Africa four alternatives, and on three occasions it condemned the Group Areas Act and asked the South African Government not to put it into operation.

The South African Government has turned a deaf ear to all this, except to the extent of intervening in the debate in the attempt to show that these are matters of domestic jurisdiction. This again is another of those expressions of the doctrine of legitimism: if people do not protest, then they are not dissatisfied enough; if they protest, then they are rebels; in either case, the people are wrong.

The next item to which we should like to address ourselves in this general debate is the colonial issue. It is not our intention to allude particularly to the problems of Morocco or Tunis or South West Africa. However, I think it is necessary to say that, in the case of the first two, which are partly under the administration of the French Republic, it is not merely a problem of colonial rule. To our mind and in our approach, it is a problem of the violation of international treaties. It is disregard of the Charter and of treaty obligations and the intervention against and violation of the sovereignty of a

territory. Morocco and Tunis are territories that are externally sovereign because the regime of the French Government is regulated by treaty obligations. By violation of the treaties, therefore, the authorities responsible have put themselves in a position where they are subject to challenge, not only-as colonial rulers-on the general problem of colonial rule, but also with regard to the sanctity of treaties and the sovereignty of territories which they have violated. We shall deal with this matter in due course when it comes before the Committee.

In South West Africa we have a similar problem. This is a territory where sovereignty is dormant, but exists in the people. South West Africa was a mandated area where only the administration was vested in South Africa. In 1921 or 1922 the South African Government, without asking anybody, gave South African citizenship to the population of South West Africa, in violation of the principles of the Mandate. What the South African Government has committed in this region is an anschluss, an invasion, a conquest. Therefore, to regard and dismiss this merely as colonialism is to condone a lack of respect for treaties. What follows from conquest is the violation of sovereignty. We who have suffered from colonial rule must naturally lend our assistance to those who are thus brought into the regions of colonialism by conquest, the violation of treaties, or illegal interpretations of them by metropolitan Powers for their own purposes.

I should now like to address myself to the general aspects of colonialism Would it be wrong for some of us who are members of former dependent peoples, whose struggles and peaceful endeavours have resulted in the establishment of a fraternity where at one time there was domination, to ask the representative of the United Kingdom, even from this rostrum, whether the "loss" of an empire did not mean the emergence of a Commonwealth; whether the removal of domination has not resulted in fraternity; whether,

where there was mutual distrust, there is not now mutual regard; and whether, where there was conflict of interests, the interests today are not complementary? Would it not be right that, in this Assembly, instead of colonialism being treated as a matter to be taken up on the plaints of those who are affected, it became, by the initiative of the metropolitan countries themselves-presented as an evil that it is sought to end-an affair that has to be brought to an end? Therefore, would it not be right to expect enlightened metropolitan countries to seek ways and means whereby the rule of one people by another ceases in the shortest possible time?

Since the time of the war, in the Asian continent some 600 million people have ceased to be members of dependent States. One is happy to say that today, in the whole Asian continent, there are only 14 million people who are under colonial rule. Most of them are under the aegis of the United Kingdom and the rest are under France. But there are only 14 million people who are what might be called subject peoples. It should be possible to bring this subjection to an end. These subject peoples occupy only a very small area of Asia.

On the continent of Africa, the problem is rather different. We have a situation where the United Kingdom, which has a home territory of somewhere about 94,000 square miles-less than 100,000 square miles-has an empire in Africa of somewhere about 2,250,000 square miles; whereas France, which has a home territory of less than 250,000 square miles, holds away over nearly 4,500,000 square miles; 6,750,000 square miles are colonial areas, and, if you include the Trust Territories, it amounts to 8,750,000 square miles. Out of a total population of 191 million people, 139 million people are either subject to colonial rule or are in Trust Territories. Therefore, the vast continent of Africa, which is 130 or 150 times the size of the United Kingdom, is still in part the latter's private domain, the

rest being shared by France, Portugal and Spain. Not only was the whole continent retained for the purpose of exploitation, but certain sections of humanity are kept out of it by various devices, indeed even on the basis of apartheid.

Therefore, in viewing colonialism, it is not sufficient for us to determine whether the people are worse or better off, or whether the metropolitan countries can find a certain number of convenient local allies to be against their own people. It is time that the sovereign countries, in the context of the provisions of the Charter, faced this colonial issue-which involves discrimination as to race and creed and militates against the self-determination of peoples and national independence-not in the way of entertaining complaints or of merely meeting agitation, but as part of the more constructive endeavours to liberate the entire world by the conscious attempts of humanity, and particularly by the metropolitan countries.

With the best of intentions and feeling-and I feel I can do so-I particularly say to the United Kingdom, which has before it the experience which has often been stated in the words, she has lost an empire to win a commonwealth, she has lost domination to win a fraternity, should not the notable example of Libya and West Africa be extended so that the United Kingdom should no longer have colonial countries any more than it should have slaves at home?

