United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FOURTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

808th PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 25 September 1959, at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 9:	
General debate (continued)	
Speech by Mr. Qadir (Pakistan)	177
Speech by Mr. Shukairy (Saudi Arabia)	181

President: Mr. Víctor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. QADIR (Pakistan): Mr. President, the fact that you were unanimously elected to preside over the deliberations of the fourteenth session of the General Assembly is a high tribute to your great services to this Organization and to the outstanding contribution which the Latin-American countries have made towards the realization, under the aegis of the United Nations, of an international legal and political order based on justice and freedom. It is only fitting that one of the most learned and eloquent spokesmen of the hopes and ideals which stir all the peoples of the world should be so honoured.

2. I should also like to pay a tribute to Mr. Charles Malik, the President of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly, for the distinguished service which he has rendered in the long course of his association with the United Nations.

3. The Secretary-General has drawn our attention, in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization [A/4132/Add.1], to the evolution of his office within the framework of the Charter. His initiative in the direction of evolving procedures of a diplomatic, operational and good offices character without altering the constitutional balance among the various organs of the United Nations, and his efforts to build up an independent influence for our Organization by expressing an independent judgement on questions of international concern must be welcomed by all Member States. In particular, the not-so-powerful nations have especial reason to endorse Mr. Hammarskjold's independent role on matters which, though of primary concern to the great Powers, also affect the interests of the rest of the world.

4. The world today is dominated by two extremely powerful blocs with a tremendous potential for destruction. Each has misgivings about the real intentions of the other. Both make declarations of their peaceful intentions. There is, however, no way of being certain that what is declared is actually intended by those who declare it, and that, even if it is intended by those who declare it today, those who take their place tomorrow will also abide by it.

5. So long, therefore, as the capacity to destroy remains, suspicions that it might be used must also remain and must be taken into account as an inseparable part of the reality of the situation.

6. The rest of the world consists of States at varying stages of economic and political development. At one end are States politically as mature and economically as developed as any of the most powerful; while at the other end are States politically in their cradle and economically at the stage where recorded history began. Some of them have tried to stay out of the way of the two giants, hoping to be left alone in safety. Some have tried to play one against the other, hoping to gain advantages from both by making each pay a price for their not going over to the other. Some have tried to seek shelter with the giant of their choice, in whom they could put their trust.

7. The spectacle of the community of States of the world today, in essence, is what the spectacle of any community must have been at the threshold of organized and orderly life. Peoples who find themselves placed in such close proximity to one another sooner or later make the discovery that co-operation is better than conflict. Organs and institutions to ensure co-operation and to eliminate conflicts then begin to appear and grow. Science today, by surmounting geographical barriers, has brought all the peoples of the world together to share the same environment and the same destiny.

8. There is, however, an important difference between the past and the present. In the conditions of the past, it did not very much matter when that discovery was made, or whether it was acted upon later or sooner. Life could be trusted to go on in spite of conflicts.

9. That assumption no longer holds good. Conflict today can be on so devastating a scale as to destroy or damage mankind as a whole. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that the discovery be made and acted upon while there is yet time. The beginnings of that discovery have already been made. This august body is a manifestation of it.

10. It would be presumptuous on my part if I, coming here for the first time and speaking on behalf of a State yet engaged in finding ways and means of attaining internal stability in accordance with the will of its people as expressed through their chosen representatives, attempted to expound to those whose experience, learning and ability are acknowledged and acclaimed all over the world the ways and means of securing lasting international stability in accordance with the will of the nations. At the same time, I think it is necessary to emphasize the imperative nature of the need for finding those ways and means—a need which cannot be overemphasized, because the future of all of us depends on finding them—expeditiously.

11. The existence of the capacity to destroy, if balanced on both sides, acts as a deterrent, but not a very dependable deterrent. If it fails to deter, the

alternative is mutual destruction. Theoretically, therefore, the choice is obvious. The difficulty lies in translating the theoretical choice into a workable formula which would ensure that, at the end of the process, neither side would—if I may be pardoned for using a colloquial expression—have something up its sleeve, and that, during the process, at all stages, the balance that acts as a deterrent would be ensured in order to obviate the possibility that either side might take advantage of a transitory lack of equilibrium.

12. Let us earnestly hope that each of the ten nations on the Disarmament Committee, set up as a result of an agreement between the Foreign Ministers of the great Powers, will realize the fateful nature of the task confronting them, and with a sense of the gravity of the consequences of their decisions—on which will depend the fate of many others who will not be there to speak for themselves—will work out a scheme ensuring disarmament as complete as that envisaged by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Mr. Khrushchev, and under controls as effective as those emphasized by the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Herter. While expressing this hope, my delegation is only too conscious of the technical and political difficulties of the problem before the Committee, more especially as to the establishment of effective inspection over the various fields of disarmament.

13. It is on this rock of effective inspection that many a scheme of disarmament, whether comprehensive or partial, has foundered. The record of the disarmament negotiations shows that a control system to ensure the complete elimination of stockpiles of nuclear weapons of mass destruction is not yet feasible. If it is true that any kind of inspection which it may be possible to agree upon in this field would leave a margin of error which would expose one side to the risk that the other might evade it, it would seem that the prospects for total disarmament are no nearer than before. In that case, it would be more realistic to proceed to negotiate initially on the basis of comprehensive disarmament as outlined to us by the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, last week [798th meeting]. The scope of the negotiations could then be enlarged to include complete and general disarmament, together with the development of techniques to bring the question of hidden nuclear stockpiles within the sphere of detection and control.

14. In regard to the other aspects of disarmament—namely, the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for the manufacture of weapons; the reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons, armed forces and conventional armaments; and the institution of measures against the possibility of surprise attack—every conceivable scheme must necessarily have some component area in which it has to be assumed that the parties will do what they undertake. With reference to that area at least, both parties have to take the risk of trusting each other in some measure. The solution, therefore, lies in reducing that area to the smallest possible size and then in taking a calculated risk. However large that risk might seem, it cannot be larger than the one involved in an accelerating armaments race.

15. Since 1957, the emphasis in disarmament plans has shifted from comprehensive schemes to partial measures in view of the scientific barrier to devising a system of effective control which would altogether eliminate stockpiles of nuclear weapons. In the context of a partial or first-stage plan, the Pakistan delegation has been urging that the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, along with certain other measures of disarmament, should be given priority.

16. Agreement in principle has been reached between the four great Powers on the ceilings of their respective armed forces in the meetings in London of the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission in 1957. It should be possible to move forward in this direction without upsetting the existing balance in the military strength of the great Powers to the prejudice of the security of either side. If this could be done, it would enable all Member States to devote the resulting savings in military expenditures to raising the living standard of their own peoples as well as that of the more than two-thirds of the world's population who live in the less developed countries.

17. My delegation hopes that the ten-Power Disarmament Committee will give the earliest possible consideration to setting up groups of experts to study, along with other questions, the technical aspects of controlling conventional armaments and armed forces. Encouraged by the "rapprochement" which has already taken place in the positions of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union, we would venture to suggest that the ten-Power Committee should make every effort to reach agreement on the reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments of the great Powers and should also give consideration to the convening of a special session of the General Assembly within two years to effect a reduction of the standing armies and armaments of all other Member States to appropriate levels.

18. Nuclear test explosions, apart from their bearing on the question of disarmament, have another aspect also, which makes it necessary that they be given special and prior consideration. These explosions are followed by after-effects which are injurious to living organisms. A part of my country is situated in the belt of the greatest concentration of radio-active fall-out. Furthermore, rice, which absorbs radio-active substances to a much larger extent than other crops, forms the staple food of the majority of our population. It is gratifying to note that the great Powers have themselves suspended nuclear tests for the time being, but this suspension rests on a precarious basis. It is our earnest hope that in the forthcoming talks between President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Khrushchev, as well as in the negotiations to be resumed in three weeks, a way will be found permanently to put a stop to all nuclear explosions. Meanwhile, we hope that neither side will resume testing pending the conclusion of a permanent agreement.

