

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



1239th
PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 11 October 1963,
at 3.45 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 9:	
General debate (continued)	
Speech by Mr. Padilla Nervo (Mexico)	1
Speech by Mr. Shabib (Iraq)	6
Speech by Mrs. Pandit (India)	9
Speech by Mr. Reid (Dominican Republic) . .	13
Statement by the representative of Somalia .	17
Agenda item 77:	
The violation of human rights in South Viet- Nam (continued)	18
Agenda item 9:	
General debate (continued)	
Statement by the representative of Israel . .	18
Statements by the representative of Pakistan	19
Statements by the representative of India . .	21
Statement by the representative of Portugal	23
Statement by the representative of Syria . .	24
Statement by the representative of Ceylon . .	25
Statement by the representative of Yemen . .	25
Statement by the representative of Af- ghanistan	28

President: Mr. Carlos SOSA RODRIGUEZ
(Venezuela).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)*

1. Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Your election, Sir, as President of the eighteenth session of the General Assembly has been a matter of particular satisfaction to the delegation of Mexico as also to me personally, for I have for many years been in a position to observe your brilliant work as the representative of Venezuela in the United Nations. The choice of you as the person to preside over and guide our deliberations in this historic moment constitutes an honour not only for you and your country, but for all of Latin America. We are confident that your experience, ability and firmness will guarantee to all Members, without exception, the full and lawful exercise of the rights accorded them by the United Nations Charter and the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. And with your wise assistance, we shall all be able, throughout our debates, to fulfil the obligations which are a corollary of those rights.

2. We are met here today to carry out a sacred mission which takes precedence over all others: to strive for understanding among nations; to condemn violence; to create by our conduct an atmosphere of mutual trust; to assert and set in motion peaceful means for the settlement of international disputes; to negotiate

in good faith and, with a firm determination, to reach reasonable and fair agreements; to recognize and respect the rights of others, of all human beings, of all the peoples of the world, of all the States represented here and of those which are not represented. Only mutual respect creates confidence and a climate favourable to the establishment and maintenance of peace in freedom and justice.

3. We have not come to advocate new principles, but rather to give effect to those which we have proclaimed as worthy of guiding us and governing our conduct. It is not enough to pay lip service to these principles; we must translate them into deeds, we must give them meaning and cogency in our daily conduct. That is why we have come here today. This session of the General Assembly will make clear to us what we ought to do and will strengthen our resolve to do it. We do not expect spectacular solutions, but we want to take another step and another and as many as we can—however partial and limited they may be—to pave the way for negotiation of the differences among nations and to bring us closer to disarmament and farther away from war.

4. Year after year, for eighteen years—when we were fifty Member States and now that we are 111 Members of the United Nations—I have had the honour and responsibility of reaffirming from this rostrum Mexico's faith in the need for understanding and for peace, in the inalienable right of peoples everywhere to self-determination. We have, to the best of our ability, defended respect for human dignity and the fundamental freedoms of all.

5. The yearning for freedom is a prodigious force which cannot be contained; it is on a par with the formidable scientific and technological conquest of outer space. Today's statesmen and politicians cannot afford not to keep pace with the hopes and wishes of their peoples, the desire for peace, social justice and better living conditions being expressed more and more forcefully within and outside the United Nations.

6. There are the so-called realists who dismiss the clamour of world public opinion as mere vociferation, and it is true that the voice of the people sometimes seems to fall on deaf ears; but we have said that the day would come when it would be heeded. That day has come, and the people are listening and acting.

7. The interests and the future of the great Powers and of the world point to one road, and one road only: mutual respect, negotiation and the peaceful settlement of international disputes. It is the only possible road; it is an arduous, slow and difficult one, but it is the only one we must and will follow.

8. Many obstacles have to be overcome. Everywhere there are men who still believe that might is right. The reactionary attitude which they represent must be overcome and vanquished if we are to survive, for in our time the mere existence of nuclear and thermo-

*Resumed from the 1237th meeting.

nuclear weapons has imposed upon us all a common fate.

9. We have for many years been living in fear of a possible nuclear conflict; in previous Assemblies, the cold war has filled this room with the stridency of mutual recriminations in an atmosphere of distrust, suspicion and doubt—a negative and sterile ground in which the Purposes and Principles of the Charter, which we all want to respect, have been unable to flourish.

10. Today, we can change course. The great Powers have opened a door, found a road, taken a step, a small one perhaps, but one which can and must be followed by others. The Moscow Treaty^{1/} represents no more than a beginning in the immense task of preventing war and strengthening peace, but great ventures often begin modestly. We trust and believe that this treaty will set off a chain reaction which will pave the way for further understandings.

11. The mistrust among the great Powers, their different ideologies, their determination to ensure the triumph of their respective social, political and economic systems throughout the world, their legitimate duty to defend their national security, their fear of military imbalance make it difficult for them to reach agreement when it is not forced upon them by their particular interests. But this Assembly, as an expression of the force of world opinion, can indicate the path and facilitate understanding. Our duty is clear, and we must carry it out. That is why we are here today.

12. The Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament has been meeting at Geneva—and of which Mexico has the honour to be a member—is fulfilling an extremely useful and important function. This Committee, backed by the General Assembly and endowed through the Assembly's resolutions with the directives and means of action dictated by the collective will of the nations here represented, has impressed upon the great Powers the real and dynamic power of world opinion and the continuing desire for agreements, arrived at through negotiation and conciliation, that will enable further progress to be made along the road to peace.

13. The existence of a negotiating body and the participation in it of the great Powers has been and will continue to be an indispensable condition for the peaceful settlement of disputes and a means of easing and eventually eliminating the dangerous clash of conflicting views. When positions have become so rigid as to cause talks and negotiations to be broken off, political crises have reached limits bordering on catastrophe.

14. On those rare occasions since the Second World War when there has been a relative easing of international tension, one of the decisive factors has been the resumption of negotiations which had been broken off and the reaching of some kind of agreement among the great Powers. The Austrian State Treaty^{2/} concluded some time ago and now the Moscow Treaty are two examples. It is therefore essential to keep the negotiating body known as the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament in operation, and it is equally

essential for this General Assembly to call upon the great Powers to persevere in their search for new areas of agreement.

15. It is no secret that the great Powers do not enter into agreements except when their interests happen to coincide and when they come to the conclusion that the failure to reach agreement is harmful to their own security. When that time comes, the great Powers find themselves compelled to revise the rigid positions previously adopted, and they must do so without losing prestige or showing weakness. In this process, the co-operation which the General Assembly and the Committee on Disarmament can offer is of inestimable value. There is no better fulcrum on which to swing from intransigence to agreement than the expressed will of world opinion. This will must be expressed not only in speeches in the general debate but in specific resolutions reflecting the desire and collective wisdom of the peoples and Governments represented in the United Nations. World opinion can be disregarded for a time, but, sooner or later, it will be heeded.

16. We have for many years been giving expression to our belief that in order to achieve collective security, reduce the danger of war and promote international co-operation and peaceful coexistence, it is necessary for the two big groups of nations into which the world has been divided to become convinced that neither is seeking the destruction of the other nor attempting to impose on the other by force its own ideology or particular political, economic or social system. If all nations, great and small, prove by their deeds that they are determined to settle international disputes solely by peaceful means, a climate of trust will be generated which will make it possible to maintain and strengthen peace.

17. The Governments of the great nuclear Powers have recognized that the formidable destructive force of the weapons which they have created has doomed future belligerents to a common fate. Only international co-operation and the peaceful settlement of disputes can prevent a nuclear war which would be the last war for all mankind. The States and peoples living in the world today have only one alternative: either live together in peace and understanding or disappear from the earth.

18. The Moscow Treaty has been ratified by the original parties and has come into force. Mexico, which was one of the first signatories, is proud of that fact. This Treaty represents a historic event of paramount importance and paves the way for a new phase in international relations. Perseverance, determination and recognition of the common interest have enabled the great nuclear Powers to conclude a partial agreement on the banning of nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water—an agreement long sought and desired by the whole world and brought about through the moral pressure exerted by peoples everywhere.

19. This agreement can and must facilitate further understandings aimed at lessening international tension, checking the arms race, preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and fostering progress towards general and complete disarmament. To keep this Treaty for ever in force will be a measure of incalculable importance on behalf of peace not only because of what this means in itself but also because it marks the first step towards achieving greater and more difficult tasks such as the complicated political agreements and effective measures required for disarmament.

^{1/} Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, signed in Moscow on 5 August 1963.

^{2/} State Treaty for the re-establishment of an independent and democratic Austria, signed at Vienna on 15 May 1955 (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 217, No. 2949).

20. For many years, world public opinion, as expressed both within and outside the United Nations, has been clamouring for the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests, particularly those which poison the atmosphere and seriously imperil the health and life of present and future generations. This universal clamour has to some extent been heeded, and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly have to some extent been carried out. We are gratified by these achievements, and we congratulate the members of the Subcommittee on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament upon the successful outcome of its negotiations.

Mr. Alvarez Vidaurre (El Salvador), Vice-President, took the Chair.

21. As a member of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, Mexico continues to be convinced that our faith, determination and perseverance will lead to the conclusion of further agreements, on underground tests and on various collateral measures, thus enabling us to progress towards the principal objective, namely, the conclusion of an agreement for general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

22. The agenda of the current session of the General Assembly contains an item 74 entitled "Denuclearization of Latin America", which was included at the request of the Brazilian delegation [A/5447/Add.1]. In the course of the general debate, many distinguished speakers have referred to this question, and we have been gratified at the favourable reception and the support accorded to the idea that the States of the region should in time adopt the necessary measures to avoid the spread of nuclear weapons to Latin America.

23. The President of Mexico, Mr. Adolfo López Mateos, got in touch with the Presidents of Brazil, Bolivia, Chile and Ecuador on 21 March of this year regarding the advisability of adopting a "Declaration on the Denuclearization of Latin America".

24. The President of Mexico turned first to the Presidents of these four Latin American countries because these States had co-sponsored a draft resolution at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly [A/C.1/L.312/Rev.2] calling for the denuclearization of Latin America.

25. The Mexican initiative was favourably received by the Chiefs of State of the four Republics, who in their replies, which expressed the peace-loving feelings of their peoples, gave enthusiastic support to the declaration. The declaration was, in consequence, solemnly approved and is today in force for the five nations that drafted it.

26. The Mexican Government considers that efforts should be continued to bring about an agreement under which Latin America would be declared a denuclearized zone recognized as such by the United Nations. It trusts that this opinion will be shared by the other Latin American Governments.

27. This action is in conformity with the spirit of resolution 1665 (XVI), which was proposed by Ireland and unanimously adopted by the General Assembly on 4 December 1961, calling upon States not possessing nuclear weapons to conclude an agreement by which they would undertake not to manufacture or otherwise acquire control of such weapons. It is also in conformity with the main objective of the Moscow Treaty, to which more than 100 States are parties and which

came into force yesterday when the original parties deposited their instruments of ratification.

28. The Mexican delegation has consistently sought to promote agreement among the great Powers so that, in the spirit in which the Moscow Treaty was negotiated, they might come to a decision on other problems of special interest and urgency. That is why, in June 1963, I suggested in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament [147th meeting] that the great Powers should undertake not to place in orbit or station in space devices with nuclear or thermo-nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction.

29. Plans for the denuclearization of certain zones on earth are meaningless if we do not achieve the denuclearization of outer space. If the nuclear threat were to be put into orbit and were to hang over the territories of all peoples of the world, outer space would be open to a nuclear weapons race more dangerous than the present one, and the risks of war by accident, miscalculation or fear of surprise attack would be increased to an unbelievable extent.

30. It was for these reasons that, at the 147th meeting of the Committee on Disarmament, I submitted a working paper containing a draft treaty prohibiting the placing in orbit and the stationing in outer space of any nuclear weapons. I was convinced that a treaty ensuring the peaceful utilization and exploitation of outer space and celestial bodies and introducing international understanding into this area would promote the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter.

31. We were therefore extremely gratified to hear Mr. Gromyko, the Foreign Minister of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, say on 19 September 1963:

"And the nations have a right to expect that the new environment in which man has now set foot—the limitless ocean of outer space—will never become yet another spring-board of war, destruction and death.

"... The Soviet Government is prepared here and now to take steps to prevent the spread of the arms race to outer space, and desires to create the best possible conditions for the utilization and exploration of space for the good of all peoples. It therefore considers it necessary to agree with the United States of America to prohibit the placing in orbit of objects carrying nuclear weapons.

"We know that the United States Government is also willing to settle this question. And we assume that the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States of America will continue their bilateral exchange of views regarding a ban on the placing of nuclear weapons in orbit. It would be a very good thing if an understanding could be reached on this important question and an agreement concluded. The Soviet Government is ready to do so." [1208th meeting, paras. 182, 184 and 185.]

32. For his part, Mr. Kennedy, the President of the United States of America, said in his statement of 20 September 1963:

"We must continue to seek agreement, encouraged by yesterday's affirmative response to this proposal by the Soviet Foreign Minister, on an arrangement to keep weapons of mass destruction out of outer space. Let us get our negotiators back to the negotiating table to work out a practicable arrangement to this end." [1209th meeting, para. 51.]

33. These encouraging statements further strengthen our confidence that the Mexican suggestion for a treaty to prohibit the placing of nuclear weapons in orbit and the stationing in space of devices with nuclear or thermo-nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction will very soon bear fruit, since it corresponds to a universal desire to keep outer space clean and free of nuclear weapons and to preserve peace on the earth and beyond the earth, no matter how far or how high man's knowledge, determination and hopes may carry him.

34. We believe that the General Assembly can and must contribute to the realization of this desire. I would venture to suggest that at the current session we should adopt a resolution noting with satisfaction the statements made by the two Powers and the decision embodied in them, a resolution expressing the unanimous will of the States Members of the United Nations to use outer space and the celestial bodies exclusively for peaceful purposes and, to that end, urging all States to abstain from placing nuclear weapons in orbit or stationing them in outer space. If this suggestion were to be favourably received, my delegation would be prepared to submit an appropriate draft resolution.

35. Since this session of the General Assembly is, happily, taking place in an atmosphere of greater confidence—or less tension—among the great Powers as a result of the Moscow Treaty, I feel impelled, out of a desire to take a further step towards the strengthening of peace, and I consider it fitting, to reiterate here the basic ideas which I expressed in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament in connexion with the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union for the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the States parties to the North Atlantic Treaty.

