

**United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

**SEVENTEENTH SESSION**

**Official Records**



**1127th  
PLENARY MEETING**

**Friday, 21 September 1962,  
at 3 p.m.**

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
<b>Agenda item 9:</b>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
<i>Speech by Sardar Mohammad Naim (Afghanistan)</i> . . . . .	35
<i>Speech by Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)</i> . . . . .	37
<i>Statement by the representative of the United States of America</i> . . . . .	48
<b>Agenda item 89:</b>	
<i>Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian)</i> . . . . .	49

**President: Mr. Muhammad ZAFRULLA KHAN (Pakistan).**

**AGENDA ITEM 9**

**General debate (continued)**

1. **SARDAR MOHAMMAD NAIM (Afghanistan):** First of all, I wish to extend the hearty congratulations of my Government and the Afghan people to the representatives of Rwanda, Burundi, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago, on the occasion of their joining the United Nations. We are confident that the admission of these countries to the United Nations and their participation in the task of the Organization will contribute to the attainment of the ultimate aims of the United Nations.
2. The increasing membership of the United Nations is of particular significance in the present circumstances. It is significant because it is the most convincing result of the great achievement of this Organization in securing the rights of peoples and nations to independence, and their equal right to contribute to the work of building the world in which they live through the direct and legitimate exercise of their will without any influence of alien domination. It is significant because at a time that has been referred to as "a critical period in the life of the Organization" by the Secretary-General, more and more countries express their deep conviction by joining the Organization, and the Member States express their willingness to strengthen the United Nations by admitting them with a unanimous voice.
3. In extending our congratulations, we are anxious to express our earnest desire to see among us representatives of the countries which, by their admission to the United Nations, will add still more to the present great increase in the membership of the Organization. This desire emanates from our deep aspirations for the achievement of the universality of the United Nations. Therefore, while we are anxious to greet Algeria and Uganda in the near future, we also wish that the co-operation of the present Members would create

the atmosphere which would make it possible for a number of other countries, desirous of membership in the United Nations, but confronted with certain difficulties which have not yet been solved as a result of the prevailing international situation, to take their places here.

4. The question of the representation of China in the United Nations should receive the full consideration of all Members of this Organization. Afghanistan recognizes the Government of the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate Government of that country and hopes that its representatives will occupy their rightful seats in the United Nations without any further delay.

5. In the introduction to his annual report [A/5201/Add.1] the Secretary-General states that the past year has been a critical period in the life of the Organization. The reasons for this statement are well known to all of us, but it is a source of confidence and hope that even in this critical period the United Nations has continued its activities, and that they have resulted in certain important achievements in various fields. In this connexion, I would like to express the great satisfaction of my Government at the solution of a problem long-standing on the agenda of the United Nations, a solution which has resulted in the independence and sovereignty of Algeria, as a great contribution not only in ending a "hot war", but also in establishing the right of a heroic nation. The realistic policy followed in this connexion by France has never been ignored nor left unappreciated by the Afghan Government. The role played by United Nations deliberations in this problem has been historic and great.

6. The spirit of understanding in the settlement of the question of West Irian has strengthened all sincere hopes that differences between nations can be eliminated by understanding and by earnestly seeking a peaceful solution to all problems. The initiative taken by the Secretary-General in this matter on behalf of the United Nations and the spirit of co-operation demonstrated by Indonesia and the Netherlands in a serious matter which was pregnant with the dangers of war, are highly appreciated. It is a source of satisfaction that the solution of the problem is based on the principle of full respect for the peoples of West Irian. We sincerely hope that such policies of understanding, co-operation and adherence to peaceful means and methods will guide all nations in the settlement of their differences.

7. Representing Afghanistan, the first point which I should like to put before the Members of the Organization as one of the most important matters to which the General Assembly should give its full consideration in a spirit of collective co-operation and with a sense of great responsibility, is the question of strengthening the Organization itself. It is a strong United Nations that comes first as an international instrument in which we can place our hope for the solution of all

major and minor problems confronting the world. The ways and means to achieve this end are many and various, and the most effective of them are difficult and not simple. Therefore, it is most necessary that the problems confronting the United Nations itself will see a new approach and a new spirit of co-operation, so that further deterioration of situations may be avoided and an atmosphere of co-operation and harmony secured. This is the only way in which the Organization can become more active and effective. Our expectations in this connexion should have been very great, but it is surely not too much to expect that all of us should do our best to avoid intensification of international tension and furthering of the cold war. This makes it necessary for each one of us to think of the world as a whole, a world in which we can either live in peace together or be destroyed altogether. It is now more than essential that the major problems which affect mankind as a whole should be concentrated upon by the United Nations and dealt with in a more effective and dynamic manner.

8. Looking at the agenda before the General Assembly, there is no item which is not of particular importance to certain countries, and therefore of great importance to all of us. But, as the General Assembly of the United Nations, we must realize that the problems of life and death to humanity are of greater importance to all of us. The major problems with which the United Nations should concern itself, first and foremost, are undoubtedly to secure the right of peoples and nations to independence and the observance and respect of the will of peoples and nations on the basis of self-determination and respect for human dignity.

9. It is urgent to lessen international tension and create an atmosphere of confidence in which humanity can live in peace and co-operate for the universal prosperity of mankind, and to stop the race in those spheres which can bring only one result, and that is the destruction of mankind. It is essential to make it possible for mankind to achieve its greatest dream of all times through general and complete disarmament with effective and trustworthy controls. It is imperative to fill the gap in the various standards of living of human beings, who are all equally entitled to enjoy the fruits of knowledge and civilization of mankind, by helping each other and devoting the powers of human knowledge and technology to peaceful purposes and only for the welfare and prosperity of man.

10. The United Nations consists of all those who are responsible for the achievement of these common aims, but there are those who should feel more responsible, due to the obvious logic of the facts dominating the life of mankind in our world. But we should bear in mind that this in no way lessens the responsibility of the other countries or the responsibility of the United Nations as a whole. Therefore it is essential that the United Nations should spare no effort in fulfilling its own responsibilities as a world Organization.

11. The United Nations, as a world Organization, has succeeded whenever it has earnestly played its role to the extent it has been allowed to contribute, and we are confident that more success would result with more efforts made in this direction.

12. We were cherishing great hopes that the new approach by the United Nations, in its last session, to the problem of disarmament, with the participation of more countries in the Geneva Conference for the preparation of a draft treaty on general and complete disarmament and a treaty on the cessation of nuclear

weapon tests, would bring about concrete achievements. Although the work already carried out in Geneva has resulted in the pursuance of negotiations aimed at such treaties, the results are limited and no real progress has been achieved. The efforts of the new participants for the solution of some basic difficulties and finding a common ground for understanding between the nuclear Powers, although not crowned with success, should be considered a sincere and considerable contribution toward the attainment of the ultimate objectives of the United Nations. It is our hope that the General Assembly, in its present session, will give full consideration to the problem of disarmament and concentrate on the real difficulties which hindered the complete success of the Geneva negotiations.

13. I am confident that a serious discussion of this matter by the United Nations will prove useful and help future negotiations. In this connexion, I would like to emphasize the role of the non-nuclear Powers in drawing the attention of the nuclear Powers to the responsibilities they bear.

14. The circumstances which have compelled those who possess nuclear power to continue nuclear testing are undoubtedly deplorable and alarming. The problem of nuclear disarmament, the cessation of tests in all environments, the destruction of all nuclear weapons, and the confinement of all progressive efforts to peaceful purposes only affect humanity as a whole. Therefore, it is imperative that the United Nations should give effective expression to the concern of mankind and assist these countries in bringing matters closer to the possibility of agreeing on a treaty banning the testing of nuclear weapons as soon as possible.

15. The situation in the Congo has been of great concern to the United Nations. We agree with the Secretary-General that progress in the solution of the problem of the Congo "is as essential for the good name of the Organization as for the Organization's continued usefulness in similar circumstances that may arise in the future". We have always supported measures for the prestige and the effectiveness of the Organization, and we shall continue this policy. But, in all circumstances, it is our conviction that no settlement of any problem can be considered lasting and reliable if it is not based, before everything else, on the full respect of the will of the peoples themselves. It is our hope that, in any future measures, this principle will be given the consideration it deserves. We hope that the co-operation of the United Nations will lead to more constructive efforts by the Secretary-General to achieve conciliation in the Congo and to assist that country in bringing about conditions of peace in which the people of the Congo may achieve their national aspirations, determined by the Congolese people themselves.

16. The financial difficulties confronting the Organization are becoming increasingly serious. This is obviously of great concern to countries which have enormous and urgent needs with limited resources to promote the economic, social and cultural conditions of their people. Afghanistan is one of these countries. Nevertheless, the Government of Afghanistan has done everything in its power to participate in measures to the point of possibility, in view of the consideration of our own difficulties. Our participation is undoubtedly of no great material significance, but we hope that it will serve as a token of our great interest in a stronger United Nations.

17. We fully agree with the statement of the Secretary-General that:

"The emergence in recent years of scores of territories from colonial rule to independence and the clear prospect that the remaining colonial areas will shortly take their rightful places among the family of nations lend urgency to demands upon the international community to provide them with material and technical assistance, if these new nations are to achieve the monumental tasks of making their newly won independence meaningful through as rapid development of their economic and social potential as possible." [A/5201/Add.1, p. 3.]

In giving our full support to this, I find it necessary to stress once again that, in emphasizing the responsibilities of the United Nations in assisting these areas, the assistance required by the conditions prevailing in other less developed areas of the world should not be ignored.

18. Great changes in the political structure of our society have taken place with great speed. We are witnessing the political emancipation of one country after another, but the changes in the structure of the world economy are slow. The primary producing countries are suffering without any protection and they are not able to diversify their national economies in order to raise their standards of living by industrialization. Industrialization is impossible to achieve without the help and assistance of international organizations and the industrially advanced countries. The facts show that the developed countries are progressing with greater speed toward a brighter horizon, while the less developed countries, although struggling very hard, are still suffering from poverty, ill health, undernourishment and lack of education. More help and assistance under bilateral and multilateral arrangements is necessary to help the developing countries in their attempts to reach higher standards of living.

19. I want to emphasize that the launching of the United Nations Development Decade is an important step which has been taken by this Organization. The Decade calls for the mobilization of all the resources of the Organization, of the specialized agencies, and of the technical co-operative organs.

20. We support the recommendations made in this respect by the Secretary-General, particularly those recommendations which call for expansion in the flow of capital and assistance to under-developed countries; an increase of \$25 million yearly in the resources of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund in order to reach a combined level of \$300 million annually for these valuable activities; intensification of work to develop natural resources, and, in particular, action to stabilize the international commodity markets on which the economies of developing countries depend. We hope also that the proposals concerning the creation of a United Nations Capital Development Fund will be approved as soon as possible without further delay.

21. I have one last word, on the importance of international co-operation in world trade. We have important items related to this question on our agenda. Because of its importance, the United Nations has been dealing with this question since its foundation. World trade is an important instrument of co-operation among nations. This co-operation will be strengthened if discriminatory economic and trade policies are not

pursued by one or a group of nations against other nations. We, on our part, recognize the importance of international trade, and we have maintained our trade relations in an atmosphere of friendly co-operation with all countries.

22. To promote better trade, coastal States should co-operate with countries which are without a seacoast, and should not hinder their economic progress by the imposition of obstructions in the way of their trade relations with other countries. In this respect, all Member nations should respect General Assembly resolution 1028 (XI) which decided that the need of land-locked States, and States having no access to the sea, for adequate transit facilities, should be recognized in promoting international trade. This resolution further invites all Members of the United Nations to give:

"...full recognition to the needs of land-locked Member States in the matter of transit trade, and, therefore, to accord them adequate facilities in terms of international law and practice in this regard ..."

We hope that the terms of this resolution, which was adopted unanimously by the Assembly, will be respected by all Members, because now almost one-sixth of the Members of the United Nations are land-locked, and, to promote world trade, this co-operation is indeed important and necessary.

23. Mr. President, before I leave the rostrum, I should like to address to you a final word, and join the previous speakers in expressing to you my congratulations on your election as President of this session.

24. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I take this opportunity, Mr. President, to congratulate you on behalf of the Soviet delegation on your election to this high post.

25. The Soviet Government's attitude towards the crucial international problems of our times has been expounded from this rostrum on more than one occasion. Twice, in 1959 and 1960, the General Assembly Hall has been the scene of statements by Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, the Head of the Soviet Government [799th and 869th meetings], in which the foreign policy of the Soviet Union was set forth in detail. These statements proclaimed throughout the world the optimistic outlook of the Soviet people, and its conviction that a new world war was not fatally inevitable and that the present generation of mankind was capable of averting such a war and preventing it from breaking out.

26. To ensure the peaceful coexistence of States with different social structures and to create conditions which will make it possible completely to exclude war from the life of society—such is the basic task, in the field of international relations, set by the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which was adopted last October by that Party's Twenty-second Congress. The foreign policy of the Soviet State is determined by that objective.

27. For thousands of years, periods of peaceful life have been mere breathing-spaces between one war and the next. War simply left the stage for a time, just as servicemen go into the reserve after having completed their term of duty. But the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki forced people who had not yet been

able to recover from the horrors of the Second World War into familiarity with the spectre of a third one.

28. The invention of rocket-propelled nuclear weapons did not represent merely the addition of yet another type of weapon to those already in existence. It meant an incomparable, a colossal, leap forward in the development of means of destruction and annihilation. It presented, in all its magnitude, the task of saving mankind from a destructive world war. And this task the peoples are now in a position to undertake.

29. A comparison of the political map of the world on the eve of the Second World War with a similar map of the present-day world clearly reveals the radical evolution which has altered the aspect of our planet during that period.

30. The map of 1938 did not show the mighty confraternity of the socialist countries, now embracing more than one third of the world's population and more than one quarter of its territory. Socialism by its very nature aspires to peace, just as aggression and military adventure are foreign to it. For this reason the socialist countries throw the whole of their international authority and might into the scales of the struggle for peace.

31. As the result of national-liberation wars and anti-imperialist revolutions over fifty sovereign States have arisen on the ruins of colonial empires, most of them having attained their independence during the past six years. And these States are swelling the ranks of those who defend the cause of peace.