That brings me to the last item on which I want to speak, and that is Korea. The question of Korea has cast its shadow not only over this Assembly but over the entire world. It is a very distressing and dark shadow, the spectre of a country drenched in blood where millions of people on one side and the other have died, where millions of children have been orphaned and where reconstruction, even if it begins today, will take many years

before it can make of Korea a homeland in which all its people can live. In addition to this, Korea stands today as the symbol of something which will test our wisdom, our humanity and our political sense. Solutions in Korea represent one of the ways of resolving world tensions. Together with Germany, people look to Korea and what happens there as an indication of what is likely to happen in the rest of the world.

The shadow of Korea is drawn long over the face of this Assembly and indeed over the world. It is a story of tragedy, not only of the Korean people but of the peoples in China, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and everywhere else where troops have gone and engaged in war for purposes which their sides believed to be right-so far as- the United Nations is concerned, to resist aggression. It is our business to see that our efforts of the last three years, which have made very slow progress, now become embodied in the terms of a truce.

The position of India in this matter is very well known. Speaking from this rostrum only a few weeks ago [430th meeting] I made it entirely clear that anything that we say in this matter or indeed on any other is not intended to add to the heat of the debate. We think that in the progress that we have made in Korea and in the winning of an armistice, we have reached one milestone. But still, what happens in Korea today is only part of the implementation of the Armistice Agreement, namely, the handing over of the prisoners in pursuance of the Armistice Agreement. When that is over, or simultaneously with it, there comes the other problem of peace.

At this present moment I satisfy myself with saying that it would be wrong, in our humble opinion, to approach this problem of peace with the same mentality and in the same atmosphere as prevailed at Panmunjom. There an armistice was negotiated by two

sets of warring peoples. The war has stopped now, and it is the common desire of either side to establish peace, and we must therefore approach the problem of peace in an atmosphere of

conference.

If I may say so without it being regarded as inappropriate, and I hope the Assembly will bear with me, I think it is appropriate for us to mention that gallant band of men who are today performing the act of repatriation in Korea. I refer to the Indian Army. The Indian Army is charged with the onerous duty of dealing with the problems of law and order, objective problems, but with very little material power. Our men and our officers have covered themselves with the kind of glory that is not usual in war. For the first time a peace army, on foreign territory, without arms, has been called upon to deal with turbulence and, according to all our information, has done so gallantly and well. I hope this situation continues. They have performed their duty in such a way as to create a feeling of pride not only in our nationals but in this Organization itself. They are part of an international machinery-and I hope it is appropriate for me to refer to this, because one thing that comes out of what has been happening with regard to repatriation is that, given the will, and if we are able to throw away the accepted and conventional views of approach, we can sometimes achieve results. Therefore, an unarmed army is today dealing with a situation in a way which is not only glorious from their point of view, but full of lessons for others who have to resolve political problems.

The Armistice has also shown us the need for patience. The Assembly will remember the resolution [610 (Vll)] that it passed by an overwhelming majority as early as December of last year, and we are still only in the Armistice period. I am not saying that because progress has been slow in the past we should be complacent, but this is not the time nor the occasion for

impatience, nor does the topic lend itself to a situation where impatience would win any results. The guns are silenced, but an outstanding problem still remains, and that problem is the problem of the conference.

I would not say anything from this rostrum which would in any way add to the difficulties which already exist, but I think some clarifications are necessary in order to aid progress. The position of India in regard to the political conference is entirely clear. It was never a candidate to become a member of the conference, and it has never refused to carry out obligations. That position we still maintain. It will become part of an international venture of this kind only on the expressed desire of the sides concerned and only on its own conviction that it can perform a useful service. We have not stated it thus in order to perform an oral trapeze act, but in order clearly to state our position.

There is a considerable degree of agreement and, as I stated in this Assembly on the last occasion, our appreciation of the situation with regard to China and North Korea is that they would approach the problem of the conference in a reasonable attitude of mind. It is therefore up to us, in so far as we appreciate that it requires two sides to make a conference, to persevere. One can also say this to the United States, quoting from Abraham Lincoln: "There are no great principles which are not flexible". Principles in politics are not like points in geometry, without dimensions. Principles must enable people to meet and reconcile their differences. It is no derogation of principle if the principal divergent points of view can honestly be reconciled within it. It is therefore important that statements made here should be taken in that light.

We heard a statement from the representative of the United States

the other day which indicated-and here I am supported by the United Kingdom, one of the sponsors of the draft resolution subsequently adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 711 A (Vu)-a degree of flexibility, and let us hope that degree of flexibility is conveyed to the other side. Let us be quite frank about it. We cannot get any settlement unless these parties talk to each other, because settlement must be reached with the other side. I do not want at the present moment to ask for clarifications in this Assembly. I believe that if the United States, on behalf of the United Nations Command, desires to speak to the Chinese people they should do so directly, as there is room for them to do so. If there are other nations that are able to offer their assistance they will be very glad to do so.

There are one or two small points which require clarification. I have been at pains to read the statement of Mr. Dulles on Korea where this particular sentence occurs: "The Republic of Korea has no ambitions which run beyond Korea." That is a statement which has to be clarified at some point, because there are two governments on the Territory of Korea. There was in The New York Times this morning-and I do not give any credence to it in any authoritative way-a statement attributed to the President of the Republic of Korea. He said as follows:

"By agreement with the United States, the Government of the Republic of Korea has postponed its determination to unify North and South Korea by military means in order to see what may come out of a political conference. We have also entered into a mutual defence treaty with the United States.