19. My Government also shares the deep concern of the Governments and peoples of Africa over the effects of an impending atomic explosion in the Sahara.

20. The Minister for External Affairs of Ireland, Mr. Frank Aiken, has rendered a great service to the cause of peace by inviting attention to the dangers inherent in the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons [805th meeting]. The United Nations should urgently take all possible steps to prevent nuclear armaments from coming into the hands of countries which do not now possess them.

21. The staggering achievement of the Soviet Union in sending a rocket to the moon underscores the urgency of reaching an international agreement to prohibit, under international control, the use of outer space for military purposes and to devote it exclusively to peaceful uses. The first aspect is a part of the problem of general disarmament. We regret to note that the recommendation in General Assembly resolution 1148 (XII) with regard to the undertaking of a joint study of an inspection system to ensure that outer space should not be used for military purposes has not so far been acted upon.

22. The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space [A/4141], which was set up at the thirteenth session to consider the area of international co-operation and programmes which could be undertaken in that field under the auspices of the United Nations, is a useful exploratory study of the problem. My delegation hopes that it will be possible at this session to take positive action in regard to the machinery of international co-operation suggested by the Committee.

23. It is desirable that, from the very beginning of the space age, certain basic legal norms in regard to the nature and uses of outer space should be firmly established. We entirely share the views of those States Members of the United Nations which maintain that the principles of classical international law concerning territory, sovereignty and occupation cannot be regarded as applicable to outer space and celestial bodies. It would be a tragedy if outer space were used to destroy mankind through the extension of national and ideological rivalries into the new dimension. To avert this danger, it would be the path of wisdom to establish at the outset of the space age that outer space belongs in its entirety to the whole world, to be freely used by all States without interference and on the principle of sovereign equality.

24. The sources of ineffectiveness in this Organization must be removed if it is to fulfil its great task of establishing lasting peace in the world. Existing disputes between States cause serious friction. The organs of the United Nations which are intended to deal with them have not always been capable of settling them.

25. There is, for example, the dispute which my country has with its great neighbour India, relating to the State of Jammu and Kashmir, on which, we are convinced, hinges the destiny of the two countries and the future of Asia and, it may well be, of an even larger area of the world.

26. Eleven years ago, the United Nations brought about a cease-fire in the State. The Security Council and the parties concerned, namely India and Pakistan, undertook a solemn commitment that the dispute would be decided by means of a plebiscite held under the auspices of the United Nations. That pelbiscite has not yet been held. Throughout this period, Pakistan has steadfastly adhered to the principle that the disposition of the State of Jammu and Kashmir must be made in accordance with the wishes of its people and that those wishes must be ascertained impartially and in conditions which do not permit any coercion or intimidation by either side. This is the substance of our demand. We ask no favour, impose no conditions, seek no bargain.

27. The right of self-determination for the people of Kashmir has been laid down and consistently upheld by the United Nations in all its resolutions on the subject, which both India and Pakistan have accepted. The implementation of these resolutions would therefore be no more than the discharge of our solemn obligations under the United Nations Charter.

28. At this historical stage, opportunities are presenting themselves which, if grasped, can assure the stability of Asia, but if neglected, can ruin the future of its peoples. We, on our part, are keenly conscious of this fact, and it was in this spirit that, on his own initiative, the President of Pakistan met the Prime Minister of India a few weeks ago. We look forward to further improvement in our relations with India.

29. The Kashmir dispute brings out in sharp focus the urgent need to strengthen the United Nations procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes in order to avert danger to international peace and security. The threat of veto which hangs over any action that the Security Council might propose to take in this direction renders the Council impotent to fulfil its commitments. Is it not time for the great Powers voluntarily to undertake to refrain from resorting to the practice of veto in matters falling within the purview of Chapter VI of our Charter, so that the high purposes of our Organization may not be frustrated?

30. In cases of friction between States which cannot be removed through negotiations, it is essential that the States should have recourse to independent third parties to compose their differences lest international peace and security be endangered. The Pakistan delegation has always maintained that no State should arrogate to itself the role of a judge in its own cause, but that all States should abide by the verdict of disinterested and impartial individuals or organs of the United Nations. We have faithfully adhered to this principle of international conduct.

31. It is in this spirit that we gratefully accepted the offer of the good offices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development made several years ago by its President, Mr. Eugene Black, in our dispute with India over the continuance to Pakistan of the historic supplies of water from the tributaries of the Indus River. After seven years of untiring work, Mr. Black, Mr. Iliff and their associates succeeded in narrowing the area of disagreement. If their good offices are crowned with success, as we sincerely hope they will be, they will have added, as the Secretary-General observes [A/4132/Add.1], a valuable new element in support of the general efforts of the United Nations.

32. My delegation shares the regret and concern expressed by the Secretary-General, in the introduction to his annual report, on the failure of many Member States to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice or to resort to the Court more freely for a judicial determination of legal questions. Had it been otherwise, it might have been possible to settle our disputes with our neighbour without the frictions and frustrations which have caused so much bitterness and threatened so much misery. An extension of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court would enable Member States to take international conflicts capable of being adjudicated to that forum, even when the organs of the United Nations charged with the responsibility for preserving peace prove unequal to the task.

33. There is another matter relating to the role of this Organization which needs special attention. As

the Secretary-General has said, the time has arrived for the United Nations to deal more directly with the formulation of international economic policies, or at least, to serve in a more systematic way as a forum for the consideration of such policies. In our opinion such a development is essential if international economic co-operation is to be a reality.

34. The problem facing us in this field is urgent. Of the eighty-two States Members of the United Nations, no less than sixty have an average income of $120 per person, as contrasted with an average income in the more advanced countries of about $800 per person. The dangers inherent in this disparity, which is not only great but growing, have been seen by many leading statesmen, who consider the potentialities of this situation to be far more explosive than those of the cold war itself. No solution of this situation can be visualized until the flow of international investment for capital formation in the under-developed countries is substantially increased.

35. There are, we think, two main factors which militate against the raising of the standard of living in the under-developed countries. The first is the rate of population growth. The second concerns the current fluctuation in the primary commodity market. The price-index of primary commodities has fallen in the last few years, resulting in the reduction of export earnings by 7 per cent to 8 per cent. This drop, coinciding with a rise in the import prices of manufactured goods, represents a loss in the import capacity of the under-developed countries equivalent to about one-sixth of the official gold and foreign-exchange holdings of these countries, that is, to about six years' lending to them by the International Bank.

36. The critical nature of this situation has brought about a certain measure of understanding of the problem. It is being recognized that commodity problems must be considered from the point of view of the development of the under-developed countries, and not as a contest between producers and consumers of the commodities.

37. While on the subject of economic development, may I draw attention to another area of activity which deserves close consideration? This concerns the progress of the under-developed countries in land reform. As pointed out in several resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Economic and Social Council, improvements in the agrarian structure of a country not only help to promote social progress and raise the standard of living, but also tend to stimulate agricultural production and general economic development by providing an integrated approach to the task of development.

38. Pakistan has taken a significant step in this field in the course of the current year. A ceiling on land holding has been fixed. Lands in excess of the ceiling—over 3 million acres—will be taken over by the Government on payment of compensation to their owners, for redistribution among landless tenants and other deserving claimants. This measure of agrarian reform will, we hope, provide the tiller of the soil with the necessary incentive to increase his output by assuring him of ownership. It is also expected to have far-reaching consequences in the social and political spheres.