32. Look at the map of Central Europe. It no longer displays Hitler's Reich, which unleashed the Second World War. The backbone of German militarism, as a result of that war, was broken. A peace-loving German State, the German Democratic Republic, has established itself east of the Elbe. This, too, will promote the maintenance of peace.

33. But no geographical atlas can reflect yet another very important factor which has changed the situation in the world—the peoples' growing determination to manacle the forces planning war. If we were to choose any specific colour for indicating the places where people concerned to prevent war live and labour, we should probably have to shade, with that colour, every inhabited tract of land. However, in that uniformly coloured map we should have to stick flags of a different colour, showing the location of those who are impelling mankind towards a new war.

34. But the existence of the possibility of averting war is one thing, and the realization of that possibility another. The General Assembly of the United Nations cannot fail to be aware that with every passing day preparations for a rocket-nuclear war are expanding throughout the world and that the threat of the outbreak of such a war is consequently increasing.

35. The United Nations would not justify the hopes of the peoples if it were to repeat the lamentable experience and mistakes of its predecessor, the League of Nations, which, like the United Nations, was intended to combat aggression and the arms race and to strive for the strengthening of peace and the security of States. It is common knowledge that the League of Nations disintegrated, like a metal structure eaten away by rust, because it was undermined and shattered by aggressive forces. Those forces prevented the adoption of proposals for disarmament, and for the suppressing of aggression and international provocation, sub-

mitted by the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries; in other words, they did not allow the League of Nations to become a real instrument for the defence of peace. Moreover the fascist States, seeking to create conditions of impunity for themselves and to have their hands free for aggression, left the League of Nations altogether. As we know, Japan was the first to go, after having attacked China, and was followed by Hitlerite Germany and finally by fascist Italy.

36. At that time, the Soviet Union issued forceful warnings and called for effective measures to prevent aggression and to avert the outbreak of a world war, but the League of Nations disregarded those proposals and did nothing to prevent the catastrophe.

37. After the Second World War, the United Nations was created, with the object of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war. An analysis of the position which has now developed suggests a certain analogy with the period of sore trial for the League of Nations which preceded its disintegration. The present situation in the United Nations cannot but alarm all those who stand for the maintenance of peace and peaceful coexistence.

38. A circumstance bound to arouse particular concern among the Members of the United Nations gathered here for the General Assembly's seventeenth session is the statement on Cuba made by Mr. Kennedy, the President of the United States of America, at a press conference held on 13 September last. The United States of America is one of the founders of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council; economically and militarily it is the most powerful of all the capitalist countries. It would seem that such a country and its statesmen, if only because of the responsibility weighing upon the United States of America as a great Power, should show particular respect for the United Nations Charter and frame their policy accordingly. But this statement by President Kennedy indicates precisely the contrary.

39. The Soviet Government has naturally observed that the statement of the President of the United States also contained some sound appraisals, revealing a realistic understanding of certain aspects of the Cuban question and of the situation which has developed. It must be noted that the Government of the United States of America has publicly dissociated itself from the bellicose circles in its country which have been calling for immediate armed aggression against Cuba. But the tone is set, not by these sober pronouncements, but by crude threats—which in fact cancels out what was positive in the statement. It follows from the President's words that the United States of America is free to take military action against Cuba and will decide for itself the juncture at which it regards it as necessary to undertake such an invasion. The President said that the United States Government would continue as before to collaborate with the leaders of the Cuban counter-revolution, who have found refuge in the territory of the United States. The events of recent days do not reduce, but intensify the alarm felt by States Members of the United Nations with regard to United States policy towards Cuba.

40. We may ask: Where are the obligations, solemnly assumed by the United States of America under the United Nations Charter, which provide for non-intervention by States in each other's domestic affairs? Are we to believe that when the United States delegation, which sat at the same table with us at the Conference of States founders of the United Nations in

1945, affixed its signature to the Charter in the name of the United States of America, that was nothing but an empty farce? In those days, after all, the leaders of the United States Government assured us that the United States of America took seriously the obligations it was assuming under the United Nations Charter. But where is this serious attitude now?

41. Representatives gathered here for the General Assembly have doubtless already been able to realize the extent to which war hysteria in regard to Cuba has arisen in the United States, and what a campaign of hostility against the Cuban people is rampant in American newspapers, radio and television. Things have reached such a point that a list of pretexts which could be used to justify an invasion of Cuba has been published in advance, and this list includes everything under the sun.

42. For example, if the United States of America considers that Cuba is in any way "hampering" the functioning of the experimental rocket-launching pads at Cape Canaveral in Florida, that would apparently suffice for the mightiest Power of the Western hemisphere to bear down upon little Cuba with all its military strength. Of course, those who contemplate aggression against Cuba will find no difficulty in levelling any charges they wish against that country, however absurd the charges may be. In the final analysis, Cuba can be blamed for any failure of rocket tests on Cape Canaveral. Apparently, Cuba is already at fault for being situated so near to Florida.

43. If this logic is taken as a guide, it would appear that any State, especially a powerful one, can accuse its neighbour of hampering the execution of certain measures in a given area. But since it is impossible to remove even a small State in the way that houses, for instance, are nowadays moved from one place to another, and since Cuba cannot be moved farther away from Florida or Florida from Cuba, what is the solution? Does this mean that the stronger neighbour has the right to gobble up the weaker?

44. Another of the listed pretexts for attacking Cuba is the existence of a threat to the security of the United States military base at Guantánamo, which is maintained on the territory of Cuba without the consent of its Government. But is it not clear that any incident can be invented in the United States of America and declared to be evidence of a threat to that base?

45. It is also said that the United States of America will be prepared to attack Cuba if it considers that Cuba is building up its forces to such a degree that it may constitute a threat to the United States of America, a threat to United States communications with the Panama Canal, or a threat to any State of the Western hemisphere. Any clear-thinking person knows that Cuba is pursuing neither the first, nor the second nor the third of these objectives. The statesmen of the United States of America also know this full well. They are further quite aware of the fact that the assistance rendered by the Soviet Union to Cuba for the strengthening of its independence has none of those objectives in view, since they are foreign to our policy.

46. A number of other equally trumped-up charges against Cuba could be adduced, each and all amounting to one and the same thing: that the United States of America announces the circumstances in which it may commit an act of aggression against Cuba, and that the United States itself assumes the role of judge in determining whether or not such circumstances have arisen.

47. It may be asked: What sort of a policy is this? It is a policy of aggression, a policy of international banditry. Upon what is such a policy based? Obviously, upon a notion inherited from barbaric times: you are strong, then throttle the less strong and especially the weak. But such are the laws of the wild animal kingdom, where the strong devour the weak. These, however, are beasts. Human beings must surely distinguish themselves from the beasts.

48. Some statesmen of the United States speak of the need to tighten control over the whole Caribbean area, as if the Caribbean Sea were some kind of internal lake within the United States of America. Let us merely ask: Who agrees to recognize United States control over the international waters of that sea? The United States might with equal success claim the Atlantic Ocean as its own, as the self-appointed heir of the god Neptune, who in ancient mythology was the lord of the seas. The less-bridled politicians in the United States, clearly losing control of their reasoning, say, if you please, that it is necessary to control the movements of Soviet ships carrying goods to Cuba and from Cuba to the Soviet Union, and of the specialists who are helping the Cubans to put their industry and agriculture on an even keel. But who is going to permit the exercise of such control? Is it not clear that such demands are a call to piracy and must be decisively condemned? It would be better if those making such demands understood their reckless nature.

49. And what can be said about the crude pressure exerted by the United States upon a number of other States, including its own allies in NATO, with a view to preventing them from supplying ships for the transport of goods to and from Cuba? What value attaches to the statements of United States representatives when, under the roof of the United Nations, they speak of economic co-operation and assistance to other countries while at the same time this mighty Power tries to snatch a crust of bread from the hands of a small country?

50. Can the United Nations tolerate the fact that one of its Members loudly proclaims its right to attack another country which is also a Member of the United Nations? And that it does so because the domestic institutions of that other country conflict with the way of thinking of the United States Government and are not to its taste?

51. No, it is not possible to disregard such statements. This is indeed to undermine the one foundation upon which the United Nations can rest: non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States, and respect for their institutions and way of life. It would seem that the countries belonging to the capitalistic system consider it possible, in order to ensure the dominance of that system throughout the world, to attack a State having a different, a socialist, social system. But such a policy would be the death-sentence for the United Nations, since the Organization can exist only if all countries, regardless of their social or political structures, respect each other's independence and sovereignty and do not permit interference by one in the affairs of another. If the United Nations were to concur in the principles proclaimed by the President of the United States of America in his statement on Cuba, that would lead straight to its collapse. This is a policy capable of destroying the United Nations. And the United Nations will in fact be destroyed if that policy prevails.

52. The situation is becoming all the more dangerous in that the United States is not only using with independent and peace-loving Cuba the language of menace, but is also engaging in concrete acts of aggression against that State.

53. It is a matter of common knowledge that many cut-throats driven out by the Cuban people have found shelter in the United States or live, on American money, in neighbouring countries, whence they carry out piratical raids on the Republic of Cuba. These raids are executed with the support of the United States, which provides Cuba's inveterate enemies with all the arms and equipment they need. Full responsibility for the piratical activities and banditry of the Cuban cut-throats rests, therefore, with the Government of the United States.

54. If one State Member of the United Nations arrogates to itself the right to announce and conduct a policy threatening the independence and security of its neighbours, then other States Members will obviously be unable to rely on the United Nations and will be compelled to seek other means of repelling the insolent imperialistic encroachments of those who wish to rule the world by force of arms. It will then only remain for the United Nations, as for the League of Nations in its day, to look on at its own collapse. But times are altogether different nowadays. They are far from what they were in the period of the League of Nations, and are not even what they were in the first years after the Second World War. In our day of the conquest of space, States possess rocket-nuclear weapons, with all their appalling destructive power. Today only a madman could conduct a policy from "positions of strength", or even think that such a policy might in any way be successful and enable him to impose his ideology or his own form of political organization upon other States. The Soviet Union and the socialist countries possess, at the very least, the same implements as the capitalist countries. For that reason, questions in dispute must now be settled, not by rattling the sabre and threatening other States, but by seeking reasonable arguments and arriving at decisions such as to strengthen peace and security for all peoples.

55. Respect for the sovereign rights of every State, renunciation of all intervention in the domestic affairs of other States, recognition of the right of Governments to establish the social and political system corresponding to the interests and wishes of their people—such must be the fixed and infrangible rules of contemporary international life. Without the unswerving observance of these rules there can be neither peace, nor peaceful coexistence, nor, in the final analysis, even a United Nations.

56. That is why the Soviet Government considers it necessary to raise its voice in warning and draw the attention of States Members of the United Nations to the full seriousness of the implications, for peace, of the policy pursued by the United States of America in regard to the Republic of Cuba. If the States represented here wish to preserve the United Nations and to make it an effective instrument for the preservation and strengthening of peace, then such a policy and such actions must be resolutely condemned.

57. In our time—and this applies particularly to a great Power—we cannot lose our heads or our composure and treat questions involving war and peace as lightly as some United States political leaders treat the situation in regard to Cuba. An attack on Cuba would lead to the consequences of which the Soviet

Government warned the whole world in its well-known declaration of 11 September 1962.

58. Those who have formed aggressive military groupings and thrown a network of their own military bases—those spring-boards of aggression—around the world, those who are preventing the elimination of the traces of the Second World War, can hardly be expected to come to this rostrum and say "Yes, we are initiating and taking part in preparations for war". It is a well-known fact that wars are almost always prepared behind a screen of assurances about devotion to peace. That is the bitter truth. And the alarm must be sounded, not after the fatal events, but today.

59. Study the newspapers and magazines and listen carefully to the voices on the radio of a number of countries, and you will come to the inescapable conclusion that those circles which have diverted one of science's greatest achievements—the liberation of atomic power—to purposes of destruction and annihilation are working day and night to becloud the minds of the peoples and accustom them to the thought that nuclear war is inevitable.

60. Policy-making officials in the United States, the United Kingdom and other Western countries can often be heard saying that the best guarantee against a new war is the "balance of fear". Means of destruction and annihilation have become so powerful, argue the proponents of this view, that no State will run the risk of starting a nuclear war since it will inevitably sustain a retaliatory nuclear blow. And since each side realizes this, the fear of retribution should restrain it from beginning to resort to the language of arms. And therefore, we are told, the higher the mountains of arms that are piled up, and the more destructive and murderous those arms become, the better it will be, because the greater will be the fear.

61. In other words, in the view of the advocates of this dangerous and aggressive doctrine, which in some NATO countries has been elevated to the status of a Government policy, the supreme expression of a love of peace is general and complete ... armament, a frenzied orgy of arming.

62. But to base the policy of States on a feeling of universal fear would be tantamount to keeping the world in a permanent state of feverish tension and eve-of-war hysteria. In such an atmosphere, each State would fear that the other side would lose its nerve and fire the first shot. Would not this create the temptation to prevent the opponent from gaining a lead? This would be exactly like a duel of olden times when the opponents raised their pistols, aimed at each other's foreheads, and waited for the other's shot—with perhaps this difference, that there would be no seconds to see that the rules of the duel were observed and to give the signal for it to begin.

63. The military doctrine of the "balance of fear" is simply half a step towards the even more dangerous doctrine of a preventive nuclear war. But the Soviet delegation will discuss this point separately.

64. There is only one reliable way of preventing a new world war from breaking out, and that is to destroy the material apparatus of war. General and complete disarmament—such is the programme of action which is now being advocated by no less than three quarters of the world's countries. This programme will be carried out sooner if fewer people are victims of the notion that the arms race and war are inevitable, and if they fight with more resolution

and solidarity for disarmament as an urgent and performable task.

65. The United Nations has been discussing the problem of disarmament for over sixteen years. It might be said that this problem has become a United Nations "sputnik". A large number of commissions, committees and sub-committees have already been put into orbit around this problem. Unfortunately they too have experienced a state akin to weightlessness, for, translated into realistic terms, the decisions they have taken in fact weigh nothing at all. Even now the Eighteen-Nation Committee, charged with drafting an agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control, has been unable to gratify the General Assembly with any successful fulfilment of the task assigned to it.