36. The universalization of this draft—if I may use this term—from the time when it was circulated and first discussed was an endeavour initiated by the Mexican delegation. At the 148th meeting of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, held on 30 July 1963, I said the following:

"It may be that the great Powers will at some future date reach an agreement embodying a solemn pledge of non-aggression. We believe that this non-aggression pact should be extended to all the Members of the United Nations, which could co-operate in reducing international tension by adopting a declaration in the General Assembly constituting a solemn reaffirmation of the obligations assumed in the Charter, a declaration which would be justified by the present international atmosphere and political circumstances."

We believed then—and we continue to believe—in the possibility that such a commitment might be universally accepted, and the basis for this belief is the remarkable similarity—which perhaps the Mexican delegation was the first to note—between the Soviet draft and a juridical instrument that is in force in the Inter-American regional community, namely, the American Treaty on Pacific Settlement, also called the Pact of Bogotá, which was signed at the Ninth Inter-American Conference. You will excuse me if I do not embark on a detailed comparison of the two texts because I do not wish to abuse your patience, but it is perfectly clear that in both these instruments the parties undertake not only—and this would be the negative aspect—to refrain from the threat or use of force, but they also

contract the positive obligation of resorting only to peaceful procedures in order to settle their differences, whatever these may be.

37. Ten years ago, in September 1953, I referred here, in the United Nations General Assembly, to the Pact of Bogotá, stressing the example given in this field by the Republics of the New World. These Republics have been able, in fact, to set up a system for the peaceful settlement of disputes that is workable and consistent, and in so doing they have complied with article 23 of the Charter of Bogotá, which imposed upon them the obligation to conclude a special treaty "... so that no dispute between American States shall fail of a definitive settlement within a reasonable period". The Pact of Bogotá gives effect to this provision by stipulating that if other pacific procedures have failed, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice or, if this body is without jurisdiction, arbitration shall be compulsory.

38. Thus, over a period of ten years the delegation of Mexico has had close to its heart the ideal of universalizing the American Treaty on Pacific Settlement—not of course, in the literal sense, but as regards the application of its essential principles—and thereby creating a true system of peace rather than a mere series of arrangements to ward off aggression. The Soviet draft just referred to has seemed to us to be a new opportunity or a fresh possibility of disseminating our Inter-American peace system throughout the world. For that reason, my delegation is now returning to this idea of the past and thinks this an appropriate moment for the General Assembly to make a declaration at least expressing the hope that one day a system will be built up by the Member States for the pacific settlement of the disputes which may arise between them.

39. My delegation also trusts that efforts will be continued to conclude agreements on other subjects, and particularly on reducing the possibilities of war owing to surprise attack, an error of judgement or a breakdown in communications.

40. The agreement concluded on 20 June 1963 between the Government of the Soviet Union and the Government of the United States of America on the establishment of a direct line of communication is an encouraging step and should be followed by others directed to the same end. The possibilities of agreement on the proposal for the establishment of observation posts at key points should also be explored.

41. We also believe that this may be the appropriate time for considering whether the Assembly should make a declaration condemning war propaganda, similar to the declaration which was considered last year by the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and which reaffirmed General Assembly resolution 110 (II) condemning "all forms of propaganda, in whatsoever country conducted, which is either designed or likely to provoke or encourage any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression". We hope that the objections which at the time prevented that declaration from being made at Geneva have been dispelled.

42. Mexico's attitude at the various sessions of the General Assembly and in the Committee on Disarmament has always been one of co-operation in the interests of understanding and harmony among nations and of facilitating the settlement of international disputes by exclusively peaceful means.

43. Mexico's policy in this connexion has just been fully reaffirmed by the President of the Republic, Mr. Adolfo López Mateos, in a speech which he made on the fifth of this month. In view of its importance, I shall quote some of the sentiments expressed on that occasion by the President of Mexico:

"Respect for the rights of others—or what is now known as non-intervention—is a traditional principle of Mexican legal thought. To Benito Juárez, the illustrious defender of our sovereignty against foreign invasion, this respect for the rights of others was the very source of peace and its true foundation. And so it is for our own generation! We are in full accord with its legal implications. In a world where international friction seems to be the general rule of life, nothing will do so much to calm men's minds and to reduce tension as the universal practice of this principle with complete sincerity and in good faith.

"Because of the blocs into which it is divided, the world urgently needs some environment in which negotiations can be carried on sincerely. Distrust and disagreement go together, but then so do good faith and constructive negotiation. Everything that we can do to bring about the triumph of confidence over sterile suspicion, of agreement over ever ominous international discord, will be an effective contribution to world peace. Considerable progress would be made in this direction if all States could agree on the principle of non-intervention in a formal agreement—including the necessary safeguards to render it effective—to be drawn up within the framework of the United Nations. Mexico would be prepared to participate in such a step and to give it strong support".

Further on, the President of Mexico said:

"The Moscow Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water—to which Mexico promptly acceded—has eliminated the danger of radio-active fall-out. Psychologically speaking, it has produced a feeling of relief for mankind and a new hope that we have perhaps started on the road to peace. We know, however, that we must carry on the fight unwearingly for the conquest of still greater objectives. The liquidation of colonialism and respect for the right of self-determination must continue for some time to come to be aims that cannot be side-stepped. We must abolish aggression and strengthen systems for the peaceful settlement of disputes. We must vigorously combat under-development, and we must create mutually advantageous conditions for international trade. In order to promote universal and complete disarmament, we must, for the time being, reduce the scale of the armaments race by establishing nuclear-free zones, prohibiting nuclear weapons tests and neutralizing outer space."

44. I should now like to touch on a problem which has been and still is of concern to my country, namely, the problem of the dependent territories.

45. I shall not at this time attempt a recapitulation, even a brief one, of the evidence provided by my country in both its national and international life of its devotion to the principles of freedom which we have never considered apart from the principles of justice and the rule of law. I shall, however, cite one example, which is sufficient to illustrate Mexico's unswerving stand on the specific problem of the powers and the duties of the United Nations with regard to those

peoples who in our time are still deprived of their liberties.

46. When, between September and October 1944, the Government of the United States informed the Government of Mexico of the efforts then being made to formulate the initial plans for the establishment of what is today the United Nations, the Government of Mexico sent to the United States Government, for the information of the organizers of the constituent assembly, a statement of our views on the new world organization and compared them with the text produced by the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, which had been held from 21 August to 28 September 1944.

47. On that historic occasion Mexico recommended, among other amendments to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, that the Charter of the new world organization should include a provision under which each and every member would recognize that the well-being and development of the peoples not yet in a position to govern their own destiny was a sacred trust of the international community. This idea, which underlies Chapter XI of the Charter now in force, had not appeared in the document prepared by the Powers which convened the San Francisco Conference. The Mexican document, on the other hand, postulated the need for a provision by which the situation of the dependent peoples would be recognized and protected. It attached considerable importance to repairing that omission and stressed the fact that if that were not done, the United Nations Charter would in that respect be inferior to the Covenant of the League of Nations, Article 22 of which, one of the longest Articles of the Covenant, dealt with the lot of the Territories under tutelage.

48. Mexico's concern for the fate and the cause of the peoples deprived of the benefit of self-government has thus been demonstrated from the earliest days of the United Nations. This has always been and still is our firm position, deriving from our profound belief in the essential capacities of man and our unshakable devotion to the principles of self-determination and non-intervention.

49. We have been and shall continue to be concerned that the Organization should faithfully discharge its duties towards the peoples who are emerging to national life. In the years which have gone by since the United Nations Charter was adopted, an appreciable number of peoples who were previously dependent have achieved full political rights. While we are gratified by the part which has been played by our Organization in the dissemination and gradual achievement of the ideals set forth in this regard in the Charter, we also have the duty to draw on and put to the service of these ideals the experience which has been acquired during this time and has amply demonstrated the dangers facing the less developed peoples, and particularly those taking their first steps as members of the world community. I should like here to repeat what I said on 27 November 1961 with reference to the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples:

"We therefore believe it to be this Assembly's duty to ensure that decolonization is carried out in circumstances which represent no threat to international peace and security and which do not make sovereignty and independence a hollow sham for the territories and peoples that win their freedom". [1066th meeting, para. 5.]

50. I have taken the liberty of making these references to Mexico's position on the problems of self-government in order to show how much we have welcomed the advent of independence among those nations which in recent years have attained it and have been admitted to our Organization, in order to reiterate our profound and sincere interest in the destinies of those which do not as yet enjoy these rights.

51. In conclusion I should like to call to mind the commemorative meeting at San Francisco^{3/} held in June 1955, when I spoke as follows:

"The birth of the atomic age, far from reducing the contribution which the smaller countries can make in contemporary international society, has increased it; for today more than ever before, they are in a position to exert a moderating influence with a view to preventing the abuse of power. In that connexion, the part which the smaller countries should play in the present division of responsibilities in the United Nations is that which is played in national societies by an alert public opinion conscious of its rights and obligations. The stronger the great Powers, the greater the moral responsibility of the smaller countries.

"My country has often demonstrated its understanding and application of that moral responsibility, and has consistently urged a return to the spirit which prevailed at the birth of the United Nations. In 1948, at the third session of the General Assembly, it proposed that the great Powers should be urged to liquidate the heritage of the war and to hasten the conclusion of peace treaties. The Mexican draft resolution as approved called upon the great Powers to renew their efforts to compose their differences and establish a lasting peace".

52. Today I still think as I thought then. What is more, it would seem to me not at all inappropriate for the Assembly to consider the possibility of issuing yet another such exhortation to the great Powers, making clear the paramount importance of redoubled efforts to achieve positive results in the disarmament negotiations as soon as possible. It is my belief that to reiterate essential principles always serves to enhance their strength and value.

53. Mexico, as is well known, believes that peace must be based on a régime of freedom and justice; it upholds the legal equality of States and scrupulous respect for their sovereignty; it regards as fundamental the principle that any intervention, whether direct or indirect, and whatever the motive, by one State in the internal or external affairs of another is inadmissible; it wholeheartedly rejects the threat or use of force in international relations; it acknowledges the obligation of States to settle their disputes exclusively by peaceful means; it believes respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms to be essential; it fully supports the right of all peoples to self-determination; and it is firmly convinced that prosperity, like peace, is indivisible and that therefore the economic development of all countries and the betterment of the standard of living of their peoples constitute an inescapable duty of the international community.

54. Peace and prosperity, moreover, are so closely connected that it is no exaggeration to say that one

depends on the other. There can be no true peace without at least a minimum of general prosperity, and prosperity except in conditions of peace is hard to contemplate.

55. Some years ago I said to the Assembly that, to judge from the opinion of scientists and experts, atomic and hydrogen weapons seem once and for all to have destroyed the traditional concept of victor and vanquished and to have left no alternative to potential enemies except the common destiny of living or dying together.

56. Permit me now to express the hope that the achievements of this session of the General Assembly will be such as to prove to all peoples on the earth that their Governments have made the choice between these two alternatives and have decided not only to live together, but to "live together in peace with one another as good neighbours" and to co-operate loyally with each other so that the weapons of destruction may soon be converted into the implements of prosperity.

Mr. Sosa Rodríguez (Venezuela) resumed the Chair.

57. Mr. SHABIB (Iraq): Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to extend to you our warmest congratulations on your election to the Presidency of the eighteenth session of the General Assembly. Your recognized abilities eminently qualify you to assume this high office, and we are certain that you will discharge your important responsibilities with the same skill and distinction which you have shown as representative of your country in the United Nations.

58. I should also like to pay a tribute to Mr. Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, your distinguished predecessor, who presided over our deliberations last year with great ability and wisdom.

59. In coming for the first time to this rostrum to address this great assembly of nations in the name of the new Government of Iraq, I wish to reaffirm my country's deep devotion to the principles of the Charter and to pledge its full support to the United Nations in its efforts to promote peace, freedom and human welfare. With our States we endeavour to maintain the closest friendly relations on the basis of strict adherence to the policy of non-alignment. In our region, we are committed to the realization of Arab unity, one of the most cherished goals of the Arab nation. No people has suffered as much from fragmentation and division as has the Arab people, and this present generation of Arabs is determined to overcome all the obstacles and eliminate all the artificial barriers that have divided our people. Our dedication to unity springs from a desire and a yearning deeply rooted in the national consciousness of our people and solidly based on the facts of geography, history and culture which have moulded the Arabs into one nation. Unity for us is not an abstract ideal, but a means for ensuring for the Arab people the full enjoyment of those fundamental rights which give quality to human life.

60. The eighteenth session of the General Assembly opens in an atmosphere of hope and optimism. There is less tension in the world today and a greater readiness on the part of the major Powers to co-operate in the interest of world peace.

61. A step, indeed a considerable step, has been taken by the three nuclear Powers in signing a limited nuclear test ban treaty. The Moscow Treaty, which has already been signed by more than a hundred countries including my own, heralds a new era in fruitful inter-

^{3/} Tenth Anniversary of the Signing of the United Nations Charter (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 55.1.26), pp. 160 and 161.

national co-operation, and strengthens the hope for the realization of mankind's most cherished dream—general and complete disarmament. One of the immediate and most beneficent results of the limited test ban treaty is the halting of the dangerous contamination of the atmosphere by deadly radio-active fall-out, and it is our hope that an agreement banning and controlling underground tests will soon be concluded.

62. We wish to pay a special tribute to the neutral countries represented in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament for their role in paving the way for this significant break-through in the disarmament stalemate. On the general problem of disarmament, we will continue to support the initiatives of the eight neutral members of the Eighteen-Nation Committee, particularly their efforts to bring about agreement on certain collateral measures which will further reduce tension and provide a more propitious atmosphere for serious disarmament negotiations. The recent agreement in principle on banning nuclear weapons from outer space is another encouraging development, and a good measure of credit is due to the delegation of Mexico which first proposed it in the Eighteen-Nation Committee.

63. We have listened with great interest to the proposals the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy [1209th meeting], and the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko [1208th meeting], made in their important statements at the beginning of this session advocating respectively joint efforts for further exploration in outer space and the convening of a meeting of the Heads of Government of the eighteen Member States represented on the Committee on Disarmament. These proposals and others already made in the Eighteen-Nation Committee will be given our closest attention.

64. Although the international situation has recently shown unmistakable signs of improvement, there are still many situations in various parts of the world that cause grave concern and anxiety. There are situations which involve the most serious infringement of the principles of justice, and their continuation can only lead to undermining the faith and hope that the peoples of the world have in the United Nations.

65. Unhappily, the Arab world has more than its share of these problems, and I shall mention only three of them: Palestine, Aden and Oman. I will begin with Palestine, because to the Arabs it represents the worst example of colonialism and injustice in our time. The Zionist aggression in Palestine was not merely an armed invasion of a country and the imposition of an alien rule on its inhabitants. It went much further than that. It sought to destroy the Arab community of Palestine and permanently to detach from the rest of the Arab world a country which has been an integral part of it for more than fourteen centuries. In no other occupied territory in the world has the physical removal of the inhabitants, through mass expulsion, been the avowed objective of the alien conquerors. For that reason, we should not lose sight of the central fact that the problem of Palestine is essentially a conflict between the people of Palestine, who are determined to regain their lost country, and the Zionist conquerors, who wish to legalize their conquest and to consolidate the fruits of their aggression. One of the means they are employing to reach this objective is to call for direct negotiations with the Arab States.