39. May I now turn to a few specific questions.

40. My delegation has taken note of the historic statement of 16 September by the President of France, General de Gaulle, in which three choices were offered to the people of Algeria: secession and independence; complete integration with metropolitan France; or semi-autonomous status in close union with France. The full implications of his statement can be grasped only when the clarifications, which have been sought by many, are given. My delegation fervently hopes that President de Gaulle's offer may set into motion a process of negotiation and reconciliation leading to an early cessation of fighting, an end to suffering and bloodshed in Algeria, and a fulfilment of the aspirations of its people.

41. In February of this year, the Governments of Turkey, Greece and the United Kingdom and the leaders of the two national communities in Cyprus demonstrated a capacity for statesmanship of the highest order by subscribing to an agreed foundation for the final settlement of the problem of Cyprus. It is the earnest hope of my delegation that the constitutional structure envisaged in the agreement between the parties concerned, based on a division of sovereignty between the two ethnic groups in Cyprus, will guarantee equal protection of the fundamental rights of both the Greek and the Turkish populations.

42. Pakistan wishes Godspeed to the republic of Cyprus in meeting the challenge of independence and looks forward to its admission to the United Nations.

43. The action taken by the Security Council earlier this month on the request of the Royal Government of Laos for an emergency force was both timely and appropriate. In appointing a Sub-Committee to ascertain and report the facts of the situation in the north-eastern provinces of Laos, the Security Council did not do more than set up a fact-finding body. It could have done no less. It could not have turned a deaf ear to the plea of Laos without seriously undermining the faith of small Member States in this Organization.

44. Pakistan is deeply concerned over the situation in Laos. A threat to the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the political independence of Laos is necessarily a matter of concern to other countries of the area as it must be to all Members of the United Nations.

45. We have been shocked to hear of the attempt on the life of the Prime Minister of Ceylon today. Mr. Bandaranaike was due to address this Assembly on 2 October. We pray for his recovery and offer our deep sympathy to the delegation of Ceylon.

46. The movement for independence is sweeping across Africa with the force of a tidal wave. When the Charter of the United Nations was written there were, apart from the Union of South Africa, only three independent African States. Today, there are nine. In the coming year, four more will achieve independence. Political evolution in that continent is simultaneously moving towards larger political unions to ensure the survival, prosperity and liberty of the new African States.

47. Pakistan rejoices in the emancipation of Africa. The goals of self-government and independence set forth in the Charter for the dependent peoples of the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories give added momentum to the demand of all other African peoples for freedom and equality.

48. The transformation of the French colonial territories in Africa into autonomous States within the multinational French Community is but a part of the same gigantic political evolution. The pledge by the administering Power to build democratic institutions in the Belgian Congo to prepare the Territory for sovereignty is a welcome recognition of the historical process which is at work.

49. One of the worst concomitants of colonial rule is the sense of humiliation which is burnt into the souls of subject peoples. Where there is domination, there can be no equality. Where there is no equality, there is discrimination. There is nothing so intolerable as to be humiliated in one's own native land by alien masters.

50. To our sorrow, discrimination is till practised by one group against another in large areas of Africa today. In the Union of South Africa, the people of Indian and Pakistan origin are subjected, together with their African brethren, to a treatment which offends against the great traditions of law and government in the British Commonwealth. It is repugnant to the principle of encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms incorporated in the Charter of the United Nations. Sooner or later, we hope, the Union of South Africa will recognize that the colour of the skin is not a rational basis for classification in respect of civil rights and social status.

51. Turning to the Middle East, may I refer to the establishment of the United Nations Emergency Force, which, born in the midst of turmoil, has lived to play a vital part in the maintenance of peace in that region. Its success should enable us to give further consideration to the idea of a United Nations stand-by force. My delegation recognizes the practical difficulties involved, but we are convinced that some initial steps by Member States for earmarking contingents can at this time be taken. Studies of the technical aspects of the question can be pursued simultaneously.

52. Pakistan, as a Moslem country, shares the great common heritage and tradition of the Moslem peoples and communities throughout the world. We share their aspirations for the future and are in deep sympathy with their problems of the present.

53. It is with great regret, therefore, that we note that, although over a decade has passed, the victims of international injustice in Palestine who took refuge elsewhere are still denied repatriation, which was guaranteed to them by successive resolutions of the General Assembly.

54. The one million Palestine refugees have continued to live on the charity of others for the past ten years, nourished only by the hope that one day they will return to their homeland and pick up the threads of their disrupted lives. With every passing year this hope has grown dimmer and the frustrations of the refugees have grown greater. Next year even the agency through which relief has so far been channelled to these unfortunate people is to be wound up unless the General Assembly decides otherwise. We think UNRWA should continue in existence. The United Nations cannot at this stage give up its direct responsibility for the relief of these people. It seems to us that, so long as the refugee problem remains, the machinery which has been built up over the years should also continue.

55. In the spirit of the World Refugee Year, Members of the United Nations must give concentrated attention to the solution of the problem of these one million refugees. So long as this problem remains unsolved, peace cannot return to that region.

56. As the Secretary-General remarked in the introduction to his annual report, the World Refugee Year has begun auspiciously. We sincerely hope that it will give an impetus to a final solution of the probelms of these unfortunate people.

57. Pakistan has its own refugee problem, different both in kind and in degree from that coming within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Although the overwhelming majority of the 10 million refugees have successfully integrated themselves into the life of the nation by their own efforts, vast numbers have remained for many years without homes and without regular work. The Government of Pakistan has set itself a time limit to solve this gigantic problem, a solution which is long overdue. Happily our efforts have coincided with the World Refugee Year. To give an idea of the pace at which we are proceeding, and in order to explain why we are not able to do more for the refugees in other parts of the world, I might mention that 15,000 housing units have been constructed in just one township near Karachi, in a period of less than six months. Refugees are being moved into them at the rate of 100 families every day. Pakistan is therefore able to make only a token contribution to the programme of the World Refugee Year—in addition to its usual contribution to the rehabilitation of the Palestine refugees—in order to show its sympathy and deep concern for all the refugees of the world, wherever they may be.

58. Finally, may I revert to the all-important question of the day. The struggle between the two systems has now entered a dangerous phase. We have come to the Great Divide of history. Will the struggle have a peaceful outcome or will it precipitate a nuclear catastrophe?

59. Genghis Khan, it is said, sought counsel from a religious divine as to how he could ensure the survival of his laws. The divine replied that systems endured only while populations survived. How could his laws remain when those for whom they were intended were destroyed?

60. May those who have in their hands the awesome power to destroy the world take this utterance of the divine to heart.

61. Mr. SHUKAIRY (Saudi Arabia): Once more we are in session, and once again we meet in the Parliament of Man. Judging by all external appearances, this session of our Assembly is regular and normal. Supposedly, it is the usual annual session. Yet the atmosphere is neither usual nor seasonal, for this session stands outside the pattern of the thirteen sessions held since the days of San Francisco. The fateful events that are rushing into the international arena and the attending trends that are manifesting themselves in our Organization are neither of a usual character nor of an ordinary nature. We seem to stand at the cross-roads of human relations—at a point of divergence, leading to diverse destinations. This session seems to break the monotony of the United Nations, a monotony that threatens to debilitate the Organization. It is a unique session—happily and fortunately led by a unique President.