66. What is the matter? Why is the negotiating machinery merely "ticking over"? The reason is that by no means all the participants in the negotiations are really trying to reach agreement on disarmament.

67. The Soviet Government submitted to the Committee a comprehensive draft treaty on general and complete disarmament [DC/203, annex 1, sec. C]. This draft provided that general and complete disarmament would be brought about in three stages over a period of four years. Even after completion of the first stage, the world would be radically different from the world in which we live today, in that there would no longer be any danger of a nuclear attack by one State upon another. For under the Soviet draft, the first stage would see the destruction of all vehicles for delivering nuclear weapons to their targets, the liquidation of military bases on foreign territory, and the withdrawal of foreign troops to within their national frontiers. This means that nuclear weapons would already be rendered harmless and would lie, like worthless stuff, in depots. As a result of the measures to be taken during the second stage, nuclear weapons would be destroyed and the very conception of "nuclear Power" would disappear. By the end of the third stage, the abolition of all armed forces and armaments would be complete. [DC/203, annex 1, section C.]

68. If the proposals of the Soviet Government were implemented, then by the time the children born in the year of the disarmament treaty's conclusion were old enough to go to school there would no longer remain in the world any armaments which might some day threaten their lives.

69. During the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, the Soviet Government made a number of important additions and amendments [A/5200-DC/205, annex 1, sect. D] to its draft treaty, in order to make it easier to find a common language in discussions with the Western Powers. It accepted the ideas of the Western Powers regarding the reduction of conventional armed forces and armaments, and met the Western Powers half-way in regard to the levels of armed forces, although it considered that a more radical reduction in armaments and the numbers of men under arms would be more in the interest of the quickest possible accomplishment of disarmament.

70. The Governments of the Western Powers complained that the time-limits for disarmament envisaged in the Soviet draft were too rigid. The Soviet Government favours the swiftest possible implementation of a programme of general and complete disarmament;

but on this point, too, we did not insist on our conditions, and agreed that the time-limits for disarmament be spread over five years.

71. If the business of disarmament has so far failed to make any headway, as though it were frozen deep in centuries-old ice, the blame for this must be placed on the NATO Powers and on them alone. The proposals which the Western Powers brought with them to Geneva were stuffed with all sorts of things, but the main thing was lacking—the readiness to scrap the war machine of States. These proposals are based, as before, on the desire to establish control over armaments, and not over disarmament; to breach the defence system of the USSR and the other socialist countries; and to maintain, for an indefinite length of time, the military bases and armed forces of the Western Powers on foreign soil.

72. It is a fact that the Governments of the Western Powers, and particularly the Government of the United States of America, stop short of no tricks and no juggling in order to justify the need for retaining their military bases on the territory of foreign States, virtually up to the very end of the disarmament programme's implementation. This means that they make disarmament itself impossible, since it would be naïve to think that the Soviet Union and the other socialist States would agree to accept so absurd a demand. Acceptance of this demand would mean that the Soviet Union and other peace-loving States would, in effect, be obliged to throw themselves on the mercy of the imperialist Powers and place their security in the hands of those Powers. We have no doubt that the demand to retain military bases on the territory of other countries has been specially devised to bury disarmament before any steps are taken to make it a reality.

73. The fact that the Western Powers are now putting their demands on control in a new form in no way changes the substance of these demands. They now propose that we should turn the territories of other States into something resembling a chess-board, divided into zones, and on this board play out the game of control. But the moves in this game would be made with the old aim in view—the securing of reconnaissance data which could be of interest only to a potential aggressor.

74. The Head of the Soviet Government, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, stated in 1960 from this rostrum [882nd meeting] that the Soviet Union was ready to accept any proposals of the Western Powers on control if the Western Powers, for their part, would accept the Soviet proposals on general and complete disarmament. For two years now we have been waiting for a reply.

75. At the Geneva talks, the United States Government objected categorically to the elimination, in the first stage of disarmament, of all vehicles for delivering nuclear weapons to their target, declaring that States embarking on disarmament would still for a time need some kind of "protective umbrella". We do not consider such conclusions to be justified; but in order to start a real move forward, we are ready to make yet another effort.

76. Taking into account the position of the Western Powers, the Soviet Government agrees that in the destruction, during the first stage of disarmament, of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles an exception should be made for a strictly limited and agreed number of global (intercontinental) missiles, anti-missile mis-

siles and anti-aircraft missiles of the "ground-air" type, to remain at the disposal of the Soviet Union and the United States, respectively, alone. Means of defence would thus be retained, for a fixed length of time, to guard against the eventuality, as to which Western leaders have expressed anxiety, of someone deciding to violate the treaty and conceal missiles or combat aircraft.

77. The Soviet Government is making corresponding amendments to its draft "Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control" which it is submitting for the consideration of the General Assembly of the United Nations at its present session.

78. There is no wider international forum for the discussion of the disarmament problem than the United Nations General Assembly, in which over 100 States are represented. And this is the place where the truth should be made known about those who are stifling the hope for disarmament, who are placing their narrow, selfish aims above the vital interests of the peoples.

79. It is the monopolies which have made the production of instruments of death their trade that are the chief enemies of disarmament. They have reaped a bloody but rich harvest from the First and Second World Wars. Traders in death, they want to secure, both today and tomorrow, thousands of millions in profits. Tomorrow, as yesterday, they want no drying-up of the golden fountain of profit derived from the arms race, and therefore give the people no chance of escaping from the vicious circle—from war, through the creation of ever more destructive means of annihilation, to yet more destructive war. It is they who have fixed a hundred locks on the door between disarmament and the frenzied arms race. But in comparison with the consequences of a feverish arms race, in comparison with the thermo-nuclear war, the interests of a handful of people waxing fat on armaments are as nothing.

80. It is not armaments that are destined, in our age, to decide which social and political system is the best and to which the future belongs, but the demonstration, in peaceful competition, of the advantages of one system over the other. No matter what ideology they proclaim or what God they believe in, each and every nation wants to live. The cause of disarmament is therefore their common cause.

81. The Soviet Government calls on the Governments of Member States of the United Nations to take full cognizance of all their responsibility to the peoples in the matter of disarmament.

82. They are accustomed to looking at the problem of disarmament from only one angle—that of the elimination of the war machine of States. There is, however, another side to the matter. General and complete disarmament signifies not only destruction of the apparatus of war, but the freeing from the clutches of armaments of enormous material and financial resources.

83. The World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace which took place this summer at Moscow, and at which most nations and political trends of the present-day world were represented, stressed that the struggle for disarmament was also a struggle for a sound economic policy, which would enable disarma-

ment to be carried out in such a way as to serve, to the maximum, the progress of mankind.

84. Diverting the resources spent on armaments to the development of the peaceful economy of States, and to a raising of the living and cultural standards of the peoples, is a great and worthy task which merits the most serious consideration. The Soviet Government is therefore proposing the inclusion in the General Assembly's agenda, as a separate question, of the item "Economic programme for disarmament" [A/5233].

85. The experts who carried out an examination of the economic consequences of disarmament in accordance with a decision taken by the General Assembly at its fifteenth session [resolution 1516 (XV)], established, on the basis of official data, that the world was spending roughly \$120,000 million annually on military account. It followed that, if the arms race is not ended, at least \$3,000,000 million will be spent on military account in the next twenty-five years.

86. What would happen if these resources were directed to a productive end? It has been calculated that the available riches of the world could be more than doubled; and this is by no means all. It would be also possible to convert to peaceful needs the enormous sums at present immobilized in all kinds of armaments, ammunition and strategic reserves. One hundred million people who are uselessly employing their knowledge and strength in service in the armed forces or are working for war in industry, agriculture and transport could be successfully transferred to peaceful creative work. The removal of military inventions and techniques from the secret list would give a powerful stimulus to peaceful industry, and would transform the technology of civil branches of the economy.

87. Disarmament alone, of course, will not remedy all the troubles and adversities which at present afflict mankind; but it can materially expedite the development of all countries and, above all, help people to satisfy their most pressing needs.

88. Everyone gains from such a programme: the countries which owing to colonialism are economically backward, the socialist countries, and the industrialized capitalist countries.

89. According to the calculations of the economists, if one fifth of the money spent on military needs by the States belonging to military-political groups were used to promote the development of the economically backward countries, the sum for this purpose would amount to \$20,000 million a year, or \$500,000 million over twenty-five years. This sum together with their domestic resources, would suffice to enable the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America to approach the current level of industrial output in countries such as England and France within the lifetime of the present generation, namely within the next twenty to twenty-five years. With \$500,000 million it would be possible to establish thirty to forty large new industrial areas in the world, similar to the Ruhr or to the industrial complex which has been set up in Soviet Siberia around the Bratsk hydroelectric power station.

90. The Soviet Government is submitting to the General Assembly a draft "Declaration concerning the



conversion to peaceful needs of the resources released by disarmament" [A/5233]. The Soviet Government considers that the United Nations should at once, without waiting for the conclusion of the negotiations on general and complete disarmament, proceed to the preparation of an international programme for the peaceful use of the means and resources at present employed for military purposes. The timely preparation of such a programme would not only make it possible to prepare on a world scale, for the painless transfer of States' economies to peaceful lines immediately after the reaching of agreement on disarmament; it would also help the peoples to appreciate more clearly the necessity and significance of disarmament, and would thus attract, under the banner of peaceful coexistence and disarmament, millions and millions of new and active supporters of this great cause.

91. The present session of the General Assembly is to have its say on the question of the suspension of nuclear tests.

92. The attitude of the Soviet Union is well known: it is that all nuclear tests—whether in the atmosphere, in the outer space, underground, or under water—should be banned immediately and unreservedly. If this matter had depended on the Soviet Union alone, experiments with nuclear weapons would long ago have ceased.

93. In order to justify their position, which obstructs the reaching of an agreement on the suspension of all types of nuclear weapon testing, the representatives of the Western Powers often resort to juggling with facts, seeking to reproach the Soviet Union with having allegedly broken some moratorium on nuclear explosions. To those who make such assertions, we must reply that it is impossible to break something which never existed.

94. Although the Soviet Union has more than once urged the Western Powers to negotiate a moratorium, no inter-State agreement involving commitment to a moratorium on nuclear explosions and to its observance has ever been reached. The myth about a moratorium was dragged out only when the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and other NATO States found themselves in need of an excuse for the new series of nuclear weapon tests unleashed by them.

95. Everyone knows quite well that it was not the Soviet Union which started nuclear testing and the nuclear arms race. All the nuclear test explosions set off by the Soviet Union have simply been an answer to the operations of the United States and its NATO allies, the United Kingdom and France. The United States was the first to embark on nuclear tests, so it is the United States and its allies which should be the first to suspend tests. The Soviet Union has every right to be the last to carry out nuclear weapon tests.

96. The Western Powers created the dispute over control, in order to kill any possibility of an international agreement on the suspension of nuclear tests. Science and experience confirm that States now possess all the necessary means for controlling, with adequate accuracy, the observance of an agreement on the suspension of tests. Even the specialists of the United States Department of Defense are now compelled to acknowledge this fact. Nevertheless, month after month and year after year, the United States and the United Kingdom have been preventing the conclusion

of such an agreement and have been seeking the Soviet Union's approval for the establishment on its territory of a network of international control posts which, while unnecessary for verification of the fulfilment of an agreement, are strongly desired by NATO's military staffs.

97. The United States and the United Kingdom oppose any proposals, whether advanced by the Soviet Union or by the neutralist States, for a ban on nuclear weapon tests, if such proposals are based on the possibility of using national detection systems for the purpose of control. In rejecting the proposals of the Soviet Union and the neutralist countries, the Western Powers continue to follow the old line; either the suspension of tests plus the establishment of a large-scale espionage system under the flag of control, or the legalization of underground nuclear explosions. It is to be hoped that they have not yet said their last word.

98. A few days ago the Soviet Government proposed the signature of an agreement banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space and specifically committing countries to continue negotiations on the suspension of underground tests. Naturally, while such negotiations are in progress and until such time as an agreement on the suspension of underground nuclear weapon tests is reached, such tests should not be conducted. We consider that this proposal provides a good basis for an agreement. The key to the solution of the problem lies in the hands of the Western Powers.

99. The General Assembly should also give serious consideration to the proposals on individual measures conducive to a lessening of international tension. There has long been a pressing need to implement the well-known proposal of the Polish People's Republic for the establishment of an atom-free zone in Central Europe [697th meeting].<sup>3/</sup> The idea contained in this proposal gave rise to plans for the creation of "denuclearized" zones in a number of other areas of the world. By supporting these plans, the General Assembly would render a valuable service to the cause of peace.

100. Both an agreement by Governments to refrain from the use of nuclear weapons, and the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact Organization, would constitute definite protection against the threat of nuclear war. These and other similar measures would at the same time remove not a few of the obstacles to general and complete disarmament.

101. In the present international situation, the task of normalizing international trade has assumed very great—I would even say, tremendous—importance. In this field there are abnormal circumstances which have been particularly aggravated by the establishment of the "Common Market".

102. The United Nations can see how entire groups of industrially developed countries, by means of discriminatory restrictions on trade, are locking the doors of their markets and adapting their external economic relations to the interests of the NATO military bloc.

103. Whatever the publicly attired in which the organizers of the "Common Market" may dress up their policy, they will convince no one that this closed economic group is not primarily directed towards intensifying the arms race and strengthening the West

German revenge-seeking forces. It may also be counted upon to bind the economies of the under-developed States even closer to the economies of the imperialist Powers, to leave the new-born States with the one-sided economic structure inherited from colonialism, and to prevent these States from attaining to genuine independence.

104. It cannot be denied that the United Nations has a great debt to discharge towards the peoples, since the Organization itself is to a high degree called upon to concern itself with the improvement of international trade, which helps towards a more rational use of the labour of man and the natural wealth of the soil, and brings States closer together.

105. It has long been a pressing need to call an international conference on trade problems, which would consider the question of setting up an international trade organization embracing all areas and countries of the world without any sort of discrimination.