66. That was repeated by Mrs. Meir in her statement on 2 October 1963 [1224th meeting]. She depicted the

problem as a dispute between Israel and the Arab States and completely ignored the existence of the principal party to the conflict: the Arabs of Palestine. If for no other reason, the Arab States reject negotiations with Israel because such negotiations are tantamount to a recognition on their part of the disappearance of the Palestine entity and the liquidations of the Palestine Arab community. This, no Arab will ever accept and no Arab Government can ever entertain. In any case the rights of the people of Palestine are not negotiable. No people are expected to agree to bartering away their country and giving up their national identity, and yet that is exactly what Israel hopes to achieve from negotiations. It is perhaps revealing that, in her speech, Mrs. Meir did not even once mention Palestine and its Arab people and did not refer to the refugees who have been languishing in their misery for fifteen years after having been forcibly expelled from their homes. That was no lapse of memory on the part of Mrs. Meir but a deliberate attempt to expunge from the records of history the tragedy of Palestine and blunt the conscience of mankind to the suffering of the victims of Zionist aggression.

67. The Arab refugees of Palestine are a living reminder of one of the gravest crimes committed against any people. As the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees has often stated in his annual reports to the Assembly it would be a mistake to assume that any economic and social absorption of the refugees that might take place would dispose of the underlying, more basic issues. The refugees continue to demand the implementation of paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III) of the General Assembly. Paragraph 11 referred to the right of the refugees to go back to their homeland. This is not a right that can be subject to negotiations and bartering. It is an absolute and unconditional right that has been solemnly declared and reaffirmed in every resolution adopted by the General Assembly on the refugee problem. The Assembly must find the ways and means to secure the full implementation of this paragraph. The dispute should, thus, be looked on as between the United Nations and Israel, which continues to flout the desires of the General Assembly. The Assembly's action should not be different from that contemplated to secure the implementation of the numerous resolutions on apartheid. The plight of the Arab refugees is surely not less tragic than that of the victims of apartheid. Justice is impartial, and our efforts to redress the evil injustices of racial discrimination should be matched by an equal determination to restore the rights of the victims of Zionism—a doctrine as pernicious and repugnant as apartheid and based on the same illusions of racial superiority and separateness.

68. Another striking example of violation of the United Nations Charter can be found in Oman, where colonialism continues to suppress the aspirations of the people for freedom and deny them their right to self-determination. At a time when the winds of change are blowing in all parts of the world and the colonial system retreating from one position after another, we still see in Oman and the neighbouring territories in South and Eastern Arabia a stubborn reluctance to face realities. Colonialism is desperately trying to maintain, in that part of the Arab homeland, an intolerably anachronistic situation where colonial influence is maintained by a variety of indirect means and ill-concealed subterfuges. The people of Oman have been fighting for the last eight years for their freedom and

independence, and the General Assembly has considered the situation in Oman during the last three previous sessions. This year the question has again been inscribed on the agenda and will be dealt with as an essentially colonial problem involving the desire of a people to attain its freedom and independence. It is our fervent hope that action will be taken this year to accelerate the attainment of freedom by Oman in accordance with the firm resolve of the United Nations that the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples be speedily applied to all territories that have not yet attained their independence.

69. The situation in Aden provides an equally glaring example of the violation of the principle of self-determination. Urgent action is required by the United Nations to deal with a potentially explosive situation. That was the conclusion of the Sub-Committee on Aden which was established by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In its resolution of 3 May 1963 the Special Committee recognized the right of the people of Aden and the Aden Protectorates to self-determination and freedom from colonial rule and recommended that an early opportunity be given to the people to decide their future under free and democratic conditions. It decided to send a Sub-Committee to the territory for the purpose of ascertaining the views of the population and holding talks with the administering Power. The United Kingdom, however, withheld its co-operation from the Sub-Committee and refused to permit it to enter the territory. The Sub-Committee, none the less, visited four neighbouring countries, heard scores of petitioners and received hundreds of written petitions.

70. The comprehensive report of the Sub-Committee represents, in our view, an indictment of the most serious nature of colonial rule in Aden and the Aden Protectorates. I need only quote a few passages from that report to demonstrate to the Assembly and the world the serious and dangerous situation which prevails in Aden and the need for prompt and quick action by the United Nations:

"... the present Federation ... represents merely an artificial unity imposed upon them and governed by provisions which ensure United Kingdom control". [A/5446/Add.4, appendix, para. 164.]

"The various treaties signed with the United Kingdom, including the Treaty of Friendship and Protection concluded in February 1959 by the Federation, are regarded by all petitioners as null and void." [Ibid., para. 165.]

"...almost all the petitioners protested against the maintenance of the military base in Aden..." [Ibid., para. 167].

"Repressive laws and police methods are a major source of discontent..." [Ibid., para. 168].

"The administering Power should therefore be asked: (a) to repeal all the laws which restrict public freedoms; (b) to release all political prisoners; (c) to allow the return of people who have been exiled; (d) to cease forthwith all repressive action against the people of the Territory..." [Ibid., para. 176].

71. We hope that the Assembly will endorse the conclusions and recommendations proposed by the Sub-Committee and adopted by the Special Committee in

its resolution of 19 July 1963 [see A/5446/Add.4, para. 478] that free elections, with full guarantees and in the presence of representatives of the United Nations, be held with a view to setting up a government genuinely representing the people, which shall be entrusted with the task of ending colonial rule and deciding the territory's future in accordance with the wishes of the people. We are convinced that such a government will realize the long-cherished dream of the people of Aden to be re-united with their brethren in Yemen.

72. I have discussed, in some detail, the major colonial problems in the Arab world because they are of immediate concern to our people. However, this does not mean that we are oblivious of the plight of many other peoples still struggling to attain their freedom. As a member of the Special Committee of Twenty-Four, Iraq is endeavouring to play its part in the historic efforts of the United Nations to bring about the speedy and total liquidation of the colonial system. The activities of the Special Committee have not always met with success, and there still exist many colonial problems which require forthright action by the General Assembly. I need only mention three highly explosive situations in Africa, namely, Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and the territories under Portuguese administration. The General Assembly at this session, as well as the Security Council, is called upon to take appropriate action for the early attainment by these territories of their independence, under Governments which are genuinely representative of the majority of their populations. The delegation of Iraq stands ready, as it has done in the past, to work for the realization of the aspirations of the peoples concerned, and will support any action that may be decided on by the General Assembly and the Security Council to ensure the speedy application to these territories of the United Nations Declaration on the granting of independence.

73. One of the worst forms of colonialism is the practice of racial discrimination. It violates the principles of the United Nations Charter and contradicts the teachings of all religions and civilizations. A violent example of this discrimination is what is happening in South Africa today, where racial discrimination is the policy and gospel of a Government which represents only a small minority of the population. The policy of apartheid has been repeatedly condemned in the strongest terms by the United Nations, but the South African Government persists in its policy and has not given the slightest indication of modifying its attitude of defiance, deserving thereby the universal condemnation of mankind.

74. We support the recommendation of the Special Committee and the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council which, we are sure, if faithfully applied, would put an end to this policy. If the Secretary-General is unable to report progress in the implementation of the recent resolution of the Security Council on this subject, then drastic and coercive action in accordance with the Charter will become necessary.

75. An Arab problem in which the United Nations has been involved is the situation in Yemen, which continues to be a source of grave concern and anxiety. A Republican Government was proclaimed last year in response to the desires of the people of Yemen to end a thousand years of isolation and backwardness imposed by the feudal régime of the Imams. The fall of this ancient and formidable citadel of reaction

was greeted with great joy all over the Arab world, and the new Government of Yemen received the sympathy and support of progressive circles everywhere. Yet from the first day, attempts have been made to undermine the new Government. It would be an intolerable affront to the Arab nation if, in this day and age, a régime that for a thousand years kept Yemen under the most appalling and backward conditions should now be allowed to regain control, and thrust the people of Yemen back into the darkness from which they have emerged after so much struggle and sacrifice. The restoration of peace in Yemen is necessary in order to enable the Government to begin the gigantic task of building up the country and bridging the gap which separates it from the modern world. The United Nations has been asked to ensure the implementation of an agreement of disengagement designed to bring peace to Yemen. Unfortunately, however, the efforts of the United Nations have not been successful. In our view, the most important factor that disturbs the peace and renders a solution more difficult is the refusal of certain Powers to recognize a Government which is now represented in the United Nations and recognized by most of the countries of the world, including the Soviet Union and the United States. Such recognition is necessary not merely on political and legal grounds, but also on moral grounds, because we cannot believe that there is any Government which can, in all conscience, condone the restoration of a régime like that of the Imams.

76. The problem of development is perhaps one of the most difficult and complex problems facing this Organization. Economic development involves a two-way process, one generated from within by fully releasing and realizing the potential of a country, and the other by harmoniously integrating this potential in the general framework of world economy. These two aspects are closely interwoven and cannot be isolated and treated separately. This twin process requires action on three broad fronts: trade, financing and industrialization. We have great expectations of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development which we hope will deal effectively with the problem of the chronic trade imbalance between the advanced and the developing countries. The fluctuations in the prices of primary commodities will, undoubtedly, be one of the most important topics of the Conference.

77. The financing of economic development is still a problem that evokes sharp controversy and disagreement. The United Nations Capital Development Fund is still encountering great difficulties in spite of the fact that the General Assembly has decided, in principle, to establish it. In this regard, we find ourselves in full agreement with the Secretary-General in his analysis of the problem of financing, particularly his statement in the introduction to his annual report that:

"The resources required from the industrialized countries are within their capacities to provide; there are perhaps only one or two among them which are as yet devoting even one-half of the proposed 1 per cent of their steadily increasing national income for development in the developing countries." [A/5501/Add.1, section IV.]

This, in our view, is a correct evaluation of the situation, and we can ill afford to ignore the Secretary-General's warning regarding the dangers resulting from the widening gap between the affluent and dynamic economies of the industrialized countries and the economies of the developing countries. The United

Nations is called upon to play an increasingly active role in helping to bridge this gap. The Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, the Special Fund and other bodies and organs of the United Nations are stepping up their efforts in this regard.

78. The pace of industrialization would undoubtedly be greatly accelerated if the problems of financing and trade were both adequately solved. On the one hand, the availability of capital will spur national plans for industrialization and this will help to reduce the trade imbalance with the advanced countries, while, on the other hand, the success of the International Conference on Trade and Development will enable the developing countries to devote more of their resources to industrialization. The International Conference on the Application of Science and Technology has been most helpful in this regard and was, in the words of the Secretary-General, "a milestone in the development decade".

79. A problem which has been before the United Nations in one form or another for the last thirteen years is the representation of the Government of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. My country deplores the continued denial of this right to the only Government entitled to speak with authority in the name of the Chinese people. Iraq will support, as it has done in the past, any proposal that will restore to the Government of the People's Republic of China its legitimate rights and put an end to an anomalous situation that has persisted for far too long.

80. Before concluding, I should like to refer to a question to which the countries of Asia and Africa attach special importance. This is the question of equitable representation on the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. When the Charter entered into force in 1945, there were only ten Asian and African Members of the United Nations. Today there are fifty-six and the number is likely to increase before the end of this year. This change in the character of the United Nations must be adequately reflected in the membership of these two Councils, as well as in the General Committee of the General Assembly. No one can question the validity or justification of this demand, and the General Assembly is called upon to deal with a problem the solution of which can no longer be postponed.

81. In the short period which has elapsed since the United Nations came into existence, unparalleled advances in technology and science have transformed life on this planet, and revolutionary changes of far-reaching significance have taken place in many parts of the world. The United Nations has been able to keep abreast of these developments, and indeed was instrumental in accelerating the pace of change. This is due in no small measure to the remarkable flexibility and dynamism of the Charter. In the hands of men of the calibre of U Thant and his devoted colleagues we may rest assured that the United Nations will continue to grow and to play a vital role in human affairs. This Organization, in its own unassuming and cautious way, has already proved to be a potent instrument for the promotion of world peace and human welfare. We have merely caught a glimpse of its possibilities, but it is enough to make us dare to hope that this noble experiment in human brotherhood may yet prove to be the most revolutionary invention devised by the mind of man.

82. Mrs. PANDIT (India): Mr. President, permit me to offer you my sincere felicitations on your election

to your high office. I, too, have had the honour—for me unique—of guiding the deliberations of this august body and I am aware of the demands that will inevitably be made upon you. May I pledge the co-operation of my delegation in the work ahead?

83. It is a decade since I last had the privilege of addressing this Assembly as a representative of India [398th meeting]. The world has seen many changes in these ten years. The most dramatic of these have been man's flight into space and his ability to orbit the globe. This marks the beginning of a new age radically different from any change that has preceded it. In the Assembly itself another and equally significant change has taken place by the emergence of Africa. The participation of the new African nations adds strength and dignity to our Organization. From a small Assembly of sixty nations in 1954 we have now grown to nearly twice that size.

84. Without the United Nations it might not have been possible for so many countries to achieve freedom in a comparatively short period without serious strife. Because of the United Nations the process of political transformation has been easier and there is a measure of security for the newly born. We welcome the evolution towards universality in the United Nations by the addition of the new nations whose distinguished representatives sit here today.

85. We in India have a special reason to rejoice in the freedom that has come to African countries. As far back as forty years ago, when our own independence seemed a distant dream, we identified our struggle with all those who, like us, were pawns of colonialism. Successive resolutions of the Indian National Congress of that period will bear this out. It was our deep conviction that Asian freedom would be incomplete if Africa remained unliberated. Colonialism and racialism were not only insults to the dignity of man, but a grave threat to the peace of the world. We tried in whatever ways were open to us to hasten the process of that liberation and we shall continue to do so as long as these evils exist.

86. India extends a warm welcome to the three colonial territories in South-East Asia which have emerged into independence. I refer to Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak. After the attainment of independence, the three territories have freely chosen to join with Malaya to establish the Federation of Malaysia. In this connexion I should like to congratulate our able and respected Secretary-General, who carried out under rather difficult circumstances the task of the wishes of the people of Sabah and Sarawak. It is our hope that the differences of opinion now existing on this matter will be relaxed and resolved in an amicable fashion by those directly concerned.

87. A further happy development in this field is the fixing of the date of independence for Kenya. We hope to welcome this great country in our midst very soon. Not much later we expect Zanzibar to join the ranks of the independent nations of Africa.