62. As one of the founding fathers of our Organization, Mr. Belaúnde hardly stands in need of an intro-

duction. His grasp of international affairs is masterly. To our Charter, Mr. Belaúnde has appended a noble rule of conduct. In gracious words, he has often urged that we think as philosophers, act as statesmen, and speak as diplomats. It is with all these qualities that our President presides. Yet in Mr. Belaúnde dwells the experience of another man. Our President was a political exile for a whole decade. He was a refugee, away from his beloved homeland, and a refugee has a burning understanding of the Charter and a fiery urge to apply its principles. To our President we extend our sincere congratulations. To his country, Peru, and to the whole continent of Latin America, we convey our greetings. This Organization should rejoice in having elected a President with the wisdom of a philosopher, the talent of a statesman, the gifts of a diplomat and, finally, with the human experience of the agony of exile.

63. As for the session, I submit that the atmosphere, rather than the agenda, speaks for itself. By and large, our agenda at this fourteenth session is identical with our agenda at the first session. But our meeting this year is held in a climate of excitement accompanied by hope and fear. One can readily state the reason. It is the meeting of President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Khrushchev, the two giants of this planet on which we live—the planet that witnessed our civilization and culture, our progress and evolution, and indeed our very existence. Mr. Khrushchev's visit to the United States and the forthcoming visit of Mr. Eisenhower to the Soviet Union are the most exciting events of the day. Given all chances of success, these visits may go far in making history for a long long time to come.

64. Obviously, the significance of these meetings can hardly be overstated. It is not only the summit, but the summit of the very summit. With the world what it is, the meeting of the two is not simply a meeting of two great leaders. Behind them there are two great conflicting worlds possessing the genius of destructiveness and the talents for creativeness. It is true that in the arena there is a group of States which seek to keep out of the way. It is equally true that there is also this Organization, endeavouring to wrestle with the problems of international peace and security. But the vibrant fact is that in the long run international peace does not rest mainly with our Organization or in our resolutions. World peace and the destiny of mankind reside in the will of the two giants of our age. In Eisenhower and Khrushchev, in their conduct and their words, lies the destiny of the whole race and the salvation of mankind from the horrors of annihilation. Never before have two men stood so squarely before the bar of history. At the third emergency special session, President Eisenhower addressed our Assembly [733rd meeting] and advanced a very noble plan for general disarmament. At this session, and from the same rostrum at which President Eisenhower stood, Mr. Khrushchev has outlined a four-year plan for disarmament [799th meeting], an exciting plan that will leave this world with nothing but a police force.

65. The United Nations has thus before it an American and a Soviet plan for disarmament. In both plans, that of the United States and that of the Soviet Union, the declared policies are noble and magnanimous, and what remains is sincere fulfilment and faithful execution. Agreement of the giant two will no doubt lead to disarmament; nothing short of agreement will ever solve this age-old problem.

66. By the force of living realities the United Nations role in this field is very much limited. No resolution or heap of resolutions would lead to disarmament. This is an item on which all efforts of the United Nations have thus far failed, and miserably failed. A discussion between the two "tête-à-tête", and heart to heart as we hope, is more likely to produce agreement. We believe that the United Nations at present can do very little, if anything at all, on this subject. Let us leave the great two to iron out their differences. This is no abolition of the United Nations, but a Charter method to facilitate the task of the United Nations. There is a stage when the Secretary-General can participate in such discussions with his usual exemplary ability. There is another stage when the United Nations in full can play a useful role. We shall not abandon our responsibilities, but let us wait and see.

67. Side by side with disarmament, however, there is the general question of the relaxation of world tensions and the peaceful settlement of outstanding disputes. In this field, agreement of the great two is a big contribution. But we have a reminder or a warning to make: it is only just solutions, not adjustments of convenience or expedience, that will lead to peace, lasting peace. Any solution repugnant to the spirit of the Charter is bound to breed conflict and unrest. It is only with this approach, and with no other approach, that we can avoid the scourge of war, with its untold sorrow and indescribable annihilation.

68. Yet to create conditions of peace and stability, we are not to sit idle. All nations have a contribution to make and a duty to discharge. In fact, many States, individually or in their regional organizations and conferences, have spared no effort to achieve these goals. The Conference of Independent African States, held at Monrovia in August 1959, is a landmark in the history of Africa in its sacred march towards complete liberty and sovereignty. In the Arab homeland, some outstanding events have taken place, and their bearing on the international situation deserves to be highlighted at this session.

69. A fortnight before the opening of the General Assembly, the Council of the League of Arab States was convened at Casablanca. For the first time since its inception in 1945, a meeting of the Arab League was held in the far west of the Arab homeland. This is a fact of great significance. It portrays Arab nationalism aiming at oneness of objective and solidarity of action. It provides ample proof that, once liberty is attained in any Arab territory in Asia or in Africa, inter-Arab relations become governed by unity and co-operation. When unity is absent, it is not because of the absence of its attributes; rather it is the result of foreign domination. Given freedom of action, Arab nationalism is bound to take its course in its march towards political unity, economic development and social advancement.

70. These are not marginal inferences or propaganda material. These are the cardinal facts of Arab nationalism in its quest for final liberation. The Casablanca meetings have provided the testimony, if testimony is required. In his message to the Council of the Arab League, His Majesty the King of Morocco referred to his country as—and I invite attention to this—an integral part of the great Arab homeland. In stressing Arab solidarity, His Majesty declared that the freedom of the United Arab Republic and Iraq is the freedom of Morocco, and that the cause of Pales-

tine and the Sudan is the cause of Tunisia. This is Arab nationalism; oneness of past, continued in oneness of present and leading to oneness in the future.

71. There is, however, another important aspect of the picture. When the King of Morocco was stressing from Casablanca these basic concepts, other voices from Cairo were resounding the echo with the same vigour: the voices of His Majesty King Saud of Saudi Arabia and President Nasser of the United Arab Republic. The two leaders, meeting in Cairo early in September, discussed all national and international problems. They went into their conference captured by the spirit of Arab brotherhood and the dictates of peace for their land and the whole world. Their official proclamation has revealed a consensus of mind, a community of interest and an identity of policy.

72. Thus the events of Casablanca and Cairo should, like a green light, encourage those who are watching the Arab movement in its struggle for final liberty. Likewise, these events should serve as a warning against any attempts to dominate or interfere in Arab affairs. They confirm more than ever that to perturb Arab waters is futile, and therefore for Israel to fish in disturbed waters is a losing game. Arab waters, no matter how deeply disturbed they appear, cool down with amazing rapidity. To the disappointment of Israel, they soon become crystal clear, at least for those who have clear vision to see. Let Israel speak no more of President Nasser's relation to one Arab State or another. President Nasser and the other Arab States are impregnable to the wishful sentiments and sympathies of Mrs. Golda Meir, the representative of Israel. Israel's lamentations over inter-Arab relations are most amusing, as we heard yesterday from this rostrum from Mrs. Meir [806th meeting]. It would be better for the Israel representative to keep her tears outside the bounds of this Assembly.

73. I have stressed these events, which took place recently in the Arab homeland, because they form the general pattern that guides our deliberations on all our questions. Further, these facts have a bearing upon the general security and prosperity of the whole Arab sub-continent. Ours is not a no man's land of insignificant history. It is the ancient homeland of an ancient people with an ancient civilization. With its material and its spiritual resources, and with its strategic position, this whole area can be a buffer zone, a belt of security. It can be a barrier of peace between the East and the West, standing as it does between the three greatest continents of the world. It can be that, and more than that, only when the powers within pull out, and the powers without continue to keep out. Israel has no place in this picture, for Israel is the embodiment of imperialism coupled with colonialism. What we are striving to attain is not beyond our inherent rights. We envy none and covet none. But none should covet our territory, and none should envy the treasures of our territory. Ours is a policy of co-operation on the basis of mutuality. We want to be let alone, not in isolation, but under conditions of free co-operation. We intend to develop our economy in the best interests of our people, free from any domination or group pressure.