106. The Soviet Government is submitting to the General Assembly of the United Nations for its consideration, as a separate agenda item, a proposal for the holding in 1963 of an international conference on trade problems [A/5219]. It is convinced that such a conference, and the establishment of an international trade organization, would not only create a sound basis for the development of economic intercourse between States, but would also help to bring about an atmosphere of confidence in their relations and a lessening of international tension.

107. In using every means, including the development of mutually advantageous international trade relations, to help strengthen the economic self-dependence of the young independent States of Asia, Africa and Latin America, we must not forget that there are other countries and peoples which are still subject to the colonial yoke. I do not think I need list all the crimes perpetrated by the colonialists. Reports regarding these crimes are published and are known to Members of the General Assembly.

108. Everyone remembers the occasion when, acting on the appeal made by the Head of the Soviet Government, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)]. That marked a great step forward. Inspired by the lofty ideas expressed in the Declaration, many peoples have attained independence. The Algerian people's heroic struggle for liberation has culminated in resounding victory.

109. Many changes have taken place in the world in the two years which have elapsed since the adoption of that historic Declaration. Only the colonialists have not changed their nature: by every means in their power they have obstructed, and continue to obstruct, the peoples' liberation. To cherish the hope that they will amicably leave the oppressed peoples alone would involve protracting the Declaration's implementation indefinitely. Moreover, as the example of the Congo shows, the future of young and as yet unconsolidated States would be jeopardized, since their wealth whets the appetite of the predatory monopolies.

110. Those who bear the responsibility for the present situation in the Congo are attempting to make the Soviet Union and other States pay for the operations of the colonial Powers aimed at subverting the independence of the Congo and dismembering that country. Can it be that they want us to pay for the murder of Patrice

Lumumba and hundreds of other patriots, for the tripartite aggression against Egypt and other similar crimes? Let no one entertain the belief that the Soviet Union will give a single kopeck or a single cent to help the colonialists sanctify their criminal deeds.

111. The Congolese tragedy is not yet over. Under cover of the United Nations flag, the colonial Powers are even now, in collusion with each other, giving effect to a new plan to split that country and turn its richest areas into appendages of the imperialist monopolies. The decisions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Congolese question are thus being unceremoniously set aside. The Soviet Government considers that the United Nations would not be performing its clear duty if it left the Congolese people at the mercy of the colonial Powers.

112. By their struggle, the peoples have broken many links in the chain of colonial domination, but they have not yet broken the entire chain. It is the vital duty of the United Nations to tear off and destroy the colonial shackles completely.

113. Whenever the most urgent tasks of consolidating peace are at issue, our thoughts inevitably turn to the problem of concluding a German peace treaty and normalizing, on that basis, the situation in West Berlin. This problem, in its acuteness, can even rival the problem of disarmament. The United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and certain other NATO countries are in effect turning the question of a German peace treaty into a test of strength between East and West. This leads to acute and very dangerous tension in relations between States and particularly between the great Powers.

114. The seventeen years which have elapsed since the defeat of Hitler's Germany have not planed down the sharp edges of the German problem; on the contrary, they have made them even sharper. The writing of finis to the Second World War by means of the conclusion of a German peace treaty is not merely what is required by international standards and practice, but, as post-war experience has shown, is essential to the establishment of lasting peace in Europe. One has only to look objectively at the present position in the Federal Republic of Germany and in West Berlin in order to be convinced of this fact.

115. If we compare the situation existing in the Federal Republic of Germany today with that in the Germany of the thirties, we can see that there is hardly any significant difference. It is true that the flags no longer bear the spidery swastika emblem. The former portraits have been replaced by others. But this is merely an outward change. There is a striking similarity in substance between the policy of Germany today and that which it was pursuing on the eve of the Second World War.

116. Before he shattered the Treaty of Versailles which had imposed certain military restrictions on Germany, Hitler prepared, within the framework of a 100,000-man-strong Reichswehr, the cadres of his future armies of millions. Today, hundreds of thousands of recruits are being moved through the barracks of the Bundeswehr by means of the same production-line technique. Their military training is based on the experience gained from Hitler's predatory campaigns. There are at present in the Federal Republic of Germany more soldiers who have donned uniform than in the vast majority of the States, represented in the

United Nations, which took part in the war against German fascism.

117. On the eve of its downfall, Nazi Germany was feverishly trying to master the secret of the atomic bomb, counting on its help to change the course of the Second World War. What Hitler was not able to achieve his successors in West Germany now wish to accomplish. They are making approaches from various directions to nuclear arsenals, trying to acquire these weapons, if not directly, then under the cover of NATO. In this connexion the Federal Republic of Germany states that it is only seeking to attain "equality of armaments" with other Powers—nothing more. Nazi Germany also started by demanding equality in armaments. We all remember how that ended. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany obviously does not want to leave the trail blazed by Hitler.

118. Nothing is changed by the fact that the statesmen of certain countries which are neighbours of West Germany today close their eyes to the dangers of West German revenge-seeking and are even participating, side by side with it, in militaristic and revenge-seeking manifestations along the banks of the Rhine. It would be better, however, for those statesmen to open their eyes, not after the metal and fire of war have crashed down on the heads of their peoples, but while it is still possible for all this to be averted.

119. The leaders of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany go so far as to declare that the Second World War is not over, that it is continuing. This is what post-war European frontiers unconsolidated by a peace treaty signify! This is what the absence of a German peace treaty leads to! If an impartial court were requested to give its view on the policy of the present Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, the mere statements of Bonn Ministers would suffice to produce the finding that that Government is in fact guilty of preparing revenge.

120. In stating all this, the Soviet Government is itself prompted not by any feeling of revenge, which is alien to the Soviet people, and certainly not by any fear of West Germany, but rather by a desire to prevent a recurrence of tragic events. The Soviet Union is ready to extend the hand of friendship to the Federal Republic of Germany as well. However, if genuine good-neighbour relations are to be established, there must be reciprocal action on the part of the Federal Republic of Germany. West Germany's policy-makers must come to understand that such relations correspond to the vital interests of the Federal Republic's population itself.

121. With every passing month, tension is mounting in West Berlin, which has been turned into a NATO military base directed against the USSR, the German Democratic Republic and the other socialist countries. Few days pass without attempts to use West Berlin for provocations against the German Democratic Republic, and that fact alone represents a threat to peace.

122. Certain Western statesmen assert that West Berlin is not a NATO base at all. The troops belong to NATO, but no one knows to whom the base belongs. Is this not Pharisaism?

123. No, West Berlin is a military base belonging to NATO and to no-one else. The troops of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc are stationed there, and the base serves the purposes of that bloc. If any further

confirmation were needed, it would be enough to take the statement made by Mr. Stikker, Secretary-General of NATO, at a Press conference held at Oslo on 10 September, in which in substance, he admits that the Western Powers have turned West Berlin into a NATO base. Stikker's statement concerning the determination of that military bloc to defend the rights of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France in West Berlin and to defend freedom of access to West Berlin, and other arguments of the kind, afford yet further evidence that a NATO base has been established in West Berlin under cover of the occupation régime. The Western Powers are trying to justify the presence of their troops, or, rather NATO troops, in West Berlin on the basis of old, outdated agreements going back to the wartime period. But the question of issue today is that of a German peace treaty, of restoring the situation in West Berlin to normal on the basis of such a treaty, and thus putting an end to the occupation of West Berlin and its use as a base of the aforementioned military bloc.

124. It is inadmissible that West Berlin should become a military base of the NATO bloc for use against the socialist countries. As long as the occupation régime is maintained in West Berlin, as long as the situation in that city is not restored to normal, there is and can be no guarantee that in the confined space of West Berlin, where the troops of the two most powerful groupings stand only a few metres apart, someone may not commit, at any moment, an act of provocation which will shake our planet to its foundations.

125. The USSR Government's position is that a German peace settlement can be reached without prejudice to the interests or prestige of any country or group of countries. Of course, the best solution of all would be for the Western Powers to sign, with us and with other countries, one or two separate peace treaties with the two German States. But if the Western Powers will not agree to the joint signature of a German peace treaty or two peace treaties, the Soviet Government will also entertain the following possibility: the Soviet Union and such other countries as wish to do so will sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, the idea being that at the same time the parties shall reach agreement among themselves on certain problems, well known to the Governments concerned, which call for solution in a German peace settlement. The Soviet Government has referred to these on a number of occasions.

126. The Soviet Union contends that the population of West Berlin should be free to choose their way of life, and that West Berlin should be able to maintain, without let or hindrance, political and other non-military ties with any country on any continent. The German Democratic Republic is prepared to guarantee to West Berlin the free movement of goods and passengers through its territory in accordance with the generally accepted rules of international law. The Soviet Government proposes that West Berlin, as a free city, should be given firm international guarantees to ensure its independence and security.

127. Although we are convinced that there is no need whatsoever for any foreign troops to remain in West Berlin any longer in order to guarantee its independence, the Soviet Government has given its consent to the temporary stationing of token military units in that city. Our proposals on the subject are known and there is no need to repeat them. One variant of our

proposal is that token contingents of United Nations troops should be stationed in West Berlin. What is wrong with a proposal that the United Nations should show itself and demonstrate its will to peace in such an important area as the centre of Europe? When United Nations guarantees are rejected and the presence of NATO troops is categorically insisted upon, it becomes even clearer that considerations of ensuring the independence of West Berlin and the freedom of its population do not really count with the Western Powers.

128. Recent experience has shown that, when there is a desire to solve complex international problems, even very acute ones, on a basis of co-operation and consideration for each other's interests, such co-operation gets results. An example of this was the successful settlement of the Laotian question. Another no less cogent example was the attainment of agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands on the reunion of West Irian with Indonesia. In that connexion, we offer our warm congratulations to the Indonesian people and Government. As Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, the Head of the Soviet Government, has pointed out, both these examples show that complex international problems can and must be solved, not by threats, but by negotiation, by peaceful settlement. This, the only correct method, is consistently advocated by the Soviet Union.

129. But the Western Powers would be making a serious miscalculation if they were to take the Soviet Union's desire to achieve settlement in agreement with them for willingness to accept endless delays in the conclusion of a German peace treaty. If the Western Powers leave us no choice, the Soviet Union, together with such other States as wish to do so, will sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, with all the consequences that entails. In taking that step the Soviet Union will, strictly speaking, only be doing what the United States of America and the other Western Powers did ten years ago in signing, without the USSR, a peace treaty with Japan.

130. Sometimes the NATO countries try resorting to open or disguised threats, to the point of declaring that in response to the conclusion of a peace treaty the Western Powers would even use force. But those who make such statements may be asked this question: are they weighing their words with sufficient care? The Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and the other States which are prepared to sign a German peace treaty will not allow the legitimate rights of the German Democratic Republic to be violated and will not let West Berlin remain a centre of provocation against the socialist States and a NATO base. They will not agree that the occupation régime and the forces of occupation should stay in West Berlin in perpetuity.

131. The conclusion of a German peace treaty will remove the last vestiges of occupation from the territory of the German Democratic Republic, and the parties to the treaty will regard West Berlin as a free, demilitarized city. After such a treaty is signed, control over communications with West Berlin will vest in the German Democratic Republic and no-one else. Its sovereignty will be securely guarded, and the frontiers of the German Democratic Republic will remain under staunch protection.

132. Let no one read into our words a lack of desire to find an agreed solution to the German problem. The Soviet Government and Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, the Head of that Government, personally have stated

more than once that we still prefer such a solution to this whole problem. We shall be compelled to take the action of which I spoke only if no agreed solution can be found.

133. It is impossible to ignore the situation, fraught with great danger, which still prevails in the Far East. The island of Taiwan, Chinese territory since time immemorial, has still not been reunited with China, is still occupied by the United States of America, and has been turned into a military springboard for the United States against the people's China and other socialist States. The longer the United States pursues this aggressive policy towards China, the longer United States occupation of the island of Taiwan continues, the greater will grow the danger to peace in the Far East and throughout the world. The legitimate interests of the people's China and the interests of the maintenance of peace demand that the foreign occupation of Taiwan be brought to an end.

134. The conversion of South Korea into a United States military base and the presence of foreign troops there merely add fuel to the inflammable situation in the Far Eastern region. As you know, the Soviet Government has raised the question of the need to withdraw foreign troops from South Korea and has proposed to the General Assembly that it should consider this question at the present session. A positive solution of this problem would do much to restore the situation to normal in the Far East.

135. Permit me to state the Soviet Government's views on yet another of the most acute factors in the contemporary international situation.

136. I refer to the calls to unleash a preventive nuclear war, to strike the first nuclear blow, which leading statesmen of certain NATO Powers have begun to utter. It is not long since a statement by the President of the United States flashed round the world to the effect that, in certain circumstances, the United States might take the initiative in a nuclear conflict.

137. The Soviet Government would prefer to speak from this rostrum, not of the things which estrange the USSR and the United States and which drive them poles apart, but of that friendship, trust and agreement between them which, we are convinced, would be greeted with deep satisfaction by all those who care about peace. The Soviet Government has stated on more than one occasion that it is in favour of such friendship, and that good relations between the two Powers—the USSR and the United States—would lead to a radical change for the better in the international situation as a whole.

138. If we censure statements about the possibility of resorting to preventive nuclear war, we do not do so in order to criticize particular individuals or statesmen. No; we protest against this doctrine itself, in order to eliminate the dangers it holds for all peoples and, not least, in order to clear the way for co-operation and mutual understanding between the USSR and the United States.

139. Think what is implied in statements about preventive nuclear war. To "take the initiative" in such a war means being the first to rain down atomic and hydrogen bombs on a peaceful country. Any objectively-minded person will say that such an "initiative" is nothing else but aggression. When statements of this kind are spread abroad, not a single person in either the eastern or the western hemisphere can be free

from the oppressive sense that the world can be plunged into a military catastrophe at any moment.

140. Threats of preventive nuclear war are so monstrous that it is difficult even to believe they are being made in the mid-twentieth century, while mankind pays homage to the heroes who are blazing the trail to the stars, and marvels at the invention of highly complex electronic machinery and the many other outstanding achievements of world civilization.

141. In an attempt to present the "shoot first" position in a nuclear war in a more palatable form, its originators assert that the United States will strike the first nuclear blow at the USSR, and thus unleash thermo-nuclear war, in the event of a mass attack by the Soviet Union on Europe with conventional weapons. Statements of this kind have only one purpose: to mislead the credulous.