88. Another change in the present session is the marked lessening of those tensions which had become part of the political climate of the world. For years now decisions on matters of vital concern to this Assembly were taken under the shadow of fear cast by the cold war. I cannot help thinking back to the last time I addressed this Assembly. The Korean war was at that time the most important issue before us. Representatives will remember that we had come very close to

disaster and tensions in this Assembly and the world had almost reached breaking point. Serious tensions continue in Asia but they no longer threaten to split us. Events in the Caribbean last year which almost brought us to the verge of a nuclear holocaust were also fortunately averted by wise statesmanship.

89. The most important problems facing humanity are those of war and peace. The atomic and outer space revolutions of our time have brought forcefully to the attention of the international community this basic choice, between the destruction of humanity and human civilization and international co-operation for peace, progress, justice and the settlement of differences by peaceful negotiations. The development of weapons of mass destruction makes it absolutely necessary that the foremost principle of the United Nations Charter, which is to outlaw war, should be fully implemented and preparations for war and the threats of war should be completely banned.

90. The signing of the recent Treaty—which came into effect yesterday—to ban nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water gives hope for the future. Paradoxically, the hydrogen bomb is helping to usher in a world without nuclear war. Such war is now outmoded. There would be no victor, no vanquished, in such a war. The belligerents themselves—and perhaps all life on this planet—would be destroyed. Nuclear arsenals may still be able to hold the peace, through the balance of terror, but they cannot be used. The struggle between rival ideologies will continue, but this will be through peaceful competition or example; described in Mr. Gromyko's words as "peaceful coexistence", and by President Kennedy as a "contest of peace". India welcomes these developments.

91. The statements of President Kennedy [1209th meeting] and Mr. Gromyko [1208th meeting] have created an atmosphere in which substantial progress can be expected in the next few months. It may then be possible to hold a meeting of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament at summit level in Geneva in the first half of 1964, as suggested by the Soviet Union.

92. In his recent statement Mr. Gromyko has brought the Soviet and Western positions closer to each other. He has said that he is ready to agree that limited contingents of inter-continental ballistic missiles and anti-aircraft missiles should remain at the disposal of the Soviet Union and the United States in their own territories, not only until the end of the second stage but also until the end of the third stage, that is, until the completion of the whole process of general and complete disarmament.

93. One of the dangers confronting us is from proliferation of nuclear weapons. The wisdom shown by the nuclear Powers in not sharing such weapons has helped to curb the mounting tensions. That this policy may continue is our earnest hope.

94. It is unfortunate that at a time when the international community has embarked on a determined policy of reducing the risks of war and of building up confidence among nations, the People's Republic of China still maintains war as an instrument of national policy and has launched a bitter campaign against the efforts being made for relaxation of tensions.

95. The wanton aggression committed on India by the People's Republic of China in September to November 1962, in fact during the period the seventeenth session

of the Assembly was in conference, was a violent assault on the tenets of civilized international behaviour, on the policy of peaceful coexistence, and on the principles of the Charter. This aggression was not any the less reprehensible because the Government of the People's Republic of China is not represented in the United Nations and has not yet become subject to the obligations and discipline of this world Organization. We in India, in common with many other countries, believe that it is essential that this Government should be brought within the discipline of this body so that it can no longer continue to persist in the ways of an outlaw.

96. Despite all their propagandist pronouncements and the most shamefaced expression of double talk, the fact remains that Chinese forces continue to be in occupation of over 38,000 kilometres of Indian territory, and even today, while I speak in this Assembly of peace, the Chinese have massed a still greater concentration of troops, weapons and supplies all along the borders of our country. Their preparations for war still continue and so also their violations of our territory and air space.

97. What grieves us most deeply in this context is the recent tendency of the unprincipled behaviour of making friends of erstwhile enemies and of seeking strange alliances for collusion in aggression. The world has witnessed such opportunist alliances in the past, but in the world order of today, after the signing of the Charter of the United Nations, such collusive alliances having aggressive purposes are indicative only of the deep-seated hatred of their participants. It is noteworthy that such collusion extends to the point where one of the parties describes the naked aggression committed by the other as "illusory", as was done in this Assembly only a few days ago.

98. The excuse given by the People's Republic of China for their inability to come to an agreement with India is that we are under the influence of Powers unfriendly to the Chinese People's Republic. Yet China finds no difficulty in befriending countries which have actual military alliances with those very Powers. We deplore this tendency, as we are fully aware of the tragic episodes of our past history when invitations to outside military Powers have spelt ruin to all the inhabitants of the sub-continent.

99. From the beginning of our independence we have planned and worked to give economic content to our political freedom and to develop the vast potential of our country so that our people may lead a better life in larger social and economic freedom. The survival of democracy, which we regard as our sheet anchor, depends on the success of the tasks we have undertaken. Ours is a unique endeavour of democratic planning based on the will of the people. Its special significance lies in the fact that it affects the lives of one seventh of humanity. Today our whole way of life and our hopes for the future have been threatened.

100. The average Indian annual military expenditure during the decade preceding the Chinese attack last year was less than the annual expenditure of the New York City schools and constituted 2.4 per cent of the gross national product of India which is one of the lowest in the world. It is only since last year that India, as a result of the attack and threat from the People's Republic of China, has been forced to augment its military potential.

101. We in India are wedded to paths of peace and to endeavours for peaceful settlement of differences, undeterred by military or other opportunist pressures. We believe that this is the only course open to all nations. We shall defend our sovereignty and territorial integrity, but at the same time continue to explore avenues of peaceful settlement of all differences.

102. We share a common history, a common language and a common struggle with the people of Pakistan, and we are determined to pursue the path of peaceful settlement of all our differences. All that we want to ensure is that, brothers as we are, we live in peace with one another; that the upheaval and unsettlement we witnessed at our birth should never again recur and that the peoples of the two countries should devote their resources and their talents to economic and social progress. There can be no greater calamity for us than conflict with Pakistan.

103. China and India are the two largest countries of Asia and share between them a population of more than one billion—which is more than one third of the total world population. If there is conflict between them there can be no peace in Asia. Should such a conflict erupt again the consequences would be global. On both India and China, therefore, devolves a great responsibility.

104. We ourselves, as well as friends of the two countries, have advanced proposals which would help in a peaceful settlement of our differences with China. As early as December 1962, six African-Asian countries met in Colombo and presented certain proposals which, if accepted and implemented, would create the necessary atmosphere for peaceful settlement of our differences. These proposals were not fully satisfactory to us and yet we accepted them in their entirety. The Chinese Government, on the other hand, refused to accept them. It is a matter of great satisfaction to us that the representatives of Cambodia, Ghana and Mongolia have drawn attention to these Colombo proposals. We continue to hope that this is not the final word of the People's Republic of China and that they will still accept them. In a communication to the Chinese Government on 3 April 1963, we indicated the concrete steps that should be taken for a resolution of our differences, beginning with the acceptance of the Colombo proposals. The Prime Minister of India repeated this position in a letter to the Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic on 1 May 1963. We reminded them again on 6 September. And yet, even after a lapse of six months, there is no answer. China, in its military arrogance, refuses to consider reasonable proposals of peaceful settlement. It appears from the actions and pronouncements of the Chinese leaders that this militant posture and their thesis of inevitability of war is directed not only against India but also against the whole world.

105. In the month of May of this year, a historic conference took place in Addis Ababa which was, in a way, a culmination of the struggle of the African people. The Charter of African Unity, adopted by thirty-two African States, is a significant document and the Conference itself ranks amongst the major gatherings of the post-war era. This conference was a reminder, if one were needed, that Africa cannot continue three fourths free and one fourth slave. So long as the territories of Angola, Mozambique, Portuguese Guinea, Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa are not independent there can be no lasting peace in Africa. India is gravely concerned that colonialism in some of its

worst manifestations should still hold sway in these areas. The fact that the efforts in this Assembly all these years have not changed the situation is frustrating and gives rise to emotions—emotions which are still not fully appreciated by certain nations. We realize that emotions are not the best guide by which to steer our course in an international forum, but they happen to be a reality today and can only be ignored at peril to the principles and purposes to which the United Nations Charter is dedicated. It should be the constant endeavour of all of us here to see that the United Nations plays a vital and effective role in bringing about this change.

106. Another threatening situation exists in South Africa. May I remind the representatives that in 1946, as Chairman of the Indian delegation, the first resolution in this Assembly [resolution 44 (I)] condemning racial discrimination in South Africa was moved by me. On that occasion my opponent was no less a person than the late Field-Marshal Smuts, whose name is closely associated with the Charter of the United Nations. The General Assembly pronounced its verdict by a two-thirds majority in a most dramatic manner at midnight. Since then we have passed resolutions year after year deploring the action of South Africa in respect of discrimination. But conditions have progressively worsened and the South African Government's attitude on the question of apartheid has grown more rigid.

107. While deterioration has been taking place in South Africa, the Assembly has viewed the situation with growing alarm which has been expressed through its resolutions. There has been no response from the Government of South Africa. I venture to suggest that, if in 1946 and the years immediately following some Member nations had not abstained from voting on the resolutions and thus supported, however indirectly, the policies of the Government of South Africa, we might have been able to prevent the extension of those policies. If, for instance, the kind of historic vote which was recorded here a few hours back had been possible some years ago, I believe that we would have been a good deal further along the road to a world without discrimination. Let us not forget that it was racial policies that led to the holocaust of twenty years ago in which millions of lives were lost in order to maintain and uphold the right of all human beings to live with dignity and in freedom. The continent of Africa is aflame with the fires of freedom. We cannot and will not let our brothers in South Africa languish and perish in conditions which our Organization has pledged to outlaw.

108. At its seventeenth session the General Assembly adopted resolution 1761 (XVII). India had the honour of co-sponsoring that resolution. The basic provisions of the resolution have been carried out by us from 1946 and India was, I believe, the first country to take diplomatic and economic action against South Africa for its deplorable policies of apartheid which we have consistently and vigorously condemned. Resolution 1761 (XVII) has had encouraging response from Member States, but the number of defaulters is still too large and it is a matter of regret and concern that even some of its co-sponsors have not implemented its provisions. Words and indignation can be no substitute for practical measures in this regard.

109. It may well be asked whether the acceptance of the principle of pacific settlement of disputes would necessarily delay the process of decolonization. I do not think that anybody suggests that in eschewing war

we are acquiescing in the perpetuation of the status quo in an area where colonialism and racialism must end, and there can be no question of the colonial Powers or racists utilizing peaceful coexistence to reverse the processes of history. One of the objectives of the Charter of the United Nations is to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed forces shall not be utilized save in the common interest. This is where the United Nations must play its role and if methods cannot be found for peaceful evolution from colonialism to freedom, then violence cannot be averted.

110. The role which the United Nations played in the Congo is a step forward on the road to peace. The military operations which were necessitated by the violence accompanying attempts to dismember a Member State have ended successfully. The co-operation which was maintained between the various countries providing military help has been gratifying.

111. Despite the urgency of our defence needs and requirements caused by the invasion of Indian territory by Chinese armed forces, the Indian contingent in the Congo which had been placed at the disposal of the United Nations was not withdrawn before the completion of its mission. At one time we had nearly 6,000 Indian soldiers in the Congo helping to maintain the peace on behalf of the United Nations.

112. Peace-keeping operations are closely linked, as the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Pearson [1208th meeting], reminded us, with problems of political control, executive direction, financial means and administrative co-ordination. India has been aware of this and we have willingly performed our duties on behalf of the United Nations whenever we have been called upon to do so. We can assure our African brothers that we shall continue to make our humble contribution to these efforts. Not only our sympathy but also our fraternal interest is bound up with their efforts.

113. It is heartening to note that, though conflict exists, goodwill and co-operation also exist on many planes, and such individual and collective co-operation is enabling us to move forward towards peace and stability. Areas of co-operation today are larger than those of conflict. It is the news behind the headlines that is making history today.

114. Two years ago, speaking on this theme, the Prime Minister of India said:

"The essential thing about this world is co-operation, and even today, between countries which are opposed to each other in the political or other fields, there is a vast amount of co-operation. Little is known or little is said, about this co-operation that is going on, but a great deal is said about every point of conflict, and so the world is full of this idea that the conflicts go on and we live on the verge of disaster. It would be a truer picture if the co-operating elements in the world today were put forward and we were made to think that the world depends on co-operation and not on conflict." [1051st meeting, para. 37.]

The Prime Minister had then proposed that the Assembly might consider devoting a year to emphasizing this aspect of co-operation. Happily the Assembly endorsed the proposal, and a preparatory committee worked on this during this year. Its positive recommendation that 1965, the twentieth anniversary of this great Organization, be designated "International Co-operation Year" will soon be before the Assembly for

its consideration. We have been heartened by the favourable response that this proposal has received.

115. In organizing aid for assisting the developing countries this Organization serves its most notable purpose. In this context, no tribute would be adequate for the successful activities of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund. Under the direction of some of the ablest international civil servants, these two activities over the years have furnished to the developing countries a measure of assistance which has been of great benefit to the economic and industrial development of these countries. Mention may be made here of the activities of the Special Fund. India, though itself beset by national problems of great magnitude, is proud of its record in this field. During the period 1959-1963 India's voluntary contributions to the Special Fund amount to the equivalent of \$8,205,000. This is 36 per cent of the total contribution of all developing countries and is the highest among such countries.

116. While India is grateful for the assistance received from the Special Fund, which amounts to no more than 244 per cent of India's own contributions, the relative figures in respect of other developing countries are in all cases much higher. Even on a per capita basis, the assistance received by India from the Special Fund is 4.54 cents, only one other developing country having received a smaller amount, while countries with ten times the per capita income of India have received more than 100 times as much per capita aid as India.

117. While India does not grudge aid to other countries, the pursuit of the principle of the sovereign equality of States—a fine principle where votes are concerned—inevitably creates an imbalance in the matter of aid where the number of human beings involved is an essential factor to be taken into consideration. The same factor plays an important role in determining the scale of contributions of Member States for providing for the expenses of the Organization. In order to reaffirm its faith in this, the most noble purpose of the Organization, the Government of India has, as in previous years, decided to continue to maintain its voluntary contribution to the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and to the Special Fund at the highest possible level.

118. The welcome improvements in the international situation should enable us to turn our energies to the problems of development. Such a focusing of energies is urgently called for because, so far, the Decade of Development has moved shakily. It is necessary to intensify our efforts if the modest targets of growth in the developing world are not to be misused.