74. This particular stress of group pressure is not without reason. There is a very genuine ground to bring this matter to the attention of the United Nations; the more so because in her statement yesterday the representative of Israel dealt at length with what she described as the Arab economic warfare waged against Israel. Let us see how this war is waged.

75. The story is simple to state. In August, just at the threshold of this session of the Assembly, Israel, directly and through Zionist organizations and a handful of mercenary congressmen, launched an unholy crusade against the Arab economy. I should like to cite one instance only as an illustration. In the course of the debate in the Senate of the United States last August—in connexion with economic aid to be extended to Saudi Arabia—Israel found, in the person of the Honourable Senator Wayne Morse, a supporter to raise a number of matters pertaining to the policy of our Government. I shall deal with the matter only to show that it is Israel which is waging economic warfare against the Arabs.

76. I shall not answer the charges of Senator Morse that His Majesty, our King, "does not believe in democracy", that he "is no respecter of human rights", that he is a "tyrannical absolute monarch", that he "still maintains a slave market", and other insolent and abusive falsehoods not worthy of a Congress that represents a polite, courteous, dignified and great nation such as the United States. Nor would I comment on Senator Morse's statement that I do not represent the views of my King, for this is none of his business. I shall make only a brief reference to the substance of that question in so far as it reflects the very same views which were expressed yesterday by the representative of Israel from this rostrum.

77. Reading the Congressional Record of 12 August, we find that Senator Morse stated:

> "Saudi Arabia ... refuses to allow [companies] to employ Jews for work in Saudi Arabia ... The Government of Saudi Arabia"—as well as all the Arab Governments—"[practises] anti-Semitic policies toward American Jewish citizens..."[1]

Based on this, Senator Morse has formally proposed an amendment that no economic assistance should be extended to Saudi Arabia, or to any other Arab Government, until all such restrictions have been removed. It requires no genius to discover the author of this move. Its smells of Israel instigation.

78. It is true that we do not allow Jews to enter our country, nor do we allow Jews to be employed in any job in our country. That is a fact which we do not deny. This is not in the least a matter of discrimination, as Israel is suggesting. This is not a matter of anti-Semitism. Mrs. Meir should be reminded that Semites cannot be anti-Semites. It is not an action initiated, but a reaction necessitated.

79. Zionism, with Israel as its embodiment, has invaded our country, expelled its people from their homes and robbed them of their properties and fortunes. But that was not the end. Israel has proclaimed that Palestine is the homeland of every Jew and that its doors should be always open to Jewish immigration. Time and again Ben-Gurion has declared that Israel is the common possession—and I draw the Assembly's attention to this new concept of international life—of each and every Jew all over the world. The conference of the World Jewish Congress held at Stockholm in August 1959 described Israel as the

[1] Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the 86th Congress, First Session, vol. 105, No. 137, p. A6971.

product of the will and effort of Jews in every corner of the globe. Here, in the United Sates, Israel has become the sole business of American Jewry. Campaigns to raise funds, or to mobilize senators and congressmen of Morse's calibre, have become the order of the day. In these circumstances, how can any Arab Government remain indifferent? It would be a betrayal of our people, an abdication of our duty, if we failed to take the necessary measures. When world Jewry is so identified with Israel and Israel enterprises, it is inconceivable to us to resign ourselves to inaction, to retire to indifference.

80. This identity between Israel and world Jewry is not Arab imagination; it is a fact of common knowledge admitted by Israel itself. In his book on Israel, Walter Eytan, Assistant to Mrs. Meir and Director-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Israel, writes as follows:

> "Israel's representatives abroad . . . are constantly engaged in the campaigns for voluntary funds contributed by Jews all over the world, in popularizing Israel bond issues, in securing . . . grants-in-aid . . . , and in a variety of other revenue-producing activities." 2/

Thus, an Israel Ambassador abroad is accredited, not to the host Government and not for a diplomatic mission, but first and foremost, to the Jewish citizenry and for fund-raising activities. Eytan writes further:

> "It is a commonplace of our Foreign Service"—and this is for Mrs. Meir to ponder—"that every Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Israel has a dual function. He is a Minister Plenipotentiary to the country to which he is accredited—and Envoy Extraordinary to its Jews." 3/

This is the concept held by the Israel Foreign Service of its relations with the world. Nothing could be more incriminating. This is a unique function of a dual character without precedent in the history of diplomatic relations—I mean decent diplomatic relations.

81. Walter Eytan cites further a most informative incident that took place in Buckingham Palace, where, we are told, protocol is always respected. This is what he wrote:

> "King George VI once startled the Chief Rabbi of the Commonwealth by mentioning to him, at a Buckingham Palace reception, that he had the day before received 'your Ambassador', meaning the Ambassador of Israel, in London." 4/

With this paradoxical situation, where the Israel Ambassador is considered in Buckingham Palace as representing the Jews in the Commonwealth, I submit that the measures—and perhaps any measures—taken by the Arab Governments are well founded and amply justified.

82. Yet these measures, of which the Israel representative complained yesterday, can be re-examined and reconsidered when the situation which gave rise to the measures is virtually brought to an end. Israel should be left on its own. Jews, whether they are Americans or Russians, should dedicate themselves devotedly and exclusively to their homelands. Their loyalty and their flag should belong to their countries, and not to Israel. When Zionism has been disbanded, when it ceases to identify world Jewry with Israel, when Israel ends its subversive activities in States which have Jewish communities, and when Jewish immigration is outlawed, then and only then shall we be prepared to consider our policy on this matter.

83. I have cited the instance of Senator Morse to show how Israel, through Zionist organizations and mercenary congressmen, has recently launched this campaign against the Arab economy. I submit that this instance engineered by Israel is nothing but warfare against the Arab economy. It is outrageous, undue pressure unleashed under the shadow of principles—principles that were reiterated yesterday from this rostrum by the representative of Israel, principles that were violated by Israel piecemeal and wholesale. Never before has a congressman stepped out of bounds to hamper the national economy of another people under the instigation and connivance of Israel. Israel owes its survival to grants-in-aid and to a host of loans from private, public and international banks. Has any congressman or group of congressmen urged that Israel should not be provided with any financial assistance unless it abides by the resolutions of the General Assembly—resolutions that were flouted and violated by Israel—unless Israel accepts the return of the million refugees to their homeland? No one has raised his eyebrows, except over Israel complaints, except over Israel cargo and freight in the Suez Canal—not over the misery, the affliction and the distress of a whole refugee nation.

84. As a matter of fact, many Arab problems are the product of Israel mobilized group-pressure that found its way to the United Nations on more than one occasion. Palestine is a striking example. The record of the General Assembly's second session, in 1947, bears evidence to the shifting of positions from one side to the other, to the shifting of votes from one position to the other. I venture to state, in fairness to historic records, that, had president Eisenhower, this great man of our age, been the head of the Executive on 29 November 1947, the day of the partition resolution [181 (II)], in all probability the partition of the Holy Land would have been averted, Israel would not have been established and the whole catastrophe of the Arab refugees would not have emerged.

85. It is against this background that we view the question of navigation in the Suez Canal. Our position is quite clear on this question; let no one have any doubt about it. It is the position taken by the United Arab Republic, with nothing more and nothing less. In his last address in Cairo, President Nasser defined his policy with firmness, frankness and clarity—characteristics of President Nasser. I venture to say that he spoke for the United Arab Republic and for all the Arab States. Israel navigation is part of the Palestine question, and no Israel navigation can be considered before the whole question of Palestine is solved in its entirety. The question of Israel cargo and freight does not overshadow that of the destiny of the people of Palestine, of their natural existence, of their property rights and, indeed, of their right to their very homeland. The state of war, about which Israel complains, is of its own making. Israel started the war in 1948 against the Mandatory Power—the United Kingdom—and the people of Palestine. In 1956 Israel renewed this state of war by its armed aggression

2/ Walter Eytan, The First Ten years (New York, Simon and Schuster, 1958), p. 225.