142. Quite apart from the fact that arguments about any attack by the Soviet Union—mass or not—are in themselves completely without foundation, it is perfectly clear that the purpose of these arguments is to prepare, in anticipation, justifications and loopholes for aggression. When a State intends to provoke a military clash, it will find a way to do so. It will find it no more difficult to represent such a clash, provoked by itself, as a mass attack by the other: that is to say, as precisely what has been declared in advance to be grounds for striking a nuclear blow.

143. The scheme is a somewhat primitive one and in fact differs little from, for example, those used to start the First and, especially, the Second World War. The assumption, manufactured from beginning to end, of a threat of some kind of Soviet attack on Europe is invented only as an outer cloak for the aggressive policy line of the NATO military bloc.

144. The idea of "the first blow", the idea of preventive war, is far from new. In the lifetime of our generation it has already left its bloody trail in dozens of countries in Europe, and not in Europe alone—a trail trodden in by the jackboots of the fascist invaders and ground in by the tracks of their tanks.

145. The Soviet people have not forgotten that Hitlerite Germany's bandit attack on the Soviet Union in June 1941 was also dressed up in statements about a "Soviet threat", although the whole world knew that Hitler and the members of his criminal gang were lying. We must assume, too, that the American people remember Pearl Harbor. Yet what Japan did to the United States of America is what the partisans of the doctrine of preventive war are calling for now.

146. What is happening? The whole world now angrily condemns—and, it is evident, more than one generation will condemn in the future—the policy of fascist Germany and militarist Japan, which plunged mankind into the Second World War. They will condemn the perfidy and cunning of the then arbiters of those countries' destinies, who by lying references to a danger allegedly threatening Germany and Japan sought to justify aggression and their own bloody adventures.

147. What then? Is the doctrine of preventive war now to be used as a weapon by the very people who were themselves among its victims, and who—together with us, their allies in the Second World War—passed sentence on the Nazi criminals? Surely when we, together with the United States and the other allied Powers, tried the chief war criminals, their barbarous policy, which led to the unleashing of the Second World War,

was with them in the dock. How can anyone forget all this today and declare with a clear conscience that he is ready to take the initiative in a nuclear conflict?

148. Perhaps not all of those present in this hall fully realize the danger of statements about the possibility of resorting to preventive nuclear war. But put yourselves in the position of the people and Government of a country at which such statements have been aimed, and you will undoubtedly understand what feelings they can arouse and to what conclusions they must lead. How, in fact, are they to be interpreted: merely as a routine thread, or as something more? Is it enough to be on the alert, or must measures be taken to anticipate an aggressor? That is the kind of question prompted by calls for preventive war.

149. We know that the United Nations has not always, in all cases, responded to acute international problems. But there are problems and problems. When it is a matter of averting a catastrophe, no one can remain indifferent. There is not, and cannot be, a position midway between condemning and not condemning preventive nuclear war, as there can be no position midway between life and death.

150. The Soviet Union attaches grave significance to this problem not only—not even particularly—because the threats are aimed primarily in its direction. The Soviet Union has everything it needs with which to meet any aggressor fully armed and to destroy it. The peoples of our country have more than once proved on the battlefield their readiness to stand up for themselves, for freedom and for the independence of their homeland. At the present time our country is marking the 150th anniversary of the rout of the army, till then apparently invincible, with which Napoleon invaded Russia. On 9 May every year we celebrate the Day of Victory over Hitlerite Germany, whose hordes were also thought by many to be invincible until they were smashed and routed in battles with the Soviet army. Today our country, together with its friends the socialist countries, is stronger than ever before. Therefore the Soviet people and the socialist countries cannot be scared by threats of preventive war. But the Soviet Government, following its unswerving and consistent policy of peace, is doing all that lies in its power to prevent a new world war.

151. Any call to strike the first nuclear blow runs counter to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and to the interests of maintaining peace, and is incompatible with the honour and conscience of mankind. The Soviet Government therefore considers it necessary to submit to the United Nations General Assembly, for consideration as a special agenda item at its seventeenth session, the important and urgent question of "Condemnation of propaganda favouring preventive nuclear war" and the draft of an appropriate General Assembly resolution (A/5232).

152. We call on all States possessing nuclear weapons, as a first step on the way to a complete ban on their use, to give without delay a solemn undertaking not to be the first to use these weapons.

153. The Soviet Government has for many years persistently striven, within the United Nations and at other international conferences and negotiations, and particularly at the Summit Conference held at Geneva in 1955,<sup>4/</sup> to induce the Powers concerned to give such

<sup>4/</sup> The Conference of Heads of Government of the four great Powers was held from 18 to 23 July 1955.

an undertaking. It is ready to put its signature to an agreement on those lines this very day.

154. Is it not a warning in itself that the Government of the United States of America should be unwilling to undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons? One who does not intend to fire the first shot in a nuclear war has no reason for refusing to give an appropriate international undertaking to that effect. Who can possibly suffer by such a decision? No one, so long as he has no aggressive intentions.

155. Permit me to express the hope that the General Assembly will give the proposal for the condemnation of propaganda favouring preventive nuclear war the careful consideration which befits the seriousness of the question raised by the Soviet Government and its importance to the cause of safeguarding universal peace, and will take the appropriate decision.

156. Sessions of the General Assembly are distinct milestones in international life; some sessions leave no perceptible mark on the peoples' consciousness, but others are marked by the adoption of decisions which bring nearer the realization of the purposes and principles proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations.

157. If the United Nations is to become a genuine centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the achievement of international co-operation, as its Charter requires, it must accurately and fully reflect the contemporary world scene. Unfortunately it is still a long way from doing so.

158. Contrary to its Charter, and to the detriment of the cause of international co-operation, the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China continue to be usurped. This is happening for one single reason: because of the policy pursued towards China by the United States of America, which from year to year, from one session of the General Assembly to another, keeps, or more precisely maintains, the Chiang Kai-shekist mummy in the place in the United Nations that belongs to the people's China and to it alone.

159. The two German States and some other States remain outside the United Nations, and this also undermines its importance as a weapon in the struggle for peace.

160. The United Nations would undoubtedly be better equipped to meet the tasks before it if its structure was altered to fit the situation now obtaining in the world, and if the three existing main groups of States — the socialist countries, the countries belonging to Western blocs, and the neutralist countries — were represented on an equal footing in its governing organs. The Soviet Government's proposals on this subject are well known, and we shall press these just demands with all the insistence at our command. So long as the situation in the United Nations remains abnormal and fails to present a true reflection of the world scene, the Organization will be unable to deal successfully with the tasks assigned to it.

161. The Soviet delegation has frankly stated the Soviet Government's position on the most acute and pressing problems of international life. We have done this in order to draw the attention of the United Nations to these problems, in the hope that all States represented in this international forum will become yet more conscious of the responsibility they bear for preserving peace. The peoples' will for peace should serve all States as a guiding principle in all their

actions. The Soviet Union, for its part, will as heretofore steadfastly pursue a policy of peace and friendship between peoples, a policy of peaceful coexistence between States irrespective of their social structure; for this is precisely the policy which corresponds to the most cherished interests and aspirations of all peoples.

162. The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of the United States, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

163. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America): I had hoped that it would not be necessary to interrupt the general debate, but the utterances of the representative of communist Cuba yesterday and of Mr. Gromyko today leave me no choice but also to exercise my right of reply, not on all that has been said here, which unhappily follows the pattern of the persistent prosecution of the cold war, but with respect to what has been said about Cuba.

164. The sober seventeenth session has ended on the fourth day, and I would remind the Members of the United Nations that since the attack on Cuba by refugees from Cuba in April 1961, repeated complaints have been brought to the United Nations by Cuba, accompanied by hysterical charges that the United States was plotting, planning and preparing immediate invasion.

165. One of these complaints, as I recall, was filed in August 1961 but was not pressed until six months later. The attack was called "imminent" in August but evidently even the Cubans did not believe it. And as you know, all these complaints were dismissed one by one by overwhelming votes, but only after the expenditure of much time by the representative and expense to the Organization. From what has been said here it is apparent that we are going to suffer another sustained assault on our patience and on our credulity. I would have thought that there was plenty of useful work to do here without renewing these tired charges.

166. Mr. Gromyko says that the United States has asserted the right to attack Cuba because it has another system. He says no nation should interfere in the affairs of another. I marvel, I marvel at the bland hypocrisy of the nation that subverted the wholesome Cuban social revolution to communism, that crushed with tanks the independence of Hungary, that holds in thrall all of Eastern Europe from the Baltic to the Black Sea. Yet he presumes to lecture us on interference in the affairs of others. But as we know only too well, such righteous rhetoric is the standing communist cloak for the very interference it charges to others.

167. Now in direct answer, let me say to the representatives of the Soviet Union and Cuba that we are not taking and will not take offensive action in this hemisphere, neither will we permit aggression in this hemisphere. For, as the President of the United States made clear on 13 September 1962, we and other countries of the Americas will not be deterred from taking whatever action is needed by threats from any quarter. While we will not commit aggression we will take whatever steps are necessary to prevent the Government of Cuba from seeking to subvert any part of this hemisphere. We shall work closely with our inter-American partners, and this intention does not of course derogate from our right, a right enshrined in the United Nations Charter, to protect our vital national security.

168. The threat to the peace in Cuba comes not from the United States but from the Soviet Union. The threat arises from the extraordinary and unnecessary flood of Soviet arms and military personnel pouring into Cuba. It is this foreign military intervention in the Western hemisphere which is creating grave concern, not only in this country but throughout the hemisphere. For what purpose is this great military build-up in Cuba intended? No one can be sure, but all of Cuba's neighbours are justified in feeling themselves threatened and anxious. If the Soviet Union genuinely desires to keep the peace in the Caribbean, let it stop this war-like posturing, this stuffing of Cuba with rockets, military aircraft, advanced electronic equipment and other armament all out of proportion to any legitimate needs. This military intervention from outside the hemisphere is the threat to which the States of the Western hemisphere cannot remain indifferent, any more than States could anywhere else.

169. I think the time has long passed when we should graduate—if I can use that word—from this sort of strident talk and address ourselves to the real and urgent business of the General Assembly, which is not propaganda and abuse but peace. The United States will exercise its opportunity to respond to other aspects of the utterances we have heard this afternoon at the appropriate time and place; meantime, thank you, Mr. President, and my apologies for detaining you.

#### AGENDA ITEM 89

Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian)

170. The PRESIDENT: It gives me great pleasure to put before the General Assembly the agenda item entitled "Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian)" [A/5170]. The Assembly has before it a draft resolution submitted by Indonesia and the Netherlands [A/L.393].

171. In order to enable the General Assembly to deal with this matter expeditiously, I propose to call first on the sponsors of the draft resolution and then, if the General Assembly agrees, to proceed to the vote. The Secretary-General will then make a brief statement and thereafter I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes. I recognize first the representative of Indonesia.

172. Mr. SUBANDRIO (Indonesia): In the first place I want to thank you, Mr. President, and through you the General Committee for generously consenting to give priority to a discussion of the Agreement reached between the Netherlands and Indonesia. About the same time last year, during the sixteenth session of the General Assembly, I stood at this rostrum more than once and set forth the position of Indonesia with regard to the West Irian affair, which at that time was a point of conflict between Indonesia and the Netherlands. At this moment I stand again at this rostrum and, thank God, with the report that the conflict over West Irian has been settled in a peaceful way between Indonesia and the Netherlands, concluded with an Agreement signed on 15 August 1962.

173. It will be recalled that at the initiative of the Secretary-General the parties came together for an informal discussion. During this informal discussion the Acting Secretary-General was represented by

Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and it was due to the tireless efforts of the Acting Secretary-General and Mr. Bunker, based upon the sincere desire of both parties to reach a settlement, that within a period of not more than two weeks an agreement could be formulated—this, in the annals of international affairs could be regarded as a very speedy settlement of a conflict which lasted for about thirteen successive years. From this rostrum I would like to pay tribute to U Thant and to Mr. Bunker for their most valuable and successful assistance in bringing about this peaceful settlement.

174. We, from our side, do not merely consider this Agreement of national importance from the point of view of building our nation and our national reconstruction, which is still in a period of growth and consolidation in Indonesia. More than that, we regard this Agreement as a valuable contribution to better international understanding between Indonesia and the Netherlands and all the countries which are directly or indirectly involved in this dispute. Also this Agreement has contributed to the success and prestige of the United Nations in bringing about a settlement and reconciliation in a conflict between two of its Member nations.

175. The Indonesian delegation, together with the Netherlands, is now placing before the General Assembly the draft resolution contained in document A/L.393. We hope that this draft resolution will receive unanimous support from this Assembly. In supporting it, this house will give its blessing and confidence to the Secretary-General, the Indonesian Government and the Netherlands Government in the implementation of all aspects of the Agreement forthwith.

176. The whole spirit of the Agreement formulated into twenty-nine articles, supplemented by the exchange of letters and other annexes, is aimed, in the first place, to serve in the best way the interests of the population of West Irian. This is the foremost task of all parties concerned, both during the period before the take-over by the United Nations Administration and the short period of the transitional administration of the United Nations, and finally during the period of the administration of the Republic of Indonesia.

177. It is the sincere aim of the Indonesian people to begin as soon as possible the development in all fields of West Irian so that the people of the territory can be emancipated into the social conditions prevailing among their brethren in the other parts of the Republic. The determination of the Indonesian people in this task has even gone so far that voluntary contributions are coming in from all parts of Indonesia, from rich and poor alike, in witness of the prevailing sentiment that the development of West Irian should be borne by the whole of the Indonesian people together with the budget provided by the State. In order to carry out this task, the Indonesian Government regards it as its first duty to restore harmony within the people of West Irian itself and harmony between the people of West Irian and the rest of the Republic. This is our national policy set forth by President Sukarno in his speech of 17 August 1962 on the anniversary of the Indonesian Revolution. From within we will do our utmost to establish the closest harmony amongst the people of West Irian itself and between them and the people of the other regions of Indonesia. This in itself is not a new thing for us, since Indonesia is constituted

out of many ethnic and regional groupings, out of nearly 100 million people spread throughout 3,000 islands included in an area covering the map of the whole of Europe from Ireland to the West to the Caspian Sea in the East, the people who have always lived in accord with the motto "Unity in Diversity".