119. The whole objective of the economic and industrial development plans of my country is to lead it to the point where a self-sustaining economy may be created. Though we are today far from that goal, signs of a break-through are now visible on the horizon. For example, in the absence of foreign aid for the Bokaro Steel Plant, which we considered to be an essential ingredient of our industrial development, it has been decided that Indian engineers themselves will now be entrusted with the task of designing and building this plant, scheduled, at its full development, to produce over 4 million tons of finished steel per year. India is also one of the few countries in the world to establish, as part of the national electrification scheme, nuclear power plants, three of which will soon be in operation.

These plants received a large measure of foreign help, as we did not then have the necessary technical knowledge. However, my Government has just taken a decision that the fourth nuclear power plant will be designed and constructed entirely from Indian resources of men and material. A nascent aircraft industry has taken root in India, which now takes its place among the very few countries that are able to manufacture civil and military aircraft. Some training aircraft manufactured in India have already been sold abroad. Finding itself on the threshold of industrialization, India is willing and able to furnish, within its limitations, technical assistance and skill in fields in which it has experience to sister countries which may wish to avail themselves of such aid through the United Nations or on a bilateral basis, and India has already done so in some instances.

120. There has been a slight improvement in the prices paid for primary commodities in world trade, and this upward movement, after years of decline and stagnation, is welcome indeed. The disturbing fact, however, remains that the share of the developing countries in the expanding world trade continues to shrink. The growth rate of the economies of the developing countries leaves much to be desired. While there is a better understanding of the needs and significance of foreign aid, but as loans and as grants, the fact remains that the resources so deployed are far short of the expanding needs and capacities of the developing countries.

121. The United Nations has set up a number of agencies and institutions that have been doing valuable work. On the drawing-board of the world Organization there are a number of blueprints, in varying degrees of finality, about other agencies and institutions planned to assist the processes of development. These varied organizations, with the array of world talent in them, can help to produce effective results if adequate resources are made available to them. The task of mobilizing the needed resources, in terms of aid and trade, will no doubt engage the attention of the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Trade and Development which has rightly aroused deep interest and great expectations among the Member nations.

122. There is today a better understanding, both in the investing countries as well as in the developing countries, of the role and worth of private investments. It would be unfortunate for the measured growth of the world's wealth if occasional aberrations on either side are allowed to mar the emerging understanding in this vital sector of development.

123. Ours is a strange world, full of paradox. On the one side we have to our credit spectacular achievements and limitless opportunity and each year brings exciting new possibilities within our grasp. The other side of the picture is an ugly one of want, hunger and disease—very real enemies which threaten to make a mockery of man's achievements. The war against these enemies is a long and continuing one for they are deeply entrenched. Is it too much to hope that as the blizzard of the cold war subsides, as the snow melts and nature unveils the buds and blossoms of constructive co-operation, this family of Nations will devote even greater thought and energy to lifting the curse of poverty and want from the many millions of our fellow beings, and thus usher in an era of hope and happiness for men and women throughout the world.

124. Mr. REID (Dominican Republic) (translated from Spanish): On behalf of the Dominican delegation and on

my own behalf I take great pleasure in congratulating Mr. Carlos Sosa Rodríguez, the representative of Venezuela, on his election as President of the eighteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

125. The fact that Dr. Sosa Rodríguez will direct the debates and work of this session of the Assembly is in itself a guarantee of its success. The outstanding qualities of the new President have become manifest during the years in which he has served with distinction and brilliance as representative of his country in this world Organization and in other diplomatic posts. His tact, moderation, sound judgement, conscientiousness and legal abilities augur well that the problems facing the United Nations will be approached and considered in the way that will most benefit mankind now and in the future.

126. The Dominican people, as a member of the family of American nations, are glad that a representative of our group will serve as President of this General Assembly and, even more so, that he is a worthy representative of the country of Bolívar. This is so because the Dominican people owe a debt of gratitude to the people of Venezuela as their most steadfast supporters in the arduous struggle to free themselves from the cruel tyranny to which they had been subject for more than thirty years.

127. The Dominican Republic stands before you today painfully shaken by the recent events that have caused the suspension of the constitutional rule which began on 27 February of this year. The facts, true or false, have been reported in all quarters of the world, and have aroused great uncertainty.

128. We are the first to regret what has occurred, but in the face of the accomplished fact and completely alien to it, we have acceded to the appeal of the people, and, without any political commitments other than those imposed by the need to help the country and the desire to restore as quickly as possible the constitutionality that has been suspended, we have assumed the duties of the Foreign Office in order to strengthen international relations and thus contribute to the process of reconstruction which is necessary whenever the democratic progress of a nation has been interrupted.

129. We do not condone coups d'état and would never have agreed to participate in the present Government if the military authorities had arrogated to themselves the right to rule the State. Now that the military authorities have discharged what they considered to be their duty, they have established an auspicious precedent in America by handing over control of the Government quickly and of their own accord to a three-man civil executive, to which they are completely subordinate and which the overwhelming majority of the people accept and support, realizing the integrity and prudence of the men who compose it.

130. We offer our friendship to those nations with which we have traditionally maintained relations, and we wish to be received in like manner. This is essential if we are to carry forward the process of transformation inevitable in the world of today, in which manifest inequalities among men anger those who lack all material possessions and harden the hearts of the privileged who are surrounded by abundance. We will never, however, make the task which we are in duty bound to carry out in our nation dependent on our recognition or non-recognition.

131. Our mission will be fulfilled. And, just as the traveller who must reach a certain destination does not abandon his journey for lack of a vehicle, we shall reach that destination. If we go on foot, we shall reach it more slowly; if we go by automobile, we shall reach it more quickly. But there can be no doubt that we intend to reach that goal and shall reach it however difficult the road may be.

132. The generation in the Dominican Republic to which I have the honour to belong accepts the challenge of fate, and with all the respect which we owe to the memory of our forebears, we shall break the shackles of the semi-feudal, patriarchal or interventionist systems which have regrettably produced social conditions that affront the dignity of the worker and the peasant. The forum of the United Nations is an appropriate place to declare emphatically that Santo Domingo will, despite reverses, become through the efforts of its people, a showcase of democracy, founded on a revolutionary process that is genuinely our own.

133. As President Kennedy once said, lost opportunities are seldom recovered. The Dominican Republic may very well prove to be an exception to that rule. If the lessons of the tragedy which our long-suffering country has undergone are correctly learnt, the opportunity of democracy will not have been lost.

Mr. Alvarez Vidaurre (El Salvador), Vice-President, took the Chair.

134. Democracy in the Dominican Republic did not fail because the people were inadequately prepared to assume their responsibilities. The first genuinely free elections which were held in the Dominican Republic in December 1962 after three decades of political obscurantism proved the contrary. That they were model elections has been confirmed by some forty distinguished representatives from the hemisphere who were invited to observe them at the request of the Dominican Council of State. The failure of democratic government in the Dominican Republic was the fault of its leaders. Democracy did not fail; the Dominican people showed their discipline and responsibility at the ballot box. We, their leaders, failed our people. We must all assume a share of the responsibility for the failure of the administration. The bitter truth is that democracy was very badly served in the Dominican Republic. This is one of the first lessons that must be learnt.

135. This fiasco in the past of the Dominican Republic should be regarded as a prologue to its future. The second lesson to be learnt from the experience of the Dominican Republic is that Latin American problems are primarily political and only secondarily economic. In our preoccupation with economic development, we have lost sight of its political aspect. Within the Alliance for Progress a comprehensive strategy for economic development has been set in motion. However, what we really need in Latin America is an over-all strategy of political development, together with the political tactics necessary to bring it to fruition.

136. Would it not be more prudent to bring all the forces of the hemisphere to bear on the creation of stronger movements based upon democratic foundations and firmly supported by democratic traditions? Would it not be more salutary to devise methods to prevent extremists of the right or the left from destroying the political keystone of a middle-of-the-road democracy? In other words, can we in Latin America

achieve justice unless there first exists a political atmosphere favourable to democracy? In our exclusive preoccupation with economic development we seem to be forgetting these facts.

137. The third lesson to be learnt from the Dominican question is that the small core of progressive and reform-minded Governments in Latin America is in greater danger of being overturned by preventive coups d'état than by external enemies. The participation of the armed forces in politics is not peculiar to Latin America; it is a universal phenomenon. It exists in the Middle East, in Turkey, in Pakistan and in South-East Asia. It is not unknown in Western Europe. Even in the United States the absolute supremacy of the civil authorities has been defied on various occasions. In the Western Hemisphere, only three countries have succeeded in overthrowing the supremacy of the military. In each case, however, this was achieved through the violent overthrow of the entire social structure. In other countries of the hemisphere, there has been a progressive growth and a maturing of the military establishments, but this does not mean that the military have everywhere abandoned their political interests. Recent events, including those in the Dominican Republic, prove the contrary. The point is that the participation of the military in politics in Latin America has taken very deep roots and has become too entrenched an institution to be eradicated at one stroke. It is well to remember that on more than one occasion in the Western Hemisphere it was the civilian authorities who persuaded the military to engage in political activity.

138. Democratic governments with a progressive outlook must be protected from the demagogues, from the coup d'état of ambitious men and from the political manoeuvrings of unscrupulous politicians who, together or separately, attempt to satisfy their ambitions by playing upon the ignorance and poverty of the people. I emphasize these three dangers because I think it is unjust to put the blame for all the evils of Latin America on the armed forces, which have often made remarkable efforts to overcome their own imperfections. This happened in the specific case of the Dominican Republic, where despite the errors that were made, the armed forces have given positive evidence that they have every intention of discharging their duty.

139. It is absurd to hope that the Inter-American system, as a unit, can serve as a kind of hemispheric shield to protect its individual members against internal attack. Nevertheless, such a shield could and certainly should be forged through the resolution and efforts of the people themselves if democracy is to flourish on the continent.

140. We believe in nations as we believe in their statesmen. And because we believe in their statesmen, we know that in these difficult times in which many countries of our continent have fallen victim to the defects which we should like to correct, these men will in this solemn hour act not according to sterile political conventions but in accordance with a humane understanding of their people and of the individuals who compose them.

141. In the Dominican Republic, the present Government could have promised a return to constitutional normality by offering to hold elections before the appointed time it had set for the fulfilment of its mandate, which is not to exceed two years and during which municipal, congressional and presidential elec-

tions are to be held, the first-mentioned immediately after the end of the first year of government.

142. Elections such as those of last December—encompassing in one single poll municipal councillors; municipal executive representatives; representatives to Congress, that is deputies and senators; representatives to the Assembly for the revision of the Constitution; the Vice-President and President of the Republic—would produce results as surprising as the previous ones, because the Dominican people, despite the difficulties of their life, have a kind of instinct which leads them along peaceful paths in the decisive moments of their history. They gave proof of this in their fight against the armed dictatorship of Trujillo and again when they went to the polls on 20 December 1962. Elections would undoubtedly be a further manifestation of democracy, but, in view of the bitter experience that we have already undergone, we ask ourselves whether this manifestation of democracy would be the final proof that we had achieved democracy and that further risks had been eliminated.

143. With obsessive interest, we ask ourselves what is the meaning of democracy. And in doing so, we cannot fail to note the concluding paragraphs of the statement made by the United States Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Edwin M. Martin, published in the New York Herald Tribune of 6 October, in which he said:

"I fear there are some who will accuse me of having written an apologia for coups. I have not. They are to be fought with all the means we have available. Rather I would protest that I am urging the rejection of the thesis of the French philosophers that democracy can be legislated—established by constitutional fiat.

"I am insisting on the Anglo-Saxon notion that democracy is a living thing which must have time and soil and sunlight in which to grow. We must do all we can to create these favorable conditions, and we can do and have done much.

"But we cannot simply create the plant and give it to them; it must spring from seeds planted in indigenous soil."

144. These are the seeds which we wish to plant in our own sorely beset country, for we firmly believe that democracy has its roots in the primary political cell of society, whether it be called municipality, city, corporation, town, village, borough, canton or anything else. We are thus convinced that only when man is able to govern himself freely and by his own efforts, resources and incentives in his own small locality and thus to transform it into a small paradise of which he may be proud, will he be equally able to govern that aggregate of localities, great and small, which make up the nation. We want to begin our task of planting the seed in our own soil and thereby constructing a democracy from the base up to the apex and not from the top down to the bottom.

145. We shall start by constructing the Dominican municipality so that it can govern itself and will not be dominated by the central Government along with which it is elected, and so that its destiny will not be directed by political bosses from an office in the National Palace. The continuity of the legislative power must become a firmly established practice; the legislature must be partially renewed so that the national Government will not have to rely on inexpert legislators submissive to its every demand. We wish to

establish an autonomous career judiciary, so that the judges will not owe political servitude to the Chief of State and pay lip-service to him which might threaten democracy. We wish to establish a balance of powers so that democracy, which is social equilibrium, shall not be forced to maintain that equilibrium with the absolute power of a single man in one plate of the balance and the sabre of the army in the other.

146. In order to accomplish this task we shall again make use of the technical assistance which the Organization of American States offered us during the last elections. The effectiveness of that assistance was proved then, and it will be confirmed again on this occasion when we shall have the time which we did not then have.

147. The Dominican Republic, 70 per cent of whose population are peasants, cannot continue to turn a blind eye to the spiritual and material poverty that is the lot of this majority, which has not so far received any positive benefit from the social advances that have been made in the course of the twentieth century. The Dominican peasant, like those of the majority of our sister countries of Latin America, is still subject to the rigours of a permanent outdoor life. His work is bedevilled by a system which leads to the perpetuation of his poverty through indifference towards ignorance and disease and the exploitation of his illusions by the false promises of a succession of candidates who, when they achieve power, ignore those promises or put off their fulfilment indefinitely.

148. Practical and immediate justice for the worker in the fields, on whose labour the present and future of the Dominican Republic depend, must be forthcoming during the tenure of the civilian Government which today guides the destinies of my country. It has an obligation to its people, who, on 20 December last year, cast their vote not for a man or a political party, but for reforms in the economic and social structure of the country which would bring to the homes of the wretched masses not only freedom from hatred but also the possibility of adequate nourishment, of living under their own roof, of cultivating a piece of land of their own and of educating their children. Those promises were unfortunately postponed so as to make way for a series of political adventures which smashed into a thousand pieces the hopes of the Dominican people.

149. It is the duty of this Government—if it is to justify itself before history—to carry out in a spirit free from demagogic motivation whatever efforts may be necessary to restore the faith of the Dominican people in their ability to achieve a better life along the broad highway of representative democracy. It should be pointed out that progress towards this goal will be slower if the political and economic sanctions deriving from certain international pronouncements are kept in force. I must, however, emphatically declare that it is the firm decision of this Government to mobilize all the resources at its command in order to realize the legitimate desires of the Dominican people to free their nation from the status of an economic satellite.