3/ Ibid., p. 192.

4/ Ibid., p. 193.

against Egypt. Israel now feels free to wage war and to deny the state of war and complain from this rostrum about the state of war. This is the logic of Israel, which we shall not answer. It is a travesty of the United Nations, a mockery of the Charter and an affront to the intelligence and dignity of this Organization.

86. Israel has complained about the state of war, but here today in a dispatch in The New York Times we find that the Egyptian-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission has condemned Israel for a violation of the armistice because of the attack of four Israel fighter-planes against an Egyptian commercial plane. If this could not be a military operation, if this could not be an act of war, if this condemnation by the Mixed Armistice Commission means nothing to Israel, then why should Israel come to the rostrum here and complain of a state of war which it is creating every day, relentlessly? Today's example is testimony of only one violation of the armistice demarcation line, and I would not say that it is the last because there will be other violations to come. But Israel feels free to undertake those military operations and to deny this state of war which it has created, and then to come here to the United Nations as a lamb, with a peaceful approach, to complain of the state of war being waged by the Arabs.

87. Let me turn now to specific problems which, though Arab by their nature, have become international by their developments. I propose to deal first with British colonialism in the Arab homeland. Under this general heading there are many problems, different in detail but one in nature.

88. In a nutshell, the Arab nation is still suffering from a legacy of British colonialism in the Arab homeland. I say "legacy", for the British have pulled out of Egypt, Iraq and Jordan. But the British are still holding a varied degree of domination in different areas around the Arabian peninsula. The situation has led on more than one occasion to tension, conflict and armed aggression.

89. In Oman, an independent Arab territory for generations, the British armed forces have in the last years been attacking the people of the area in order to destroy their determination to maintain their independence. The matter was raised before the Security Council.[5] The bombardment of defenceless villages, particularly by the use of rockets, has recently aroused indignation in the United Kingdom House of Commons.

90. Armed British incursions into the eastern side of our territory were also reported to the Security Council.[6] British domination of the so-called nineteenth-century Trucial Sheikhdoms is still continuing with the same vigour. The British are endeavouring to alienate the people of those areas from their Arab brothers, a fashionable British policy that has grown out of fashion.

91. In Aden, which was captured to defend imperial communications and the route to India, the British are still stuck to their trenches. The Empire exists no more and India, now India and Pakistan, belongs to its people. But Aden is still administered as a colony.

92. In the southern areas in Yemen, British air bombardment has become seasonal—it ceases for an interval, to be resumed for another. The villagers have to be on the lookout, always on their guard, waiting for British Spitfires spitting showers of death and torrents of destruction on their land.

93. In most of the areas in the south and east of the Arabian peninsula, the United Kingdom is establishing military bases and airfields. The timing of such military enterprises is an irony in itself. While the United Kingdom speaks so loudly from this rostrum about disarmament, we find the British engaged in building military establishments on another's land. This is really a yardstick to measure British plans of disarmament advanced here in the United Nations. We can readily fathom the depth of the lengthy speech of Mr. Lloyd on the issue of disarmament [798th meeting].

94. Further, British oil companies, taking advantage of British preponderance, have entered into, and I would say imposed, oil concessions that are devoid of the rudiments of equity and fairness. All this takes place while here in the Assembly we speak most eloquently of economic assistance to the under-developed areas. In his address to the Assembly, Mr. Lloyd referred to his Government's intention to increase its contributions to technical assistance funds. Well and good, but let those who speak so lavishly about the under-developed countries render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's. And in this case, I am afraid, Mr. Lloyd will have to be reminded that there is nothing to be rendered unto Caesar. Let the people enjoy their riches, and let the riches be enjoyed by the people.

95. It is high time that the United Kingdom liquidated this legacy. Sooner or later the United Kingdom will have to pull out. If sooner, it will mean that sooner there will be better relations with the Arab people. I trust that the United Kingdom delegation will receive our observations in the same spirit that animated its observations on the questions of Laos and Tibet [798th meeting]. Mr. Lloyd has lamented the situation in those countries. With regard to Tibet, Mr. Lloyd regretted the "ruthless assaults upon the historic life of a sturdy and friendly people". As for Laos, Mr. Lloyd urged the preserving of "the rights of a sovereign people to live their own lives in independence and security."

96. We are for the cause of freedom, wherever the issue arises, but there cannot be two yardsticks for freedom. Freedom is indivisible. You cannot protest what you call "ruthless assaults upon the historic life of a...people" when you stand in the dock with a verdict of "guilty" for committing an assault against the historic life of another people. We do not mean to be offensive or discourteous. This is simply a reminder, in the interest of consistency, let alone in that of the dignity of this Organization.

97. I turn now to the question of Algeria. I shall not deal with the various aspects of the problem; neither will I survey the cause of war in Algeria since our last session. I shall confine myself to the statement of President de Gaulle and keep within its confines.

98. With a close resemblance to a mine, the statement of de Gaulle contains a diversity of matter. In a mine—where any mineral is mined—you are bound to come across darkness, dust and mud, and a certain

[5] Official Records of the Security Council, Twelfth Year, 783 and 784th meetings.

[6] Ibid., Supplement for October, November and Decmeber 1958, document S/4119.

amount of ore. So it is with the statement of President de Gaulle: it is full of darkness, mud, dust and a bit of precious ore. The precious ore, I hasten to say, is the principle of self-determination. I do not need to say that we welcome this principle, for the question of Algeria from the very beginning has been advocated and included in the agenda of the United Nations as an issue of self-determination. I would even venture to say that the war in Algeria, its "raison d'être", its objective and indeed its flag, is the principle of self-determination; and nothing is more dear to Algeria, to its Government and its people than the principle of self-determination and its genuine application.

99. President de Gaulle, in his introductory words, referred to the free choice of the Algerians as the only path worthy to be followed. We welcome recourse to the free choice of the people of Algeria—but it must be a choice genuinely free and genuinely democratic. But let us see for a moment how General de Gaulle envisages the principle of self-determination and the right of free choice. President de Gaulle declared: "...I commit myself to ask...of the Algerians... what it is they finally wish to be"—so far so good—"and...of all Frenchmen to endorse their choice"—so far so bad. It requires no genius to discover that this is neither a free choice nor a process of self-determination. To become effective, according to de Gaulle, the choice of the Algerians must be endorsed by France. It becomes glaringly obvious that the future of Algeria is going to be determined by France and not by Algeria. The choice will rest ultimately with France and not with Algeria. But it is Algeria's future we are dealing with. It is not the French destiny we are dealing with. It is the free choice by Algeria which is the crux of the whole problem. What de Gaulle has offered is not self-determination; it is French determination. This is no free choice. It may be a choice, but free from the essence of choice. This is a chaos of choice, pure and simple.

100. But this chaos too deeply permeates more than one aspect of the statement of de Gaulle. The manner of voting is one aspect, and the time of the voting is another. Algerians will have to vote as individuals, we are told by President de Gaulle, for, in his words, "since the beginning of the world there has never been any true Algerian unity". Well, this is a fallacy. It is a fantastic argument, not worthy of a great man such as President de Gaulle. If we were to trace back the unity of various countries since the beginning of the world, then the unity of France itself would become questionable, and President de Gaulle would have to drink from the very same cup he is serving. Algeria is an integral territory. Its people are one. Should they vote, they must vote as a whole. The principle of self-determination is one that belongs to a people, not to individuals. The Algerian people know what President de Gaulle conceals behind individual voting. It is self-termination, not self-determination.