178. This is perhaps also not a new thing, especially among the old, established nations that have achieved unity though diversity in the course of decades or perhaps even centuries of national growth. They achieved this during a period in which foreign intervention is regarded as something uncommon. Nowadays, either in the period of struggle for independence or after the achievement of national independence, the question of national unity is becoming a problematical issue because of outside vested interests. But at any rate, we in Indonesia have survived that period, and even the radical changes introduced into our national life and conceptions in adapting them to the requirements of the twentieth century did not too seriously undermine the pillars of national unity. And with the transfer of administration over West Irian to the Republic of Indonesia, this national unity has been completed. Basing ourselves upon our past experience, we are confident that we can establish harmony among the several regional and ethnic groupings within the Republic.

179. On the other hand, we will not relax our alertness toward any effort, either from outside or from within, to create disharmony amongst us, and for this we are preparing ourselves for any kind of emergency. In this context we hope that the parties concerned—that is, Indonesia, the Netherlands and the United Nations Administrator—especially during the transitional period, will always have in their hearts first and foremost the interests of the population of West Irian itself. Any disharmony among the people of West Irian itself, any disharmony among the people of the other parts of the Republic and the inhabitants of West Irian, will only serve to retard further constructive development in that area and consequently inflict upon the people there further sufferings. At this stage the inhabitants of West Irian need, first and foremost, peace and the improvement of their social condition through better health and better education. I am confident that the United Nations Administration during its few months of operation, together with the Government of the Republic of Indonesia, can start forthwith in close and harmonious co-operation, studiously aiming at the above-mentioned objectives. Certainly this will benefit all parties concerned, not the least Indonesia and the Netherlands themselves, in the promotion of normal relationships and co-operation.

180. It is also for this purpose that I would appeal to the General Assembly for their full support of the draft resolution submitted by Indonesia and the Netherlands.

181. Before leaving this rostrum, Mr. President, may I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election as President of the seventeenth session of the General Assembly. Everyone knows your record of service, especially with regard to this body, and for this reason no one will harbour any doubts concerning your ability to guide the Assembly forward in its search for peace. My delegation is also very much gratified that your country, Pakistan, is also playing an important role in the implementation of this Agreement by providing the necessary troops for the transitional period.

182. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands): Mr. President, permit me, on first taking the floor in this General Assembly, to express to you the very warm feelings of rejoicing at your assuming your office, which animate not only the members of the Netherlands Government and of our delegation, but in this special case the Netherlands people as a whole. During the years when we were privileged to have you in our midst as a distinguished Judge in the International Court, we in the Netherlands came to admire your intelligence, tact and sense of fairness, and also to cherish your presence in The Hague as a revered public figure. If now we have to do without you in Holland, we can reconcile ourselves to that loss only by the knowledge that the General Assembly has called you to the top post and that here you will exert your benign influence on the greatest forum in the world. And so I say to you, Sir, "Veel geluk, Mijnheer de President".

183. The Netherlands delegation recommends the adoption of the draft resolution [A/L.393], jointly sponsored by Indonesia and the Netherlands. Under the terms of this resolution the General Assembly, in the first place, takes notes of the Agreement signed on behalf of the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands at United Nations Headquarters, New York, on 15 August 1962 [A/5170, annex] and subsequently ratified by both Contracting Parties; in the second place, acknowledges the role conferred upon the Secretary-General of the United Nations in that Agreement, and finally authorizes the Secretary-General to carry out the tasks entrusted to him in the Agreement.

184. My Government hopes that this matter may be dealt with expeditiously and that the Assembly will approve the draft resolution. It is only when the General Assembly has adopted the resolution that the Agreement reached between the Netherlands and Indonesia will enter into force, and it is only from then on that all the clauses in this Agreement which refer to actions by the Secretary-General can become effectively operative. For the Netherlands the part to be played by the Secretary-General is of the utmost importance.

185. Now that the parties have devised and agreed to a settlement, it would be both surly and redundant to revert once more to the long history of this conflict between the Netherlands and Indonesia. I do feel it my duty, however, to make for the benefit of the Members of the General Assembly some comments about the reasons that have compelled the Netherlands Government to sign the Agreement and to recommend its ratification to our Parliament.

186. As must be abundantly clear to all those who have followed the debates on this subject, the New Guinea question was not a colonial problem. The repeated statements culminating in the proposals made by the Netherlands in the sixteenth session of the General Assembly<sup>5/</sup> left no doubt about our whole-hearted acceptance of the principles and the terms of the decolonization resolution [1514 (XV)] or about our offer to leave the Territory at once and to hand over its administration to an international body, provided only that this body should see to it that the population of the Territory could freely exercise its right of self-determination.

<sup>5/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Annexes, agenda items 88 and 22 (a), documents A/4915 and A/4954.



187. No, the New Guinea question was not a colonial problem; rather, it is a chapter in the history of the right of self-determination. Although this right, inscribed as a principle in the Charter, is continually being extolled by all and sundry, the disagreements on its practical application were such last year that our offer was not accepted by the necessary two-thirds of the membership of the General Assembly.

188. Of what happened after that I will say only this: that the Netherlands Government regrets that in this instance no effective remedy was to be found against the use of force, contrary to the obligations of States under the Charter of the United Nations. As a result, the Netherlands was faced with the choice between fighting in self-defence or resigning itself to transfer of the territory to Indonesia without a previous expression of the will of the population. War would have meant exposing the Papuans and their country to death and destruction and many Dutchmen and Indonesians to the horrors of combat without even providing a sensible solution to the problem. And so, with a heavy heart, the Netherlands Government decided to agree to the transfer of the territory to Indonesia on the best conditions obtainable for the Papuan population. My Government would not have been prepared so to decide, however, had not the Agreement now before you provided for participation of the United Nations in the exercise of the right of self-determination. Allow me to read out some of the most significant clauses referring to the role of the United Nations in safeguarding this as well as other rights of the population of West New Guinea.

189. First of all, I would draw your attention to the first paragraph of article XXII, which says:

"The UNTEA and Indonesia will guarantee fully the rights, including the rights of free speech, freedom of movement and of assembly, of the inhabitants of the area. These rights will include the existing rights of the inhabitants of the territory at the time of the transfer of administration to the UNTEA."

I would also draw attention to the last sentence of article XV, which states:

"Any aspects relating to the act of free choice will be governed by the terms of this Agreement."

190. Then, I come to the articles determining the United Nations machinery to be set up for the supervision of the exercise of the right of self-determination. These are articles XVI and XVII, reading as follows:

"Article XVI: At the time of the transfer of full administrative responsibility to Indonesia a number of United Nations experts, as deemed adequate by the Secretary-General after consultation with Indonesia, will be designated to remain wherever their duties require their presence. Their duties will, prior to the arrival of the United Nations Representative, who will participate at the appropriate time in the arrangements for self-determination, be limited to advising on and assisting in preparations for carrying out the provisions for self-determination except in so far as Indonesia and the Secretary-General may agree upon their performing other expert functions. They will be responsible to the Secretary-General for the carrying out of their duties.

"Article XVII: Indonesia will invite the Secretary-General to appoint a Representative who, together

with a staff made up, *inter alia*, of experts referred to in Article XVI, will carry out the Secretary-General's responsibilities to advise, assist and participate in arrangements which are the responsibility of Indonesia for the act of free choice. The Secretary-General will, at the proper time, appoint the United Nations Representative in order that he and his staff may assume their duties in the territory one year prior to the date of self-determination. Such additional staff as the United Nations Representative might feel necessary will be determined by the Secretary-General after consultations with Indonesia. The United Nations Representative and his staff will have the same freedom of movement as provided for the personnel referred to in Article XVI."

And, finally, we have the articles providing for the manner in which the people of the Territory are to be given the opportunity to exercise freedom of choice. They are articles XVIII, XIX, XX and XXI, which lay down the following rules:

"Article XVIII: Indonesia will make arrangements, with the assistance and participation of the United Nations Representative and his staff, to give the people of the territory the opportunity to exercise freedom of choice. Such arrangements will include:

"(a) Consultations ('Musjawarah') with the representative councils on procedures and appropriate methods to be followed for ascertaining the freely expressed will of the population;

"(b) The determination of the actual date of the exercise of free choice within the period established by the present Agreement;

"(c) Formulation of the questions in such a way as to permit the inhabitants to decide (i) whether they wish to remain with Indonesia; or (ii) whether they wish to sever their ties with Indonesia;

"(d) The eligibility of all adults, male and female, not foreign nationals, to participate in the act of self-determination to be carried out in accordance with international practice, who are resident at the time of the signing of the present Agreement and at the time of the act of self-determination, including those residents who departed after 1945 and who return to the territory to resume residence after the termination of Netherlands administration.

"Article XIX: The United Nations Representative will report to the Secretary-General on the arrangements arrived at for freedom of choice.

"Article XX: The act of self-determination will be completed before the end of 1969.

"Article XXI: 1. After the exercise of the right of self-determination, Indonesia and the United Nations Representative will submit final reports to the Secretary-General who will report to the General Assembly on the conduct of the act of self-determination and the results thereof.

"2. The Parties to the present Agreement will recognize and abide by the results of the act of self-determination."

191. While reading these articles referring to the right of self-determination, I should like at the same time to read out another article that is important for the Members of the Assembly, namely, article XXIV, which states:

"1. Deficits in the budget of the territory during the UNTEA administration will be shared equally by Indonesia and the Netherlands.

"2. Indonesia and the Netherlands will be consulted by the Secretary-General on the preparation of the UNTEA budget and other financial matters relating to United Nations responsibilities under the present Agreement; however, the Secretary-General will have the final decision.

"3. The Parties to the present Agreement will reimburse the Secretary-General for all costs incurred by the United Nations under the present Agreement and will make available suitable funds in advance for the discharge of the Secretary-General's responsibilities. The Parties to the present Agreement will share on an equal basis the costs of such reimbursements and advances."

As a result of this stipulation the United Nations will not be burdened with any of the costs incurred by the performance of its task.

192. As I said before, the New Guinea question is not, and never has been, a colonial problem; it is a chapter in the history of the right of self-determination. The final part of that chapter will open with the resolution which, I trust, will be adopted by this Assembly; it will close when "the act of self-determination will be completed", that is not later than the end of 1969. This final part of the chapter may be one that tells of sorrow and disappointment, but it may also become the story of the vindication of the rights and principles of our Charter and of the happy and successful strengthening of the rule of law in that part of the world. We hope and trust that the latter will be the case and that the end of the chapter will be written in a mode of good will and good faith.

193. The Papuan people are not unknown strangers to the Members of the United Nations. The Netherlands administration of the territory and the Netherlands activities for its development have been openly and publicly conducted. Each year the Netherlands has submitted to the United Nations extensive reports and documentation, not only as required by Article 73, paragraph e of the Charter on the economic, social and educational conditions, but also, beyond the Charter requirements, on development and progress in the political field. Our delegates and their Papuan experts have answered all questions asked by the members of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories and, when the report of that Committee was dealt with, by Members of the General Assembly. Whenever necessary they have transmitted additional information. To this day the territory and its life have been an open book.

194. When the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority (UNTEA) takes over the administration, the transmission of information by the Netherlands will cease. It will not be replaced by the transmission of data which continue to keep the United Nations informed of the progress of the country and people of West New Guinea towards greater development and well-being. The Netherlands-Indonesian Agreement does, however, direct the spotlight of United Nations enquiry on to the right of self-determination. As a result of this Agreement the "free choice", granted to the population of the territory, is no longer exclusively their own concern, nor is it any more a question of Netherlands or Indonesian policy; from now on it is a matter of world concern for which each Member of the United Nations carries a responsibility of the same order as that of the parties themselves.

195. Soon the Netherlands will withdraw from West New Guinea, and this withdrawal, forced on us by the circumstances, will make it impossible for the Netherlands people to discharge the obligations to which they feel committed vis-à-vis the Papuan population. The task of development, to which many Dutchmen have given of their best and to which we contributed \$30 million per annum, will not be continued by us but will be the responsibility of others. Nevertheless, our feelings of sympathy with this emergent people remain, and it is for that reason that, on the instructions of my Government, I wrote a letter to the Acting Secretary-General of the United Nations on 10 August 1962 in which I informed him that the Netherlands Government had decided to make available to him annually the sum of \$10 million, to be allotted by the Secretary-General to the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies as a contribution from the Netherlands to any programmes of technical assistance, undertaken by one or more of them for the sole benefit of the population of the territory of West New Guinea. The offer was made for an initial period of three years and a request was made to inform the Indonesian Government of the offer and to let me know whether it was acceptable to the Secretary-General and to them. I have as yet had no answer to this letter, but the offer made in that letter is still valid.

196. And now I will end this brief intervention neither with rejoicing nor with recrimination or undue pessimism—in short: neither with a bang nor a whimper. All I wish to say, on behalf of the Government and people of the Netherlands, is that we hope that this joint resolution, sponsored by Indonesia and ourselves, will be adopted, that thus our Agreement will enter into force and that the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority will find the strength and the wisdom to carry out its task with tact and skill—and finally, that the United Nations will assist the Papuan people on their way to development in such a manner that the outcome of their free choice may redound to the honour and glory of all concerned.

197. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the draft resolution presented by Indonesia and the Netherlands [A/L.393]. The delegation of Cameroon has requested a roll-call vote.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Romania, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal,\* Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia,

\*In a letter dated 24 September 1962, addressed to the Secretary-General, the representative of Senegal asked that his vote should be recorded as negative.

Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Rwanda, Togo, Upper Volta, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Dahomey, France, Gabon, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Mauritania, Niger.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 89 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.*

198. The PRESIDENT: I invite the Acting Secretary-General to make a statement.

199. The ACTING SECRETARY-GENERAL: By adopting the resolution sponsored by Indonesia and the Netherlands, the General Assembly has brought into force the Agreement between these two States concerning West New Guinea—that is, West Irian. At the same time the Assembly has placed on the Secretary-General a very heavy responsibility indeed. I accept this responsibility and shall endeavour, to the best of my ability, to carry out the tasks entrusted to me under the Agreement.