150. As a first step in our resolve to set to work without delay, I make a formal request from this world rostrum to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for this Organization to help us immediately by providing technicians who can proceed as speedily as possible to Santo Domingo to study the legislation that may be necessary to guarantee to the peasants of

my country a minimum return from their labour. I wish to put forward the idea that, just as the worker enjoys a minimum wage for his daily hours of work, so the peasant, who cannot limit his working day to a certain number of hours because of factors beyond his control, should have the assurance that when the harvest is in, his efforts will have guaranteed a minimum decent life for him and his family.

151. Latin America, which is basically agricultural, must answer without further delay the anguished cry of an immense majority of peasants whose fate can no longer be left in the hands of those who have exploited them in the past or of the dreamers of today who wish to remedy injustice with empty words and insubstantial promises.

152. I should like, before concluding, to explain the Dominican position on foreign policy, the essence of which was set out in the statement made by the Chief of Government when he took office and is as follows:

"Now that absolute tranquillity has been assured throughout the nation together with the full exercise of power by the Triumvirate over which I have the honour to preside, I wish to refer to the very important matter of the foreign policy which the Dominican Government will follow and which can be summed up in the unshakable decision to honour all international commitments undertaken in the name of the Republic. Within the framework of the Inter-American system, it will be our constant concern to strengthen our ties with the sister countries of America and to fortify the Organization of American States, that regional organization which has so consistently and effectively come to the aid of our country in moments of deepest anxiety. And thus will it be possible to convert into reality the programmes designed to give effect to the concepts of the Charter of Punta del Este, so that the Alliance for Progress may continue more rapidly to assist in improving the level of living of the Dominican people. This is the supreme goal of the Triumvirate, which is convinced of the urgent need for reconstructing the economic and social life of the country, so that the overwhelming majority of the people may be provided with the maximum opportunity for betterment. In referring to this economic and social aspect of the undertakings given at Punta del Este,^{4/} we do not wish to leave unmentioned the obligations deriving from the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, which likewise took place at Punta del Este.^{5/} The Triumvirate will endeavour with all the means at its disposal, to offer the Western world its fullest co-operation both in the United Nations and at every international conference in which the future of America is involved."

153. I shall conclude by recalling that although in this difficult moment of its history the Dominican Republic is cut off from diplomatic relations with the Governments of Latin America, it does not forget the fraternal ties that bind it to a race which has suffered so much precisely because it has been wanting in the mutual understanding that should exist among peoples having a common ancestry so that they might rediscover their own destiny, which cannot be forged except by ourselves.

^{4/} Special Meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at the Ministerial level, held at Punta del Este from 5 to 17 August 1961.

^{5/} Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States, held at Punta del Este from 22 to 31 January 1962.

154. Santo Domingo, steeped in history and the pride of a whole race, regrets that it is unable to greet those Governments which have not yet officially granted recognition to ours, but it enthusiastically and with deep emotion embraces all the peoples of America, who in the present and for the future constitute the refuge of Christian civilization.

155. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We have reached the end of the list of speakers in the general debate. Several representatives have asked to exercise their right of reply, and I now call upon the representative of Somalia.

156. Mr. DAAR (Somalia): I am compelled to take the floor again to correct some inaccuracies contained in the statement made by the United Kingdom representative in exercise of the right of reply [1237th meeting].

157. He stated that my delegation did not make reference to the Rome Conference. If you will remember, my delegation had no intention of going into the details of this problem, but was merely answering the statement of the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom in his intervention of 27 September 1963 [1219th meeting]. But since this matter has been brought to the forefront by the United Kingdom delegation, it is necessary for me to give you a proper picture of the Northern Frontier District problem.

158. We attended the Rome Conference in a sincere spirit of compromise and conciliation, but unfortunately this was not reciprocated by the United Kingdom delegation, who used the Conference as a means to withdraw finally from their responsibility in solving the problems of the Northern Frontier District.

159. In that Conference the United Kingdom delegation, in accepting the interests of the Somali Republic on the future of the Northern Frontier District, proposed that further talks should be entered into between us and Kenya.

160. We considered this proposal very carefully and the following day presented to the Conference our views on it. We informed the United Kingdom delegation that we welcomed its recognition of our interest in the Northern Frontier District and likewise accepted that the problem is a disputed one.

161. We went further and accepted in principle the United Kingdom's proposal that talks should be entered into between us and Kenya. We, however, informed the United Kingdom delegation that inasmuch as the Conference had accepted the Northern Frontier District problem to be in dispute we felt that, pending a final solution of the problem and as an interim measure, the administration of the territory should be placed either under the United Nations or under a joint Somali-Kenya administration. This proposal was totally rejected by the United Kingdom delegation. Nevertheless we expressed the hope that the United Kingdom delegation, on further reflection, would accept this proposal in the same spirit of conciliation and compromise in which we made it. Indeed, we still leave this proposal open for the United Kingdom to accept.

162. The United Kingdom delegation told us yesterday that it did not intend to take a unilateral decision on the issue of the Northern Frontier District. But I find myself at a loss to reconcile the attitude of the United Kingdom Government with the sending by it of an independent commission composed of a Nigerian and a

Canadian to the area to ascertain the wishes of the people there regarding their future. What, then, is the underlying motive in sending this commission when it is quite clear that the United Kingdom did not have the slightest intention of acting on its findings, which, as it turned out, showed that 87 per cent of the population opted for union with the Somali Republic? The only conclusion appears to us to be that the United Kingdom merely intended to mislead us and the people concerned by such moves and also to buy time in order to create an explosive situation in the area.

163. The United Kingdom representative has also made reference to the Addis Ababa Conference. In that regard I should like only to say this. Having actively participated in the framing of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, we, of course, totally subscribe to it. In our view, that Charter does not in the slightest way conflict with our position on this problem.

164. The African Charter specifically accepts without any qualification the right to self-determination and freedom for all the peoples of Africa. In fact the very reason that has motivated the African Heads of State and Government meeting in Addis Ababa to create the Organization was their common desire to clean up and to correct the shameful legacies left behind by colonialism. This might come as a surprise to the United Kingdom delegation, but the people of the Northern Frontier District are among the African people to whom the Charter refers.

165. The United Kingdom delegation accused us of using violent terms, because we spoke the truth. When we described the United Kingdom policy as one of duplicity, we felt we used the words advisedly, and we have been borne out by the United Kingdom's stand yesterday. It has attempted to explain that in this problem it subscribes to the view of the Addis Ababa Conference. We welcome the United Kingdom's adherence to the African Conference, but what we find strange is the fact that that Government should on the one hand deny the right of the people of the Northern Frontier District to self-determination on the clumsy pretext that the signatories of the African Charter would not have approved of the United Kingdom taking a unilateral decision in acceding to the expressed wishes of the people of the Northern Frontier District. At the same time, it is the United Kingdom Government that is flagrantly disregarding the resolutions of the Addis Ababa Conference with regard to the supplying of arms to the racist white Government of South Africa and in persisting with its unholy protection of the white minority Government of Southern Rhodesia.

166. We hold the United Kingdom totally responsible for the solution of the problem, because, first, it is that Government that took the decision to take the people of the Northern Frontier District under protection and later to annex their land territorially within the colony of Kenya and, secondly, it is the United Kingdom that has laid down the principles by which the administration of the territory and its people should be directed, embodying therein a clear recognition of separation from Kenya and its people. Consequently it is quite obvious where the responsibility lies. It is the United Kingdom that has annexed the Northern Frontier District to Kenya, and therefore there is an inescapable obligation on the part of that Government to correct the unlawful usurpation of the territory of the Northern Frontier District.

167. All we seek is that the people of the Northern Frontier District be given the right to self-determination as enshrined in the United Nations Charter, in the same way as we are seeking this right for the rest of humanity that is still under colonialism.

168. Finally, it must be stated that the United Kingdom's makeshift expedient, already hazardous, of side-tracking the issue and leaving matters as they stand at present, can satisfy no one. To us as well as to those on the spot, this policy can be only a further manifestation of colonial injustice and brutality.

AGENDA ITEM 77

The violation of human rights in South Viet-Nam
(continued)*

169. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Before calling on the next speaker among those wishing to exercise their right of reply in relation to agenda item 9, I must make an announcement to the General Assembly.

170. In accordance with the authorization given me by the General Assembly at its 1234th plenary meeting to act on the basis of the letter dated 4 October 1963 from the Head of the Special Mission of the Republic of Viet-Nam conveying the invitation of his Government to have the representatives of several Member States visit Viet-Nam in the near future, I have appointed a mission consisting of the representatives of the following Member States: Afghanistan, Brazil, Ceylon, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Morocco and Nepal.

171. The Governments of these States have designated the following persons to represent them on the mission: Afghanistan, Mr. Abdul Rahman Pazhwak; Brazil, Mr. Sergio Correa Da Costa; Ceylon, Sir Senerat Gunewardene; Costa Rica, Mr. Fernando Volic Jiménez; Dahomey, Mr. Louis Ignacio-Pinto; Morocco, Mr. Ahmed Taibi Benhima; and Nepal, Mr. Matrika Prasad Koirala.

172. The Chairman of the mission will be Mr. Pazhwak, of Afghanistan.

173. The purpose of this mission, as indicated in the letter of 4 October 1963, is to visit the Republic of Viet-Nam so as to ascertain the facts of the situation in that country as regards relations between the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam and the Viet-Nameese Buddhist community.

174. The Secretary-General has informed me that the cost of the mission will be approximately \$33,600. The mission will have to leave as soon as possible so that its report can be submitted to the General Assembly at the present session.

175. The representative of Thailand has asked to speak in connexion with this announcement.

176. Mr. JAYANAMA (Thailand): I hasten to assure members that in spite of the bundle of papers which I am carrying I shall take only two minutes of their valuable time.

177. On Tuesday afternoon, 8 October 1963 [1234th meeting], on the resumption of the debate on the violation of human rights in South Viet-Nam, after a temporary suspension for a period of more than twenty minutes, the meeting was again adjourned almost immediately, before my delegation could have

time to submit a request to speak. What I would like to say is simply the following.

178. The delegation of Thailand appreciates the notes prepared and circulated by the delegation of Ceylon with the purpose of facilitating the deliberations on the question of the violation of human rights in South Viet-Nam. We would like, however, to make an observation as regards the sketch map appearing therein. We realize that the map is intended to serve merely to give a rough geographical location of the countries in the region of South-East Asia. Still, we could not refrain from pointing out to this Assembly that the boundary line between Thailand and her sister neighbour and very good friend, Malaysia, has been moved some hundred miles up, almost to include Bangkok, the capital of Thailand, within the Malaysian territory.

179. Fully aware of the good intentions of the delegation of Ceylon, whose leader is my personal friend, in producing and circulating the said notes, my delegation would like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the inaccuracy of the sketch map in regard to the Malaysia-Thailand frontier line. We have no doubt that the mistake was made inadvertently and that the delegation of Ceylon would be the first one to agree to the remarks which I have just made, with no other purpose than to set the record straight.

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

180. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I shall now call on those speakers who have asked to speak in the exercise of their right of reply, and shall do so in the order in which I have received their requests.

181. Mr. COMAY (Israel): Mr. President, I am grateful to you for permitting my delegation briefly to exercise its right of reply to a number of Arab statements in this debate, statements in which my country has been attacked and threatened in a manner completely out of step with the more relaxed and conciliatory tone of the present Assembly. The utterances to which I refer have attempted to inject into our proceedings the so-called Palestine issue, and I must therefore make plain at the outset that, for the United Nations as for us, no such issue exists at all.

182. A long time ago, the Organization was seized of the question—what should be done with the mandated territory of Palestine? That question was disposed of finally and irrevocably in the early post-war years. In 1947, the United Nations rejected the Arab claim to the whole country and endorsed the right of the Jewish people to independent nationhood in their ancient homeland. In 1948, the newly born State of Israel stood its ground against invading Arab armies, and that was the first time that the Security Council had to cope with open aggression and armed defiance of United Nations resolutions.

183. In 1949, and that is fourteen years ago, Israel was admitted to membership of the United Nations, and since then it has established normal relations with over eighty different countries in every region of the world.

184. We do not come here to discuss whether we should or should not exist. Our existence is an immutable reality. What then is the Israel-Arab problem confronting the United Nations in the world of 1963? First and foremost, it is a conflict between States, or,

*Resumed from the 1234th meeting.

to be more precise, the continued belligerency of a group of Member States against another Member State, with all the dangers which that involves for the peace of our region and the world.

185. The Israel Foreign Minister, in her statement in the general debate on 2 October 1963 [1224th meeting], soberly drew international attention to this danger and made a plea for relaxing tensions and moving towards a peaceful and negotiated settlement of differences. The Assembly has heard in what terms this plea has been rejected. Only yesterday the Foreign Minister of Egypt [1236th meeting], called for what he termed an Algerian solution, and indicated that his country would place itself behind such a renewed attempt to settle political differences by force and bloodshed.

186. I wish to point out to him that Israel is not Algeria. It is a self-evident proposition that Israel is not also Yemen on whose soil a foreign occupation army is fighting.

187. What is so disconcerting is that he should, at one and the same time, expect Israel to open its borders to an influx of hostile Palestinian Arabs from the neighbouring countries in order no doubt to create more favourable conditions for his wished-for Algerian solution. He piously invokes United Nations resolutions; but I, for one, would be curious to see the United Nations resolutions which would cover such an action.

188. This sort of threat, which has been repeated in one form or another in every Arab statement, would not need to be taken seriously except for certain disquieting factors. We see revealed in these statements how a dream of military conquest, a concept of arbitrament by the sword, is being deliberately kept alive and nurtured in the minds of Arab masses in the Middle East, including the refugees themselves. Moreover, this is being done by countries which are being flooded with the most modern engines of destruction.

189. The basic issue before the United Nations, therefore, is quite simply one of war or peace. Within that problem there is caught up the humanitarian one of helping a group of refugees to be absorbed and to find new homes and lives for themselves and their families.

190. What is the best and most constructive way to tackle these interrelated issues—that of acquiring peaceful coexistence between the States concerned, and that of resolving a refugee problem? Surely the best way is not by sterile and useless debate in these halls while arms pile up within the region. We believe that we know a better way, and we believe that this is the United Nations way.

191. Let the States concerned establish lines of communication with each other, and let them make an honest effort to find common ground and resolve their differences at the conference table. Nobody would delude himself that this is a short or an easy road. But there is no other road consistent with our obligations under the Charter, with the real needs of our peoples on both sides of the border, or with the universal hope for a world in which force can no longer be an instrument of national policy.