101. As to the time of voting, President de Gaulle sets out a highly spectacular time-table. President de Gaulle himself will fix the time: four years at the latest from the restoration of peace and, as he said, "once a situation has been established whereby loss of life...will not exceed 200 a year". I do not wish to condemn this time-table as ridiculous, for really it is ridicule itself in crystallized form. France should be reminded that the people of Algeria are not so naïve—and, by the way, "naïve" is a French word—as to lay down their arms and leave their destiny for four years to the mercy of President de Gaulle. If anyone thinks that the people of Algeria are so naïve, he is naïve himself.

102. Yet what is most outrageous is to make the maximum loss of 200 lives as a prerequisite to begin the voting. We wonder how President de Gaulle arrived at this exceedingly amusing figure. What is the scale of this human evaluation? What sort of mathematics of death brought about this figure? We know that there are some blood-thirsty "colons" who are ready to step up the maximum figure of President de Gaulle's. We know that such thirst for blood—

103. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): No one has a greater admiration than I for the talent and eloquence and personal qualities of the representative of Saudi Arabia. May I, nevertheless—and this not to interrupt him, for I have no wish to interrupt anyone, and I recognize the right of delegations to speak quite freely on whatever items they see fit in the general debate—may I, as a friend, appeal to him, very humbly but very sincerely, not to use any adjective which might disturb the atmosphere of this Assembly, because it is still my hope that this will be the Assembly of Peace. Forgive me.

104. Mr. SHUKAIRY (Saudi Arabia): I understand you very well, Mr. President, and I understand that you are referring to freedom of speech.

105. We know such thirst for blood is to be found in the French Army itself—as evidenced by the most brutal acts of torture committed against the people of Algeria. We have in evidence testimony from Catholic clergymen, the highest religious authority in France, testifying to the atrocities of the French Army in Algeria. It is on the basis of this testimony of those sublime and sacred people that I portray from this rostrum the situation in Algeria and disclose the tortures inflicted by the French Army in Algeria.

106. But looking closer at the picture as presented by President de Gaulle, we find the details to be most appalling—and if the details are appalling I feel I must tell this Assembly that the details are appalling; I cannot use sweet words in speaking of events before this Assembly when the events themselves are bitter. Bitter events can be explained to the Assembly only in bitter words. Hundreds of thousands of lives are now being destroyed in Algeria, and we are here being called upon to be gentle and sweet. We should, rather, call upon de Gaulle to be gentle and sweet with the people who are fighting for their liberty and independence.

107. The Charter of this Organization, its very foundation, calls for the self-determination of peoples, calls for their liberty, for their freedom. President de Gaulle sets out first the principle of self-determination; then he proceeds to outline the measures for its implementation. But self-determination is killed by the measures prescribed for its application, and President de Gaulle kills his own creation at the very first breath of life. And this dead corpse is thrown onto the steps of the United Nations here, with some distinguished people welcoming it as a solution to the Algerian question.

108. Let us examine the three alternatives President de Gaulle sets out for the solution of this problem. Let us examine them with a sober mind and with cold

calculation in order to see how far the principle of self-determination has been adhered to by President de Gaulle himself.

109. The alternatives are three:

First, secession, which, in President de Gaulle's own words would be "incredible and disastrous ... [it] would carry in its wake ... appalling poverty, abysmal political chaos, all-out slaughter, and ... the warlike dictatorship of the communists". Here we see de Gaulle's concept of independence. He describes independence, a cornerstone in the Charter and one of the objectives for which the United Nations was established as incredible and disastrous—a fantastic and ludicrous description;

Second, "Francization"—and here President de Gaulle is very sweet and gentle, as the President wishes us to be, because it is "Francization", that is integration, which he said would offer the Algerians full equality with the French in salaries, responsibilities, jobs, social security, and a handful of privileges;

And third, federation with France—another alternative which he introduced with a great deal of sweetness and gentleness, and which he praised as offering assistance in the economic, social and military fields.

110. It is quite evident that by these offers President de Gaulle does not really offer a free choice. Secession, which he ridicules as possibly leading to independence, is offered with all the threat of disaster, poverty, chaos and wholesale manslaughter. To the Western world, to arouse their fears—for he knows where lie the fears of the Western world on this question—independence is described as leading to a bloody communistic dictatorship. Coupled with this is the devastating spectre of the partition of Algeria and the integration of the Sahara with France, thus robbing the people of Algeria of the only mineral wealth which they possess. If you threaten the people of Algeria with all these perils, then there is nothing to choose, particularly so when the choice is to be exercised under French administration.

111. Thus the three alternatives offered by President de Gaulle boil down to complete integration, or dependent independence, threatened by the looming spectre of partition.

112. But if President de Gaulle stands by his words, if he does not play pun or fun with independence, the test is quite simple. We all agree that the people of Algeria should be allowed to exercise freedom of choice to determine their destiny. A referendum conducted on this basis would be perfectly simple to carry out. But in order to be free from any pressure and any form of interference, it is only fair that such a referendum should not be carried out by France; it should be undertaken by the United Nations. President de Gaulle said that he invites "observers from all over the world to attend ... the final culmination of this process". We think this invitation to observers satisfies neither justice nor the importance of this historic event in the destiny of Algeria. If President de Gaulle means real business and if he wants a clean referendum, he should hand over the whole operation to the United Nations—and we have complete confidence, let me add, in Mr. Hammarskjold's taking over the operation. Once France is prepared to accept a referendum conducted by the United Nations, the government of Algeria on the other hand will also be ready to accept it. I can state categorically that the Algerian government will accept the choice of the majority of the people of Algeria for anything: for independence, for union with France, or for federation.

113. This is the challenge we put before France, and it is for France to respond to the challenge. If President de Gaulle accepts this United Nations role, the Algerian government would be ready to negotiate with the French Government to discuss the conditions of a cease-fire. I say "a cease-fire". It will not be a pacification, which France has thus far failed to achieve and can never achieve. It will be real peace, with all its blessings. Short of negotiations with the Algerian government, the prospects of peace are dim and the prospects of war are glaring. Not only that: ultimately it will be no victory for France. True, it is an uphill battle, with France and the allies of France; but on the side of Algeria are the gallant heroes of Algeria and the freedom-loving peoples of the whole world.

114. In his concluding words President de Gaulle made the following very interesting statement: "... the road is open. The decision is taken. The game is worthy of France." If by this "game", General de Gaulle means a sincere political solution, then we invite him to ask the United Nations to conduct the game in accordance with the rules of the game. If, on the other hand, by "the game", General de Gaulle means to abduct certain votes from here and there in the United Nations, then what a tragic game it would be! If such a game is worthy of France, as President de Gaulle has chosen to say, then it is not worthy of the United Nations and the net result would be war and the continuation of war. But let us wait and see.

115. I come at last to deal with the question of UNRWA. Although it is only one fragment of the Palestine question and one aspect of the refugee problem, this topic as has been rightly remarked by Mr. Herter, the United States Secretary of State [797th meeting], is of high importance.

116. It is not my intention at this stage of the debate to trace back the history of the Palestine question in the United Nations, of how the partition of the Holy Land was elicited, how Israel was established and how the refugees were driven out of their land. In a nutshell, the Holy Land was partitioned against the will of its people, with an alien community and Government established on the territory by sheer force of arms. This is the background of the refugee problem.

117. Ever since its inception, the problem of the Palestine refugees has been the continuing responsibility of the United Nations. From the very start, the policy of the United Nations has been based on the principle of repatriation. Since 1948, in all the General Assembly resolutions on the subject, the United Nations has reiterated its stand in support of the refugees returning to their homes. To give effect to its decisions, the United Nations established two agencies. The United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine with a definite mandate—and these are the words of the resolution [194 (III)]—"to facilitate the repatriation ... of the refugees", and, side by side with that body, a United Nations agency to provide relief for the refugees pending their repatriation.