"If ninety days after the political conference opens it has failed to achieve the objective of Korean unification, then naturally we shall resume the battle for our national independence and~unity. We expect, and we have no reason so far

to believe otherwise, that all friendly forces now in Korea will assist us toward that objective if the Communists force us to resume the war. Any plan or programme entered into by a friendly nation which is contrary to this determination of ours will not be accepted or respected by us."

I do not ask this Assembly or any of the fifteen Powers which sponsored the draft resolution which I referred to just now to assume responsibility for the President of the Republic of South Korea. At the end of the seventh session of the Assembly, the delegation of India put the question to the representative of the United States, who answered that there were no agreements with South Korea beyond what had been published. For myself, I am prepared to accept that, and I therefore regard the above statement as simply that of Mr. Rhee.

But the statement of the Secretary of State of the United States that "the Republic of Korea has no ambitions which run beyond Korea" is something that requires clarification in the light of the objectives of the United Nations for the unification of Korea. There are two governments in the place and that is that.

With regard to the consideration of the item in the Assembly itself, all I wish to say is that the question of Korea is on the agenda. I hope that we may be able to discuss it in order to congratulate everybody concerned on the issue of the conference if it takes place. If that happens, it is right that we should have an opportunity of discussing Korea. If, on the other hand, the conference does not take place, or there are certain impediments which have to be removed or certain other steps to be taken, it is also right that we should discuss the question. But when it should be discussed is a matter within the wisdom of this Assembly in which each of us has his own contribution to make. At

the present moment the item stands on the agenda.

We have also this advantage, that our Secretary-General has fully justified the confidence which the Assembly placed in him by leaving him latitude in the matter of reporting. We have now an Assembly document which from its content would appear to be an interim document, and we must expect more information and must also allow time for events to develop, and for the direct negotiations to which the representative of the United States referred. For our part, our Government will carry out the obligations arising from the repatriation duties that it has undertaken, but we hope that the Assembly will appreciate the fact that if, at the end of ninety days the problem of these prisoners cannot be turned over to the political conference, a somewhat ticklish situation will arise. It would be very wrong for anyone to expect that the Government of India is forever to be charged with the responsibility of looking after such prisoners as may remain.

But this is not a problem which we need anticipate just now, because we must address ourselves to this question not only with a sincere desire for the conference to come about, but with faith that it will come about.

In order that our faith may be justified we must seek flexibility. We do not desire to ask inconvenient questions. The resolving of this matter is not beyond the wit of man. There is a desire on both sides for the holding of a conference. We have the experience of the negotiations at Panmunjom, there are lessons we should now learn from the work of the Indian Army in repatriation, there is the working together of two sides on the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission. All these are contributory factors which lead to the hope that a Korean

settlement is not far away.

That brings me to the end of the observations which I desired to make in my intervention in this general debate. We meet in the eighth session, as I said a while ago, many years after the war, in an organisation which was established to rid the world of the scourge of war. My delegation has put forward certain proposals.

To sum them up, my delegation would like to propose, at an appropriate stage and if the opinion of the Assembly warrants it, that some request be made to the heads of those great States on who the primary responsibility lies-and that responsibility is heavy and onerous indeed-the men of whom Sir Winston Churchill said that they would "stand shamed before history". We should address our appeal to them to meet in high level conference without any further loss of time, because today the guns have been silenced in Korea, there is a context of greater flexibility in regard to the problems of the European continent, and there are further problems looming ahead. It has to be remembered that the delay in the solution of problems creates further problems.

This then is our first request-the high level conference-which the Assembly should ask those concerned to bring about.

Secondly, we would like the Assembly to consider whether it would not be possible to make some declaration for the purpose of placing beyond use in war atomic and other highly destructive weapons and instruments of death by torture, so that the inventions of man could be applied to constructive purposes.

Thirdly, we would like to see the content and context of the Assembly broadened by the admission of new Members and the process of "blackballing" limited. We should like to reduce to a minimum the attempt to argue on technicalities, appreciating that these technicalities work both ways. We should like to bring into our fold at least such applicants as have been standing long at the door and who have been supported at one time or another by both parties concerned. Equally, we should like, and would make our own humble contribution towards, a lowering of tempers and the heat of discussion in this place in order that the Assembly may really become more of a concert of nations. We do not look upon the United Nations as an exclusive body. We look upon it as a family of nations, with all its divergencies, and to attempt to limit it in the other way- to make it a more convenient body of like-minded people-would be to go against the spirit, the principles and the purposes of the Charter and to postpone the day of the consolidation of the world community.

Therefore, under the President's guidance we shall go forward with faith and determination, relying upon the collective wisdom of us all to achieve solutions, or the beginning of such solutions, which we can render possible in the context in which we help to shape events, so that, as Dante said, "On this little plot of earth belonging to man, life may pass in freedom and with peace".

=========