192. In the statement to which I have referred, my Foreign Minister called for a regional code of conduct by which all the States in our area would respect each other's political independence and territorial integrity, would not interfere in each other's internal affairs, would renounce the threat or use of force, would

abandon policies and practices of belligerency, would settle disputes by peaceful means and would seek a negotiated disarmament. Every Arab statement that has since been made from this rostrum has added fresh point and urgency to Mrs. Meir's appeal. The policy expressed in it is entirely in accord with the spirit of the present session of the Assembly. Were there to be a positive response from Arab spokesmen, a feeling of relief and hope would sweep through this chamber and a brighter day would have dawned in the Middle East.

193. Despite all the disturbing aspects of the present situation, we retain our faith that that day will dawn, and we look to the United Nations and to every peace-loving country within it to put their full moral and political weight behind a renewed call for a sincere and fruitful Israel-Arab dialogue.

194. Mr. BHUTTO (Pakistan): The representative of India has stated:

"What grieves us most deeply in this context is the recent tendency of the unprincipled behaviour of making friends of erstwhile enemies and of seeking strange alliances for collusion in aggression."

195. I am constrained to exercise my right of reply because there can be no doubt of the representative of India's aspersions against my country. May I ask, was China an erstwhile enemy of Pakistan with whom Pakistan has now become friends? If so, I should like the representative of India to produce evidence of Pakistan's enmity with China.

196. Since the emergence of the People's Republic of China towards the end of 1949, Pakistan has had a correct and friendly relation with that country. We recognized the People's Republic of China in 1950, about the same time as India did, and also the United Kingdom. We voted for the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations in 1950 and in the following years. We became a member of the Manila Treaty—better known as SEATO—in 1954, but, as this was purely a defensive Treaty against aggression, our relations with the People's Republic of China continued their normal course.

197. In 1956 Prime Minister Chou En-lai visited Pakistan at the invitation of the Government of Pakistan, and his visit was returned by the Prime Minister of Pakistan as a reciprocal gesture of courtesy and goodwill. In December 1960, two years before the outbreak of the Sino-Indian conflict last October, Pakistan proposed a demarcation of the common border between China's province of Sinkiang and the contiguous areas, the defence of which is the responsibility of Pakistan. The People's Republic of China gave a favourable indication of its willingness to negotiate a boundary agreement. The preliminary formalities were completed in May 1962 and the negotiations themselves commenced in Peking before China and India clashed in the North East and the Ladakh frontiers.

198. Does this record of Pakistan's relations with China establish that the two countries were enemies who became friends only after the outbreak of the Sino-Indian conflict last year?

199. The representative of India, in the same passage, has accused Pakistan, by insinuation, of "seeking strange alliances for collusion in aggression". May I ask the representative of India to produce evidence of these "strange alliances"? Was it referring perchance

to the boundary agreement completed last year or to the trade and air agreement? What evidence is there in India's possession of this "collusion in aggression"? I have already said that we have entered into no such collusion; if we had, we would have taken advantage of the opportunity to attack India last October when India was engaged in a conflict with China. We did not do so; and yet India, instead of appreciating the peaceful conduct and good neighbourly intentions of Pakistan, has accused Pakistan of "collusion in aggression".

200. It is clear from the allegation of the representative of India that, in its pursuit of domination and hegemony of the Indian Ocean region, India cannot contemplate with equanimity the existence of small independent States on its borders and would not permit them the right to conduct their own affairs internally and externally. Only a few years ago, when the cry of "Chini-Hindi Bhai Bhai", which means "Chinese and Indians are brothers", was resounding from one corner of India to the other, Pakistan was accused of not being friendly to India's brother, the People's Republic of China, and of aligning itself as a member of SEATO against China.

201. Today, when the relationship between India and China has become unfraternal, Pakistan is accused of having changed its feelings of enmity towards China to those of friendship. This kind of self-reversal is psychologically interesting. It indicates, I fear, a paranoid state. Otherwise, why should India expect its neighbouring countries to regulate their relationships with third countries according to the twists and turns of India's own relations with them? The fact is that India cannot bring itself to recognize that its neighbours have the right, as equal sovereign States, to make independent judgements and conduct their foreign relations with other countries in the light of their own interests and in the interests of international peace and security. Is this not a covert claim to suzerainty of India over its smaller neighbours and the manifestation of neo-colonialism in its most insidious form?

202. The representative of India went on to state:

"It is noteworthy that such collusion extends to the point where one of the parties describes the naked aggression committed by the other as 'illusory', as was done in this Assembly only a few days ago."

Obviously the representative of India is referring to my reply to her allegations before the Assembly on 30 September 1963. Aggression, as this Assembly is aware, is both a matter of law and a matter of fact. What is the principle of international law that was transgressed in the outbreak of fighting between India and China last October? Is the MacMahon line a legal line? It is so claimed by the Government of India. It is denied by the People's Republic of China. It may also be noted that the legality of the MacMahon line was also denied by its predecessor Government, the Republic of China.

203. Have the Colombo Powers, which have been exercising their good offices to bring about a peaceful adjustment of the situation between India and China, given their verdict on this Indian charge of aggression against China? To the best of our knowledge and judgement, the fact of who committed aggression last October has yet to be established. Surely, India's own word cannot be the final verdict even though India believes that it can do no wrong.

204. The representative of India also said, at the 1221st meeting, with all the authority of her Govern-

ment, that she would like to deny categorically my assertion that the central issue in Kashmir is that of self-determination. Let me remind her of the statement of the Prime Minister of India, made on 25 November 1947, in the Indian Constituent Assembly:

"The issue in Kashmir is whether violence and naked force shall decide the future or the will of the people."

Does the representative of India deny that statement too?

205. The representative of India also referred to the genesis of the Kashmir dispute and alleged that Pakistan is embarrassed by facts relating to its origin. She mentioned the acts "of plunder, arson, rape and murder" alleged to have been committed by the tribesmen who entered Kashmir through Pakistan territory. But she passed over in complete silence the acts of plunder, arson, rape and murder committed by the feudal tyrant, the Maharajah of Kashmir, and multiplied a thousandfold in his campaign of genocide against his own people—the same tyrant from whom India claims to derive sovereignty over Kashmir. Let me cite the report of *The Times* of London of 10 October 1947 that "237,000 Muslims were systematically exterminated, unless they escaped to Pakistan, by the Dogra forces, headed by the Maharajah in person."

206. The representative of India gave her own version of the United Nations Commission's resolutions on Kashmir, according to which she tried to fasten on Pakistan the obligation to effect an unconditional and unilateral withdrawal of its military forces from Kashmir. But the essence of these resolutions is that the obligations of withdrawal of forces by the two sides are reciprocal and it is laid down that the withdrawals should be concurrent. Moreover, these withdrawals had to be governed by the Truce Agreement between the parties. It is India which has consistently refused to co-operate in the formulation of this Agreement and the modalities of its implementation. Then it turns round and accuses Pakistan of failure to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan.

207. The representative of India maintains that India's sovereignty over Kashmir is complete and total and cannot be questioned. Not so long ago, we used to hear in these very halls similar reiterations of the unquestionable sovereignty of France over Algeria, and we continue to hear them from Portugal. These "unquestionable" claims have not only been questioned but unsettled by the irrepressible force of the principle of self-determination enunciated by the Charter.

208. But we find from the statement of the representative of India that India has, as it were, procured proof of its claim to sovereignty from the fact of its involvement with China in Ladakh. I confess that it is hard for me to comment on a statement of this kind because the only inference to which it can lead is that India chose to provoke China into conflict so that it might thereby consolidate its title over Kashmir.

209. Then the Indian representative opposes self-determination in the following terms:

"It does not, however, apply to the present case, since it is not applicable to a section of a people. It applies to all those territories where, by force of arms or by the vicissitudes of history, people

are held under an alien power. If the policy of self-determination were to apply to parts of constitutionally created States, most of them would be broken up. The plea of self-determination in a plural society could mean nothing but disruption. And may I add that most of the new States in Asia and Africa fall into this category. That is why, I venture to suggest, the United Nations tried so hard to prevent the secession of Katanga on the plea of self-determination." [1221st meeting, para. 216.]

210. The representatives will note the attempt made here to denounce self-determination by trying to relate it to the question of Katanga's secession. The Katanga question had nothing to do with self-determination. In fact, the secession of Katanga was aimed at denying the self-determination of the Congolese people. Had Mr. Tshombé consulted the wishes of the population of Katanga, is there any doubt that the majority of the different tribes inhabiting that province would have voted against secession? What he did in fact was to substitute his own arbitrary will, as the Maharajah of Kashmir did, for the people's right of self-determination. We trust that the representative of India will refrain from attempting to establish similarities where none exist.

211. In regard to the contention that the right of self-determination is not applicable to a section of the people and that, if applied to parts of constitutionally created States, most of them would be broken up, let me remind the representative of India that the people of Kashmir are not a section of the people of India. Nor is Kashmir a part of the constitutionally created State of India. Let me remind the representative of India of the statement of the Prime Minister of India made in the Indian Parliament on 31 March 1955:

"Kashmir, while a problem between India and Pakistan, is not a thing to be bandied about between India and Pakistan for it has a soul of its own and an individuality of its own."

212. Let me remind the representative of India also of the statement of the Prime Minister of India on 2 January 1952:

"Kashmir belongs to the Kashmiri people. If they tell us to walk out, I would have no hesitation in quitting Kashmir."

The so-called argument about India being a plural society which should not be disrupted by the application of the principle of self-determination, if logically followed, would give a new lease on life to imperialistic establishments. It would mean that empires should never be dissolved.

213. Then the representative of India referred to the "two-nation" theory on the basis of which British India was partitioned into India and Pakistan. This was never a theory. It was always a fact—embedded in the history of the sub-continent for a thousand years and its logical consequence—namely that the Hindus and Muslims are entitled to separate sovereignties in their respective majority areas—was accepted as much by India as by Pakistan.

214. It did not mean any division of classes of citizenship between Hindus and Muslims either in India or in Pakistan. By bringing it into controversy the Indian leaders are only trying to question the principle of the establishment of Pakistan, thus making it impossible for relations between the two countries ever to be established.

215. This notwithstanding, we welcome the pronouncement of the representative of India in seeking the friendship and co-operation of my country. Pakistan has always demonstrated its sincere willingness to be a partner in the peaceful pursuit of a more prosperous and happier sub-continent. As I said on 30 September 1963 [1220th meeting], it is not the law of nature for our people to live in perpetual poverty. We are willing to share our talents and resources for a better life for our people, for the people of India and the people of Pakistan. What a great and glorious vista can be opened up only when India vacates its aggression in Kashmir and permits the unfortunate people of that strife-ridden region to share and participate in mutual benefits as a people who have determined their destiny.

216. Pakistan has sedulously striven by peaceful means to achieve this honourable end. Unfortunately, India persists in holding the people of Kashmir in bondage. Let the chains of incarceration break, free the Kashmiris and have the friendship and goodwill of Pakistan. In so doing, India would be the greater for it. It would have then truly contributed to a peaceful order in the sub-continent.

217. Pakistan is one-third the size of India. We would therefore welcome from every consideration the complete removal of tension and bitterness between us. It has always been Pakistan's effort to establish cordial relations with our neighbours, but in establishing this relationship it is wiser to break the barrier of injustice and aggression that divides us in Kashmir, and which India has erected in defiance of the United Nations resolutions and its own solemn pledges.

218. Co-operation does not flow from words. It is rooted in conduct and in positive action. Let India's words be matched by its actions. Neither India nor the world will find Pakistan faltering in its fullest response to a positive gesture recognizing the norms of justice and equity in the world.

219. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India): On 30 September 1963 [1221st meeting], after the Foreign Minister of Pakistan had spoken for the second time, we had reserved our right of reply. We had, however, refrained from exercising this right in the hope that we would thereby put an end to this futile debate. Now that the Foreign Minister has chosen to make another attack, we are constrained to make a reply, much as we dislike it.

220. We had not even mentioned Kashmir in our statement in the general debate. I had thought that the right of reply arises out of some statements made or when you have reserved your right to reply in a previous statement. As far as I know, the Foreign Minister did not reserve any further right of reply to the statement made by the leader of my delegation on 30 September. He chose to reply for a lengthy twenty-five minute period and after that, today, he has enlivened this debate at the tag-end of the day by another similar speech. I do not know whether he was quite in order to raise this question again by way of a right of reply.

221. However, I start with his first point when he says that it is indeed an "illusory" attack, and I was more than amazed when he had the courage to question the legality of the MacMahon line.

222. Everyone knows that Pakistan seceded when British India got its independence. Both of us are, I presume at least—we certainly are—bound by the treaties entered into by the British Government as

their successor Government. If Pakistan thinks that Pakistan is not a successor Government of that type, it does not inherit any of the treaties entered into by the British Government, then Pakistan should say so. Unfortunately, however, that is not its attitude toward the Durand line which was the border in the British days of British India in the west. I would be interested, and others would be interested, if it were to say that the Durand line is no more a boundary than the MacMahon line.

223. The Foreign Minister said on the last occasion—lest I am misunderstood, I reserve my right of reply then—"that is why India wants Pakistan to vacate its illusory aggression, that is why India wants the People's Republic of China to vacate its illusory aggression" [1221st meeting, para. 258]. The whole world, both East and West, with a few exceptions like Pakistan, recognizes that the People's Republic of China committed a wanton and premeditated aggression against India. The Foreign Minister must either be singularly ignorant of facts or his concept of aggression is quite different from that of others. It is only natural that India must continue to press for the vacation of aggression. It is a strange coincidence that on the very day, 30 September 1963, when the Foreign Minister spoke, this is what appeared in The Washington Post:

"The aggressive Indians opened fire on China last year, and the whole border dispute could be simply solved if the Indians 'were willing to sit down for a round table talk'. The voice of Peking? Not at all; these are the words of Pakistan's Speaker of the Parliament, Mohammed Afzal Cheema, tossed off at an airport interview in Beirut—and, alas, they represent official policy, according to the Pakistan Embassy here.

"No doubt, using this Alice-in-Wonderland logic, the Chinese troops that occupied vast stretches of land claimed by India were only pacific tourists seeking rare specimens of botany."

224. The only reference that I need make to Kashmir is that the Foreign Minister has quoted from the speeches of my Prime Minister and the representatives of India at the Security Council to show that India had agreed to a plebiscite after conditions necessary for such a plebiscite had been created, a normal life had been restored.

225. But this is precisely what the leader of my delegation stated on that occasion as well: that we had agreed to the plebiscite arrangements under certain specific conditions. It is because Pakistan did not fulfil those conditions that the plebiscite could not take place and is no longer possible, as the situation has changed.