118. Israel, as is known, has blocked the efforts of the Conciliation Commission and rejected every proposal for the implementation of repatriation, with the

result that UNRWA has had to drag on up to the present day.

119. This is the situation the United Nations is facing at the present moment. It is a situation which has arisen from the defiance of Israel, and of Israel alone. In his report on the problem [A/4132, chap. I, sect. 10 (c)], the Secretary-General has come to the conclusion that UNRWA should be continued pending the repatriation or the resettlement of the refugees, in accordance with the choice of the refugees. I stress that it should be "in accordance with the choice of the refugees". A detailed analysis of the report will be circulated by the Arab delegations in due time. At this stage, we can safely say, without accepting certain reasonings of the Secretary-General, that his recommendations for the continuation of UNRWA meet the necessity of the situation. But before any misconceptions can gain root in the minds of the Members of the Assembly, it is our duty to state five basic principles which the people of Palestine—and they are the first party in this question—and the Arab States are not prepared to abandon under any sacrifice, no matter how serious and grievous it may be.

120. To begin with, I must state most categorically that, in spite of all that has taken place in the last decade, the Holy Land remains and will continue to be considered as part and parcel of the Arab homeland. Its inhabitants, Moslems, Christians and Jews, and no other aliens, are the only people legitimately entitled to determine its destiny. The territorial integrity of Palestine and the right of its legitimate people to regain their homeland shall continue to remain the cornerstone of Arab policy for all time to come.

121. In the second place, let me make it quite clear that the problem of the refugees is a United Nations responsibility and that this responsibility should continue until the refugees go back to their homes.

122. In the third place, let there be no doubt that the continuation of UNRWA and the continuing burdening of the contributing Governments arises directly and primarily from the continued refusal of Israel to allow the refugees to go back to their homes.

123. In the fourth place, let no one make a mistake about the determination of the refugees to return to their homes. This is their inherent right, which no power on earth is justified in denying or hampering. The people of Palestine, after a decade of exile, now and forever are unswervingly determined to exercise their right of repatriation and their right to return to their homeland.

124. Fifthly, the Palestine refugees are unanimously opposed to any plans which, directly or indirectly, would lead to their absorption in any area outside their homes. Call it what you will, every plan of integration outside their homes, outside their cities and outside their villages is categorically rejected in principle and in detail.

125. There are the five principles which govern our policy on the question of refugees. It is the position taken by the people of Palestine, and I again remind the Assembly that in this case the people of Palestine are the first and primary party, and it is supported by all the Arab States without reservation.

126. Yet, to bring this matter to a speedy end we shall not confine ourselves to stating principles here in the United Nations. We are eager to relieve the burdens of the contributing Governments. The refugees themselves are eager to see this charge discontinued. They are a people with a national pride and a national dignity, and in the past they have shared in such international charities themselves. It has been stated that the United Nations cannot go on endlessly providing them with food and shelter and that the refugees should become self-supporting. The refugees, while resisting an idle life, have equally resisted any plan that will affect in any way their right of repatriation. The question has been asked: what constructive proposals can the Arabs put forward to meet the situation? There has been a current Zionist falsehood that the Arabs have nothing to say except "no" and that they have no constructive plans to offer.

127. This is nothing but sheer nonsense and cheap propaganda material. We take this occasion to propose a constructive plan, not for the Palestine question as a whole because that is not on our agenda, not for the refugee question in its entirety, because that is not on our agenda, but a plan which will relieve the international community from further contributions or further financial burdens. It is three-year plan, after the implementation of which UNRWA could be terminated.

128. The plan consists of three stages and would take care of one million refugees. The first stage deals with the reintegration of 400,000 refugees by the end of 1960. They would be reintegrated in western Galilee, Jaffa, Lydda, Ramla, the Triangle, the central and the southern zone of Palestine. These are areas that have been exclusively allotted to the Arabs under the General Assembly resolution of 1947 [181 (II)]. Without going into the merits of that resolution or the equities or inequities, these areas have been reserved for the Arabs, and there should be no difficulty in reintegrating the refugees in the economy of that area. The region is abundant with productive land and admits of various economic projects. These are Arab lands.

129. The second stage for 1961 deals with 100,000 refugees. In this second year reintegration would take place in the Jerusalem area which was delimited as an international corpus separatum by the United Nations—the United Nations decreeing that sovereignty in the Jerusalem area belongs to none. Here again UNRWA can start projects for the reintegration of the refugees into the economy of the area.

130. The third stage for 1961 deals with the remainder of the refugees, that is, 500,000 refugees—half a million. This group of refugees would be reintegrated in the area now controlled by Israel. But this is not Israel land. Under the Assembly resolution and according to the reports of the Committees of the United Nations, in this region projects for reintegration are feasible because Arab ownership there is preponderant, while Jewish ownership does not exceed 6 per cent of the whole area. So, under the third stage we are proposing the reintegration of half a million refugees on Arab land in an area where Israel does not own more than 6 per cent.

131. The advantages of this plan are manifold. First, it is in accordance with every resolution passed by the General Assembly on the question of Palestine. Secondly, it is in accordance with the wishes of the refugees as stressed by the Secretary-General in his report. Thirdly, it brings to an end the United Nations

financial responsibility by 1961. Fourthly, it cuts down to a fraction—and I say, to a minimum fraction—the cost of economic reintegration of the refugees anywhere. Under our plan, the United Nations does not have to provide a home and a land for a refugee. He has his land, his home, and his homeland in which he has lived, and for which he is always prepared to die.

132. No other plan is workable. The refugees will not accept in any way to be reintegrated outside their lands. This is as certain as the certainty of fate and as the decisiveness of destiny. The Secretary-General in his own way has warned against ignoring the wishes of the refugees. In dealing with the psychological aspects of the problem, he stresses in his report the impossibility—and to this I call the attention of this august body—of economic reintegration without the consent of the refugees. In analysing the political aspect, the Secretary-General endorses the right of the refugees to repatriation in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly. The following meaningful words of the Secretary-General occur in the introduction to his annual report:

> "...this evaluation of the economic conditions... does not in any way detract from or change the substance or legal validity of those [General Assembly] resolutions." [A/4132/Add.1, p. 5.]

This is not where we disagree with Mr. Hammarskjold; we shall explain at the opportune moment where we disagree. What we want to stress at the present is that even on the strength of the report of the Secretary-General, the choice of the refugees—which is their absolute right—is the basic factor for any kind of reintegration. Well, if this is the case—and it is definitely the case—then there is no reintegration outside Palestine. The refugees have already expressed their will. They oppose reintegration outside their lands; and this disposes of the whole matter. If anyone harbours any doubts about the intentions of the refugees, the test would be a plebiscite. And a plebiscite we accept, and the results we accept, here and now.

133. Finally, let me say that it is high time that this refugee question, and the Palestine question as a whole, be solved with justice and nothing but justice. This is a problem that has thrown the Middle East into disaster for the last decade. It is a problem that has damaged the relations between the Arab States and many a friendly State. This is a problem that has brought the world to the brink of war on more than one occasion, and might do so again at any moment. While the world's anxieties are focused on divided Berlin as a powder keg, the flames may be unleashed from divided Jerusalem. The land is ours, and the people are ours. Thus, not only by nature, but also by necessity, we stand for peace and nothing but peace.

134. It is our hope and prayer that in this second decade the Palestine question will usher in an era of peace, based not on expedience or convenience, but on justice, and nothing but justice. To achieve this sublime goal, we place ourselves in the service of peace with all our minds, with all our hearts and with all our souls.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

Litho. in U.N. 77001-November 1959-2,150