200. I feel that this Agreement sets an epoch-making precedent. Under it, for the first time in its history, the United Nations will have temporary executive authority—established by and under the jurisdiction of the Secretary-General—over a vast territory.

201. The Agreement is unique in another respect: although the United Nations has a vital role to play in implementing the Agreement, the general membership of the Organization will not be required to meet additional financial burdens, as the entire cost of the United Nations operation will be borne by Indonesia and the Netherlands in equal proportions.

202. This novel settlement may well be a step in the gradual evolution of the United Nations as an increasingly effective instrument for carrying out policies agreed upon between Member Governments for the peaceful resolution of their differences, in line with the Charter. On this basis, and at the request of the two Governments, I have had to authorize certain steps in connexion with the implementation of the Agreement, in anticipation of its approval by the Assembly.

203. The Agreement itself was made possible because of the spirit of accommodation between the two Governments and their willingness to settle this long-standing dispute which had poisoned the relations between them. I am glad that, with the settlement of this dispute, diplomatic relations are to be resumed, and I hope that the future relations between the two Governments will be marked by the same spirit of friendship, understanding and cordiality that made the Agreement itself possible.

204. Some kind words have been said about my role in bringing about this Agreement. I am grateful for these expressions of appreciation. I should, however, like to point out that a major burden of responsibility was borne, ably and willingly, by Mr. Ellsworth Bunker, who acted on my behalf during the preliminary negotiations. I have already paid public tribute to his patience, integrity and diplomatic skill, which contributed so significantly to the successful conclusion of this Agreement.

205. The representative of the Netherlands has just drawn special attention to the various articles of the

Agreement which provide the people of the territory with the opportunity to exercise freedom of choice. I am confident that the Government of Indonesia will carry out these undertakings, not only in the letter and spirit of the Agreement itself, but also in the spirit of the Charter.

206. I have already referred to the heavy responsibility which is now placed on the shoulders of the Secretary-General. I know I can count on the co-operation of my devoted colleagues in the Secretariat who have shown in the past that they can always rise to the occasion. We shall all count upon the full co-operation of both Governments, without which, of course, our task cannot be satisfactorily and successfully carried out.

207. I should like to inform the Assembly that I am arranging for copies of all instruments and documents in connexion with this Agreement and the resolution of the General Assembly thereon which has just been adopted to be transmitted to the Security Council for its information.

208. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Australia in explanation of his vote.

209. Sir Garfield BARWICK (Australia): Australia has cast its vote in favour of the resolution just adopted by the General Assembly. Australia, though not a party principal to the dispute which the Agreement settles, has been concerned both with the existence and the cause of that dispute, and it has interests which will be closely affected by that Agreement. Australia welcomes the fact that the dispute was resolved without war and that the claims of the inhabitants of West New Guinea to be afforded self-determination have been recognized and provided for.

210. When the General Assembly last considered this dispute—that is, at its sixteenth session—the island of New Guinea was divided in administration, the western end under the Netherlands and the eastern end under Australia. In the exercise of authority recognized by the Trusteeship Agreement, Australia had brought both Eastern territories—Papua, a Non-Self-Governing Territory; and New Guinea, a Trust Territory—into an administrative union. Though the position of an administering Power under Chapter XI of the Charter differs from that of a Trustee under Chapter XII, I do not pause to examine the difference, for Australia has long devoted itself to the pursuit of the same objective in relation to both these Territories—namely, the preparation of their people for, and the grant to them, of self-determination—the real and effective opportunity of choosing for themselves both their form of government and their international affiliations. The Netherlands was pursuing the same objective in relation to the people under its control.

211. Australia is no new-found friend of the principle of self-determination. Those who were present during the formulation of the Charter at San Francisco will remember Australia's prominence in the insertion and formulation of Chapters XI and XII. Our people are sincerely concerned with the welfare and the future of the Papuan people. We have throughout considered it to be part of the self-determination to be given these people that they should, if possible, have the opportunity to decide for themselves, in due course, whether or not they shall be united in one independent nation with the members of their own race who inhabit the western end of the island. We have never attempted to decide this question for them, either for or against,

nor have we actively promoted the idea amongst them. But we have been very careful not to foreclose their opportunity for decision. This was a motive behind the Australian agreement with the Netherlands in November, 1957, for administrative co-operation in connexion with the development of the western and the eastern ends of the island.

212. The Australian Government, throughout its association with the dispute between Indonesia and the Netherlands, has maintained its respect for the principle of sovereignty. We have always felt, and still feel, that respect for this principle is fundamental in international affairs and, indeed, is most important to small and particularly newly emergent nations. Sovereignty is a basic concept of the Charter; but of course membership of the Organization means also the provisions of the Charter with respect to the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories. Australia, recognizing the sovereignty of the Netherlands over the western end of the island, and aware of the Netherlands' determination to give effect to the principles of Chapter XI of the Charter, was thus assured that the people of the Non-Self-Governing Territory of West New Guinea would receive the benefit of the recognition of their claims which membership of this Organization imports.

213. The Australian Government has never entered into discussion of the merits or demerits of the respective claims in the dispute which developed between Indonesia and the Netherlands as to the sovereignty or administration of the Territory. It has steadfastly maintained the view that if the dispute involved a juridical question capable of resolution by the International Court of Justice, the claimant party ought to take the dispute to that tribunal for its resolution. If, on the other hand, as indeed I think Indonesia has maintained, the claim to the Territory was not based upon a legal right but on political consideration of historical or consensual origin, then the Australian Government has always maintained that the dispute should be resolved by agreement. We have throughout taken the stand that there was no room for territorial aggrandizement or the settlement of the claim to additional territory by force or by the threat of its use.

214. If the claim of Indonesia had been carried to the International Court of Justice, and had there succeeded as a legal right, Australia would have recognized and respected the decision of that Court and all that it involved. But, legal right apart, Australia had felt that the indigenous inhabitants of both ends of the island should not be disturbed by changes in administration and had preferred that the administration of the Netherlands should remain.

215. Let me say here, in parenthesis, that the announcement of the present Agreement has in truth caused considerable apprehension in that portion of the island which is under the administration of Australia. For this reason Australia has felt compelled, through its Minister for Territories, in very recent weeks to reassure the indigenous inhabitants of its own goodwill towards them and of its own determination to see that they do maintain their freedom to make their own choice of their future in due course. This attitude on the part of Australia has not been motivated by any unfriendliness towards the people of Indonesia. Towards them, the Government and people of Australia have the utmost goodwill and a constant desire not merely to live in amity but to live in a co-operative

effort to advance the well-being and the standard of living of the peoples of both nations and the peace and security of the region in which we both live as closest neighbours.

216. When, in 1959, the Indonesian Government sought Australian understanding of its political claims, Australia said that it would respect any agreement between the Netherlands and Indonesia as parties principal to the dispute which was arrived at by peaceful processes and that, in accordance with internationally accepted principles, Australia would not oppose such an agreement. Australia has faithfully adhered to that declaration, which was couched in terms that indicated that we would not regard a forceful solution as binding. Australia has not put any pressure on the Netherlands either not to transfer the Territory to Indonesia or to transfer it. We have remained ready to respect any agreement freely arrived at between the two countries.

217. However, it has become evident that, because of circumstances into which there is no need to enter, the Netherlands desired to end its administration of the Territory within a relatively short period, provided that the welfare of the inhabitants of the Territory was safeguarded. Thus the need arose to find an outcome which would provide an administration, pending that time when the people of the Territory might decide their future for themselves.

218. At the sixteenth session of the General Assembly, an opportunity was offered, and supported by Australia, of providing such an outcome and thus of preserving to the indigenous people of the island a right of self-determination. That opportunity was not taken. The general desire to end colonialism and the awareness of the Indonesian national desire to complete its national unity, both of which I fully appreciate, may have tended to obscure the full weight of the claims of the indigenous inhabitants of the island.

219. It is not appropriate that I enter upon any recital of the events of the period which intervened between the last session of the General Assembly and the conclusion of the Agreement now under consideration. There are no doubt in the minds of representatives as I speak. But I must remark that Australia, although not a party to the dispute, and having no rights or claims of its own directly involved therein, did urge the parties to a patient negotiation with a view to a peaceful and just settlement which would provide for the satisfaction of the claim of the indigenous people. Australia did, and does, deplore both the use of force and the threat of it during this period, whether as a means of attempted conquest or as a lever in the negotiations.

220. The Members of the United Nations, including Australia and the parties to the dispute themselves, have preferred that the intervention of this Organization should be through the quiet diplomacy of the Acting Secretary-General and by his representative and through the assistance thus afforded to the parties in reaching a reasonable solution. In the result, the Acting Secretary-General's good offices and those of his representative outdrew and overcame the consequences of the regrettable incidents and enabled the parties to reach the present agreement. This form of United Nations intervention has proved both successful and effective and I should like to place on record the Australian Government's appreciation of it.

221. The Agreement which has been reached accords with the desire of the Netherlands, in the circumstances

which had developed, to terminate its administration, and with the desire of the Indonesian people to achieve their territorial unity—a unity drawn from historical circumstances. It also recognizes and provides for the exercise of the right of the indigenous people to a real and effective opportunity, to decide for themselves their future, both in the form of government and from the point of view of international association and to be equipped in the meantime for the making of that decision. No doubt, in reaching that Agreement neither party obtained what it regarded as the optimum in the matter of timing and in the details of the modalities of transfer, nor in the precise expression of the obligations assumed. In substance, however, the Agreement does cover the essentials I have mentioned. Australia has been concerned to see the dispute peacefully resolved in such a manner that the claims of the Papuan people are both recognized and provided for. Whatever reservations we may have had as to the course of events prior to the making of the Agreement, Australia accepts the parties' Agreement as I have described it.

222. May I add that I believe that, quite apart from the moral considerations involved in the principle of self-determination, the long-term interests of stability and progress in the region and of relations between the peoples, will be served by a bona fide performance of the self-determination provisions of the Agreement.

223. Australia looks to the United Nations to perform its proper functions under the Agreement, and to Indonesia to place the welfare of the Papuans above all other considerations in its administration of the Territory—whatever the proper status of the Territory in relation to the Charter may be—a matter into which there is no present need to enter. Having achieved its principle of national unity by now completing the transfer to its own administration of all those Territories which formerly formed part of the Netherlands East Indies, Indonesia has now undertaken as its own act and as an expression of its national will to afford the indigenous population self-determination in the sense I have mentioned.

224. Indonesia in its administration, and the Acting Secretary-General in carrying out the functions of the United Nations, will find Australia ready to co-operate in the achievement of the purposes of this Agreement. The ending of this dispute opens possibilities of greater co-operation among all the nations of the region in fields other than those related directly to New Guinea, and this is a prospect which Australia greatly welcomes.

225. Mr. PELAEZ (Philippines): I am highly honoured to place on record my Government's profound gratification at the peaceful settlement of the West Irian question embodied in the Agreement which we have just formally recognized in this General Assembly of the United Nations. This Agreement brings to an amicable end a most difficult and stubborn dispute which had defied solution for thirteen years and had been of deep concern to the United Nations, particularly to the Member countries from South-East Asia. Great stakes were involved and at times the issue of war or peace hung in the balance. The Agreement solemnized by this august body today required an exceptional amount of patient effort, forbearance and statesmanship of a high order on the part of all concerned. It has been aptly described as an historic achievement by the two dedicated men whose intervention contributed greatly to its realization, the Secre-

tary-General of the United Nations and Mr. Bunker of the United States. Lasting credit is due, both to the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands, for persevering in the face of the most formidable difficulties in their efforts at conciliation, which finally succeeded in resolving these difficulties and producing a mutually acceptable agreement.

226. The part played by the United Nations and its decisive contribution as mediator in the dispute is known to us all. Not as well known, but I dare say likewise deserving of credit and commendation, are the moderating influence and the disinterested assistance of friendly nations in facilitating the peaceful settlement of the question. The Philippines is proud to count itself among those nations.

227. While we supported the position of Indonesia in this dispute, in accordance with our commitments under the Bandung Declaration, we earnestly urged that every effort be exercised for peaceful settlement and helped in our own modest way to keep open the channels of communication between the disputants, particularly during the more difficult moments. We in the Philippines have special reasons to feel gratified over the peaceful settlement of the West Irian question. First, we are neighbours and kinsmen of the Indonesian people, linked closely to them by enduring ties of amity, historical experience and a common devotion to freedom and peace. It is understandable that we should rejoice with them in the conclusion of this Agreement, which marks to our mind another forward step towards the liquidation of the remaining vestiges of colonialism in our part of the world. The Philippines looks forward to the early completion of this historical process, when all existing pockets of colonialism everywhere in the world will have been eliminated. Secondly, we have a vital stake in the peace and stability of South-East Asia. This Agreement removes a serious threat to that peace and paves the way to greater stability in that important area. Finally, we share with like-minded Member countries an abiding interest in the continuing effectiveness of the United Nations. This Agreement strengthens our faith in the efficacy of the United Nations as an instrument for the peaceful settlement of international disputes. Where the essential ingredients of sincerity, mutual accommodation and genuine respect for the Charter are present, differences can always be reconciled peacefully.

228. I would like to conclude these brief remarks with an expression of the best wishes of the Government and people of the Philippines for the successful implementation of the Agreement on West Irian. We are prepared to give whatever useful and positive contribution we may be able to make to the immediate task of effecting an orderly transfer of the Territory under United Nations auspices. Beyond that we are prepared to co-operate fully with our neighbour and sister Republic in the common task of enlarging the freedom and enriching the lives of the peoples in our part of the world within the framework of the United Nations and the principles for which it stands.

229. Dato' ISMAIL (Federation of Malaya): The Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands on the future of West Irian should be welcomed by all of us. For many years the West Irian dispute has been a source of discord and conflict, and in recent months has even threatened to explode into open war with potentially devastating consequences to the general peace of South-East Asia.

and of the world. There is no doubt that the Agreement represents a positive step in the direction of restoring a climate of peace and tranquillity in the area.

230. As a country close to Indonesia and to the area of dispute, the Federation of Malaya has obvious reasons to be particularly concerned. We are therefore highly pleased that the parties in the dispute have finally reached an agreement. We earnestly hope that by this Agreement the long-standing dispute over West Irian is settled for good. The removal of this deep-rooted source of discord and conflict will, it is to be hoped, facilitate a speedy normalization of relations between the Netherlands and Indonesia and pave the way for a new era of co-operation between the two countries.

231. In supporting the approval of this Agreement by the General Assembly, my delegation wishes for nothing more than that both parties will sincerely respect and implement its every provision, for only in this way would a recurrence of tension in the area be averted and the welfare and happiness of the people be ensured.

232. In conclusion, allow me to pay our sincere tribute to the Acting Secretary-General, whose vision and statesmanship made the negotiations possible. Our congratulations must also go to Mr. Bunker, who successfully steered the course of negotiations towards a satisfactory conclusion.

233. To the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands we offer our sincerest congratulations for the happy reconciliation of their differences. May we entertain the hope that the two countries will henceforth be able to contribute ever more towards the general peace, stability and prosperity of the South-East Asian region.

234. Mr. ALI (Pakistan): Mr. President, in coming to the rostrum to explain our affirmative vote, I would like to avail myself of the opportunity to extend, on behalf of my delegation, our sympathies and condolences to the Government and people of Yemen on the death of His late Majesty the Imam Ahmed. Our hearts go out in sympathy to the new Imam in this hour of his grief, and we pray that he will reign long and bring about increased prosperity and progress for his people.

235. Also, Mr. President, I would now like to add the congratulations of the delegation of Pakistan to the many that you have received on your election to the high office of President of this Assembly. We are extremely happy that you have brought honour to our country.

236. It is a happy augury that the very first substantive task that the present session of the Assembly has been called upon to perform is to endorse the Agreement reached last month between the Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands for the settlement of the problem of West Irian. Our warmest congratulations must go to the leaders of both countries for the statesmanship, the spirit of accommodation and the devotion to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations displayed by them, in arriving at a settlement of this protracted and difficult dispute, which had for so long caused bitterness between them and sorrow to their mutual friends. It is the earnest hope of my delegation that, with the honourable settlement of this dispute, friendly relations between Indonesia and the Netherlands will be restored and co-operation resumed to their mutual benefit.

237. The Government and the people of Pakistan are happy at this reconciliation between two countries with which they have such close and cordial relations. We are proud at having been called upon to play a small part in the implementation of the Agreement. We appreciate the confidence reposed in us by the Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands. On behalf of my Government I pledge that, insofar as it is given to us, we shall spare no effort to contribute to the success of the Agreement.

238. The Secretary-General merits the gratitude, not only of those immediately concerned but of all of us here, for his wise initiative, patience and discretion which brought his efforts to happy fruition. The Agreement is indeed a triumph for the principles of the Charter. We all rejoice at this. It is a clear manifestation of the fact that, given statesmanship on both sides, disputes between nations can be settled peacefully, honourably and justly. It clearly and abundantly proves that where goodwill exists, a satisfactory solution of international disputes can be found.

239. The leaders of Indonesia and the Netherlands have demonstrated magnificently that concrete disputes between nations can be resolved by recourse to the peaceful means set forth in the Charter of the United Nations. I hope—I most earnestly hope—other nations will profit from this glorious example so that we may contribute to the lessening of tensions in regions where disputes between nations still exist. We will thus help to strengthen the capacity of this Organization as a force for peace and progress.

240. My delegation is happy that this Agreement embodies the right of a people to determine its future according to its own wishes. We hope that this example will pave the way for according similar rights to other peoples who are still held captive and denied the right to shape their own destiny. We earnestly hope that this Agreement will serve as an inspiration for all nations to respect the rule of law and their obligations under international commitments.

241. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) (translated from French): Before I explain my vote, Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you, on behalf of my delegation, on your election to the Presidency of the General Assembly.

242. The Government of Dahomey recognizes the efforts made by the Secretary-General and by the Governments of the Netherlands and Indonesia to achieve a pacific settlement of the problem of West New Guinea. We have always been in favour of negotiations and of peace. But we have also been, and continue to be, in favour of the absolute right of peoples to self-determination. Despite all its goodwill, my Government cannot endorse arrangements whereby a people of 700,000 is transferred from one Power to another under a bilateral treaty concluded without previous consultation with the party chiefly concerned, the Papuan people.

243. Much has been said on the subject of self-determination; but when we peruse this Agreement, what do we see in the articles dealing with self-determination? Not once—I repeat, not once—do we find in the text any mention of a "referendum", the most normal, the most usual and the most objective form of public expression of opinion. The most precise formula we find is the vague one of "the freely expressed will of the population", without any indication of how that will is to be expressed. That is left entirely to the discretion of the

councils, which are described as "representative" without the slightest definition of the manner in which they are to be appointed.

244. Furthermore, the United Nations presence, which will doubtless be extremely effective during the transitional period in which it will be responsible for the administration of West New Guinea, will subsequently be very limited. It will be confined to advising on and assisting in preparations for carrying out the provisions for self-determination. In other words, the actual public expression of opinion will be organized entirely by the party which has the greatest interest in the yielding of results that are favourable to it.

245. This is the first time in history that plans have been made for a public expression of opinion which is intended to be objective and which is to be organized by the party chiefly concerned in the matter.

246. For all these reasons my Government, although thankful that peace has been safeguarded in this part of the world, cannot but regret that that should have been achieved to some extent under the threat of war. Nevertheless, we hope that the Agreement, however unsatisfactory it may be, will be executed and fully observed in its letter and in its spirit. We count upon the Secretary-General to see to it that this is done, and we have no doubt of his ability and his objectivity.

247. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): Coming as I do to this rostrum for the first time during the seventeenth session of the General Assembly, it is my pleasant duty, Mr. President, to offer you my congratulations, on behalf of my delegation and myself, on your elevation to this high office.

248. From the procedural point of view, we are here at this moment to explain our vote. I want to make it quite clear that, so far as we are concerned, it is not a vote that we are explaining, because my Government does not consider that it is for us to decide whether this Agreement should have been signed or not signed. It is an Agreement reached between two sovereign countries, and we have no right of interference. We welcome it, and we welcome the Secretary-General's role in it. It has been registered, no doubt, with the United Nations and therefore we recognize its presence. We also support paragraph 3 of the explanatory memorandum, which authorizes the Secretary-General to carry out the tasks entrusted to him, again by agreement between the parties.

249. I would like to say that we come here to express our good wishes to the Indonesian Government and people, as well as to the Netherlands Government and people, for the termination of a situation which has not been very happy for either side. We hope that the Agreement now reached, although it does not complete the process by which the enforced isolation of part of Indonesia from the rest of the mother country will be ended, can see that this process is satisfactorily completed.

250. I have been asked by our immediate neighbours, Ceylon and Nepal, to speak on their behalf in offering these congratulations.

251. Whatever we say on this platform is a matter of public significance. We want to make our position very clear in regard to the status of West Irian. The interest of my country and its participation in this matter go back to 1949, when the Government of India, with the co-operation of the Government of Australia, rallied the Governments of that part of the world in

order to focus public attention on the subject status of Indonesia and its attempt to free itself from thralldom to the Netherlands Empire. Since then, our position has been that Indonesia is one and sovereign, and we have repeated that year after year in this Assembly. That has no relation exclusively to either our geographical closeness or the personal relations that obtain between the Indonesian leaders and ourselves, but rather to our approach to the whole problem of colonies. As late as November 1961, I told this Assembly at the 1058th plenary meeting:

"West Irian, so far as the Government of India is concerned, is an integral part of Indonesia . . .

"The position of the Government of India is that West Irian is a colonial territory, having been administered by the Netherlands, and whose sovereignty has been transferred under the terms of the Charter of Transfer of Sovereignty."

We are familiar with this problem in which there is a bit of unfinished business—and you have to finish it, one way or another.

252. With regard to the text of this Agreement, it is, as I said, an Agreement between two sovereign nations, and it is part of sovereignty to have the capacity to deal with it one way or another.

253. However, I feel we should make certain observations on this matter. The United Nations has assumed for itself a role in this matter—very ably sponsored in this instance by the Acting Secretary-General. We congratulate him on the success of this effort, in so far as we have an Agreement of this kind. But the role of the United Nations—and let there be no misunderstanding about it—is not the conversion of this area into a trust territory. While it is true that the Secretary-General, as one of the principal organs of the United Nations and its spokesman, has successfully intervened here, that does not mean that the accountability to the Assembly, in regard to what happens during the period of its stewardship or whatever status—this *ad hoc* position they have adopted, and the United Nations assumes *ad hoc* roles in many different places, under the previous Secretary-General we used to have a very common feature, what was called the "presence" of the United Nations, not provided for in the Charter—but, whatever it may be, it does not make West Irian a trust territory. There is no question therefore of creating independence in this area. Indonesia is one and independent. By the enforced separation of this part through the non-completion of the agreements reached in 1949 at The Hague, at the Round Table Conference, this territory has remained under adverse possession and the rightful owners, for the sake of peace—I will not say the rightful owners, but the rightful sovereign Power—for the sake of peace, and also in order that the culmination of this business may be in a peaceful way, have come to certain arrangements which suit them, and we congratulate them in so far as, on the one hand, the conclusion of the objectives of the Round Table Conference at The Hague is now in sight, and, secondly, that, while a certain amount of waiting may take place, it will still take place under the auspices of the United Nations so far as the practical part of it is concerned.

254. We also want to say that this period of the presence of the United Nations is in no sense a period when its authority will be exercised as a kind of super-authority in the place. The United Nations will have very limited functions. In our view, this period should

be as short as possible. The period of 1969 that is prescribed is a maximum, and there is no reason why it should remain a maximum. The role of the United Nations, consistent with the Charter, would be to harmonize the various interests as far as possible, without being a super-authority over the sovereign authority of Indonesia.

255. We are very jealous of the sovereignty of our neighbour over its territories, over 3,000 islands, and its territorial seas. Because if this is not fully stated there are other implications.

256. It is open to any sovereign Government to provide for any form of internal arrangements within its own territory. Some countries are sovereign and do not allow people to have any influence on the Government. When they come here they speak about the will of peoples! There are large numbers of Governments which are sovereign over their territories, so far as the United Nations is concerned, where there is no opportunity for the people to express themselves or share in this sovereignty.

257. It is entirely up to the Indonesian Government to decide how this enforced partition and the historic conditions created thereby—all the trends of separate personality that have developed—can be overcome. It is much to the credit of yourself, Mr. Secretary-General, and the others concerned, that any Agreement has been brought about. Our own Government, in this matter, has always asked for direct negotiations between the Indonesian Government and the Netherlands Government.

258. Last year there came before the Assembly three draft resolutions. As regards one of the resolutions, the Government of the Netherlands, I am happy to say, showed its wisdom in withdrawing it. That draft resolution aimed at the creation of a United Nations commission and thereby an international trusteeship over the sovereign territory of Indonesia. We would have resisted such a proposal even if we were the only delegation which voted against it.

259. My delegation, along with a number of other Governments, submitted a draft resolution at that time which obtained a majority but it did not obtain the necessary two-thirds majority. The purpose of it was that the Indonesian Government and the Netherlands Government should directly negotiate, with the good offices of the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations. To our regret at that time, a large number of countries, forty of them, mainly belonging to the Western group of countries, did not find it possible to support it. But soon after the conclusion of the Assembly session, the same kind of arrangement was made of the two countries talking to each other, with your good offices, Mr. Secretary-General. So all's well that ends well, and we have now a situation where colonialism in that area in the Pacific, is, we hope, ended, with perhaps the exception of a small place called Timor.

260. We shall have to deal with that problem in some other way, at some other time. Therefore, what has been accomplished by this Agreement is that once and for all, without any reservations, there is the termination of Dutch authority, factual or even otherwise as is claimed, for good and all.

261. I share with the Indonesians and a host of our colleagues the hope that in spite of the difficulty that

has prevailed in the past, the relations between the Dutch and Indonesians will now develop. It is our experience that once an Empire removes itself, there are closer relations between peoples who were hitherto apart. There are more Englishmen in India today than when the British occupied the country. We are no longer afraid of them and they are no longer afraid of us.

262. Actually the Indonesians have had a long period of tutelage under the Dutch and their educational system and so on, and the impact of Roman-Dutch law—all kinds of things in that way. Since their independence they have come under the influence of other countries also. They are our close neighbours. We wish them well, and we hope that the arguments and various theories which challenge Indonesia's sovereignty will now disappear, that the unity of Indonesia and the termination of colonialism in that part of the world will become fully accepted and achieved. Furthermore, we must hope that there will be no attempt to revive it in one way or another.

263. Mr. AKAKPO (Togo) (translated from French): My delegation simply wishes to give a brief explanation of its vote on the resolution which has just been adopted by the General Assembly.

264. First of all, we welcome both the resolution's purpose and the Agreement concluded between Indonesia and the Netherlands. The Agreement is, in spirit, based essentially on the United Nations Charter, which is designed to safeguard peace and bring about the settlement of disputes through negotiation. From that standpoint my delegation rejoices at the active role played by the Secretary-General and the United Nations.

265. My delegation could not, however, vote in favour of the resolution, for a number of reasons which I shall briefly explain. First, my delegation thought it rather strange, in view of the importance of the matter, that the vote should have been taken in some haste. The general debate of the seventeenth session has not yet been concluded, the text of the Agreement between the two Governments has only just been submitted to the General Assembly, yet we already have a resolution under which the General Assembly takes certain action and authorizes the Secretary-General to carry out the tasks entrusted to him in the Agreement concluded between the two Governments.

266. My delegation would have liked so important a question to be studied in all its aspects and the agreement to be thoroughly examined, so that, even if the final text had not been perfect, the General Assembly would at least have been able, in full knowledge of the facts, to estimate what the probable results of the agreement would be.

267. Nevertheless my delegation, aware of the competence and goodwill of the parties concerned, and knowing that the representative of the Secretariat, with his customary tact, will be able to implement the Agreement, did not wish to vote against the resolution; we therefore abstained.

268. In conclusion, my delegation hopes that, despite the rather unusual procedure adopted and, in particular, certain imperfections in the Agreement and in the resolution on which we have just voted, the final result will accord with the spirit of the Agreement and with the objective sought by the two parties.