226. The doctrine of rebus sic stantibus applies to permanent treaties. If the Foreign Minister of Pakistan suggests that the Security Council resolutions which India accepted are treaties, I cannot, I regret to say, agree with him. They are commitments which we had entered into under certain specified conditions, and we had made it quite clear at the very time that we would not be bound by them if these conditions were not fulfilled. All this is quite different from entering into a treaty.

227. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has said that Pakistan does not want Kashmir; it wants only self-determination for Kashmir. I need only quote his own President, who said in December 1959: "Kashmir is vital for Pakistan, not only politically but militarily

as well". "... Kashmir is a matter of life and death to us". Whom are we to believe: the President of Pakistan or the Foreign Minister?

228. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has now referred to Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah as a great leader of Kashmir. He seems to have forgotten that it was this very leader of Kashmir, leader of the largest political party in Kashmir, who, along with the Ruler of Kashmir, had endorsed the accession of Kashmir to India. He continued to be the leader of the ruling party and Prime Minister of Kashmir for six years thereafter. But during that entire period the Government of Pakistan, including its successive Prime Ministers, always referred to him as a quisling. It is therefore refreshing to know that Pakistan now recognizes that he was a great leader of Kashmir.

229. But when Sheikh Abdullah made some false moves, the ruling party threw him out, and when it appeared that he had committed some offences against the laws of the land, he had to be prosecuted.

230. I do not wish to name erstwhile leaders and renowned patriots in other countries who changed their roles and suffered execution or exile, but may I remind the Foreign Minister of Pakistan that a former President of his own country was exiled in 1958 and that several Prime Ministers and Ministers of Pakistan were put under restraint. Sheikh Abdullah is receiving a fair and open trial and enjoys the right, like any other defendant, to employ whatever counsel he wishes from any part of the world. A well-known British counsel has already defended him. The matter is, however, sub judice and I cannot say more at this stage.

231. Whether political leaders or other citizens of Pakistan receive a fair trial should be no concern of ours. Since, however, the Foreign Minister has raised this question, we cannot help but express the greatest regret that the greatly revered patriot and leader, Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan, who, as a noble fighter in the struggle for the independence of India, was a source of inspiration to us all, has been rotting in a Pakistan prison without trial, if you please, almost ever since the creation of Pakistan.

232. I now come to the question of infiltration. It is regrettable that the Foreign Minister, instead of giving an explanation of the Indian and Pakistani census figures which had been quoted on the last occasion and which conclusively disprove the allegation of eviction of Indian Muslims, has gone further now and is complaining of genocide. Between 1951 and 1961 the Muslim community in India increased by 25.6 per cent, against an over-all increase of population in India of 21.5 per cent. Is that his concept of genocide? I leave it to representatives in this Assembly to decide for themselves.

233. The Foreign Minister expressed a desire for a commission of enquiry. Enquire into what? Has he even made out a prima facie case of eviction of Indian Muslims? He has not chosen even to meet the arguments that we gave. He has also chosen not to give any explanations of why the Hindu population of East Pakistan has remained virtually stationary over the decade. The natural increase in population during that period should have been about two and one-quarter million. If the Foreign Minister does not accept our explanation that these two and one quarter million Hindus have been squeezed out from East Pakistan, will he be good enough to offer some other rational explanation? Is it possible that Pakistan has discovered a most efficacious system of family planning

which the world is looking for? If so, why practise it on Hindus alone?

234. The Pakistan Foreign Minister has sought to give the impression that India is refusing a discussion of this problem of infiltration. The facts are quite the opposite and are known personally to the Foreign Minister. India was anxious to discuss with Pakistan the problem of infiltration, with a view to seeing whether a solution could be found to India's natural objection to admitting illegal immigrants from Pakistan, as well as Pakistan's valid desire to avoid administrative complications arising from the return of such Pakistani nationals. At the very beginning of the Indo-Pakistan talks on Kashmir and other related matters in Rawalpindi on 29 December 1962, the leader of the Indian delegation referred to this problem. The Pakistan delegation, of which the Foreign Minister was the leader, doggedly refused to consider any issue other than Kashmir until March 1963, when Pakistan proposed a separate ministerial meeting to deal with infiltration. India readily agreed, but found Pakistan claiming the unusual right to decide the composition of the Indian delegation to these talks. The Government of India then suggested discussion at an official level, to which Pakistan agreed during the Calcutta round of talks; but when the talks were resumed in Karachi, the Pakistan delegation showed no desire to take up such issues until the Kashmir issue was first settled. India has again proposed to Pakistan negotiations on this matter through normal channels. It is for Pakistan to respond to this proposal.

235. In this connexion, I may be permitted to quote from an article written in *The Economist* of London of 5 October 1963 by a correspondent who claims to have been lately in Pakistan:

"The sub-continental strategy of irritating India has received its latest expression on the Assam-East Pakistan frontier. India has long complained of 'infiltrators' from East Pakistan, numbering, some say, up to half a million since 1951. The exodus is probably more an index of East Pakistani misery than a cold political calculation from Rawalpindi. When the sad emigrés are returned over the frontier, Pakistan protests that India is attempting to depopulate Assam of its Muslims."

Is there a better statement than that to support what I have been saying here?

Mr. Sosa Rodríguez (Venezuela) resumed the Chair.

236. Mr. DE MIRANDA (Portugal): My delegation has not so far taken up any of the time of the Assembly, and in the exercise of our right of reply I shall try to be as brief as possible.

237. Some of the delegations who participated in the debate just concluded thought fit to pass judgement against my country in terms which do not correspond to reality. It is not the intention of my delegation to go into details, if only because we have heard those allegations in the past and have given our answer. It serves no point to reply once again to the same old charges, but since others persist in repeating them, we have no alternative but also to repeat that we reject them, as they are entirely devoid of foundation. Indeed, we are unable to understand the motivation of making charges which have already been disproved with abundant evidence provided by hundreds of impartial observers, and even by specialized agencies of the United Nations. We have thrown open our terri-

ories to all who desire to know the reality for themselves without prejudice.

238. In the seventeenth session of the General Assembly we gave proof of our goodwill and sincerity by agreeing to the proposal of the United States delegation to receive in Angola and Mozambique rapporteurs chosen by the President of the General Assembly; it was not our fault that the proposal fell through. Last July, we extended personal invitations to each of the four African States who sent their delegations to the Security Council; we invited them to visit the Portuguese territories in Africa and offered them full facilities to study the situation prevailing in those territories. Since last May we have been inviting African States, particularly those having common frontiers with us, to send qualified observers to obtain on-the-spot information. We continue to hope that these invitations, made in all sincerity, will be accepted, for we firmly believe that the truth will prevail once it is known.

239. When fashion rules that the facts about us be garbled and conclusions be drawn based on distortions, it requires exceptional moral courage to speak the truth. That is why we feel it our duty to pay a special tribute to the Foreign Minister of Spain, Don Fernando Maria Castiella, for the noble speech he delivered from this rostrum on 24 September 1963 [1213th meeting]. True to the best traditions of his great country, he did not hesitate to do my country the justice which it is being denied by others. Among these others we are particularly pained to find some who not only know us well enough but have actually inherited from us many of the virtues of which they are themselves justly proud—the virtues of a multi-racial society.

240. Nobody rejoices more than the Portuguese nation when speeches are made in this Assembly and elsewhere in praise of multiracialism. Every time this happens we are reminded that, at long last, the pattern of society which we created and pioneered is gaining recognition as the right pattern for the human society of the present and of the future. This recognition is for us a matter for legitimate pride and satisfaction, all the more so as some, who but yesterday looked down on Portugal for practising multiracialism, are now among the most vocal defenders of multiracialism. We do not wish to doubt their sincerity, but we are at a loss to understand how these new champions of multiracialism can, in the same breath, call for a reorientation of our policy, thus placing in jeopardy the multiracial society which constitutes the Portuguese nation. We fail to see how the cause of multiracialism can be promoted by efforts to destroy one of the most flourishing examples of racial peace and harmony and respect for human dignity—a reality which has been once again exuberantly demonstrated in the course of the recent three-week visit of the President of the Portuguese Republic to Angola.

241. As we do not like to think that the praise of multiracialism heard in many quarters nowadays is mere lip service, we wonder how much praise can be reconciled with encouragement of racial conflicts in Portuguese Africa. Nevertheless, this is unfortunately being done. Perhaps it is due to a lack of understanding of the true meaning of racialism. This is not surprising, given that the concept is new to many and its full connotation has not yet been grasped. But, having followed that ideal for many centuries, we Portuguese are in a position to explain that multiracialism, by

very definition, excludes and guarantees against domination or exploitation of one race by another and implies equal rights, duties and opportunities, in all fields of activity including political, that is, equal freedom for all within a true racial democracy. That is why for us Portuguese any reference to a racial majority or minority is meaningless. We neither count nor distinguish our citizens by their colour or race, but all our people, irrespective of colour or race, move together towards the same goal, led by the same ideal, each holding the position for which he is best prepared, while the opportunities of preparation are being constantly multiplied so as to enable all to take an increasingly larger share in the great task of promoting their common well-being. Thus, when others had separate electoral constituencies for white and coloured people in their territories, we did not follow their example. When others had separate service cadres, separate clubs and even separate living quarters, we made no such distinction. Those who had thus separated had to depart from the territories where they had established themselves as the ruling race. But for us the very idea of a ruling race is abhorrent. In all parts of our nation we are equal, whether it is the European Portuguese in Africa or the African Portuguese in Europe. And this is not something which we have now invented to accommodate winds of change, nor is it a static condition, as is sometimes alleged. In fact, the modern winds of change, to the extent they seek to do away with ruling races and exploited subject races and encourage multiracialism, must necessarily blow in the direction which we originated five centuries ago and which is still a dynamic reality making steady progress in all fields of activity.

242. I have deliberately restricted myself to answering our critics in general terms. I have not even named them, because we like to think that they might perhaps themselves be victims of the atmosphere which has been created in this Organization. In a big gathering like this one, impulses and inhibitions are generated which often affect independence of judgement. We are willing to give most of our critics the benefit of this interpretation of their attitudes towards us.

243. But, when the Indian delegation joins this chorus, we cannot refrain from pointing out that that delegation represents a country that has committed aggression, and is still retaining the illegal fruits of that aggression, while the populations concerned—the people of Goa, Damao and Diu—are agonizing under the yoke which the Indian Union has imposed on them by brute force. And this has been done, as the Indian representative told the Security Council on the day of the invasion, "Charter or no Charter, Council or no Council".

244. It should be recalled that it was the veto of a great Power that came to the rescue of the Indian Union against the majority opinion of the Security Council. Thus secured in its course of lawless occupation of foreign territories—I repeat, of foreign territories—the Indian Union has embarked on arbitrary measures to subjugate the helpless populations whose true voice is prevented from reaching the world outside. Nevertheless, their tragic story has been told by the foreign journalists who have visited the territories since the invasion, and by thousands of citizens of Goa, Damao and Diu, who have sought a home in Lisbon and in other parts of Portugal, even though their assets have been frozen and their property

is threatened with confiscation by the occupation Power.

245. My delegation feels that it is its bounden duty to draw the attention of this Organization to the suppressed groans of the people of Goa, Damao and Diu. Perhaps the Indian delegation will again come to this rostrum to try to throw up a smoke-screen of abusive epithets and sophistical allegations. But the issue is crystal clear. Whether one looks at it from the point of view of international laws or of morality, of the Charter or even of the General Assembly resolutions, there is no way of avoiding the fact that it is a clear-cut case of armed aggression and subjugation of populations against their will—a unilateral act of brute force which cannot be sanctioned by any standard of civilized conduct. So long as the wrong is not righted, the case of the Portuguese State of India cannot die, much less can it be killed by any collusions or lawless procedures.

246. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (translated from French): I apologize for taking the floor at this late hour and abusing the patience of the representatives gathered here, but the representative of the Israel authorities, in his desire to have the last word and to have his remarks published by all the information services owned by international Zionism in certain countries, decided to speak this evening. I do not want to allow him the satisfaction of having had the last word. He may answer me if he wishes, but I think that the lucubrations he has accumulated in his speech will not change the situation.

247. A short while ago the representative of the Israel authorities wished to answer certain Arab representatives who had spoken quite simply of the Palestine question, and he said that the Palestine question did not exist. Such an assertion is completely false and without foundation. The Palestine question does exist, and I would remind Mr. Comay that he has forgotten that one of the agenda items is entitled "Report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East". This very title proves the reality of the Palestine question. The Palestine question is, moreover, on the agenda of the Security Council. It exists in the annual report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly and in the United Nations yearbook and has not disappeared from all the publications of the Organization.

248. It therefore cannot be claimed that because Israel is a Member of the United Nations—and if the discussion were to turn to how Israel became a Member of the United Nations, there would be much to criticize, but I do not want to trouble the Members of the Assembly with that matter—this means that the Palestine question has ceased to exist. This question does exist, I repeat, and we persist in our view that there is no question of Arab-Israel or Israel-Arab relations; there is a Palestine question, and the people of Palestine are still there. They are a people who have their rights and their just claims and for whom a basic question of justice arises. Were they consulted when the Palestine question was settled? They were not. Consequently the Palestine question is not settled.

249. May I remind Mr. Comay and all the Members of the United Nations here present that the general armistice agreements which Israel signed in 1949 with four Arab countries contain an article providing that the agreements will remain in force until the peaceful settlement of the Palestine question. I repeat,

until the peaceful settlement of the Palestine question, and not until the conclusion of so-called negotiations between the Arabs and Israel.

250. Consequently, Mr. Comay, who tried to catch the representatives here present unawares in order to show them something which does not exist—Israel makes a habit of such manoeuvres which, moreover, are without foundation—claims to have good friends and to make good friends here. However, I invite all our friends who have joined us in the United Nations since 1956, as a result of the decolonization process, to ask Mr. Comay whether Israel was in favour of that process when the African and Asian States were struggling in the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly to bring it into being.

251. I can tell you that Israel was then on the other side of the fence. Israel was fighting on the side of imperialism and colonialism. Israel fought on the side of colonialism in order that the Arab countries which are here would not receive their independence. Israel never showed any desire for Tunisia and Morocco to become independent; the records of the First Committee and of the General Assembly will substantiate that.

252. Israel never fought for Algeria, although today the representative of Israel has criticized a statement made by our colleague Mr. Fawzi, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic, who said [1236th meeting] that the struggle of the Arab people of Palestine was similar to the struggle of the Algerian people. Before saying that Israel is not Algeria, Mr. Comay must come and tell us today whether his predecessor defended the cause of Algeria, either here or in the First Committee.

253. To assert, therefore, that Israel is not Palestine is to make an unfounded statement. Just as there was an Algerian people which fought for its independence, so there is a Palestine people which is fighting for its independence, for the recognition of its rights to independence and self-determination.

254. It is contrary to right and justice that, in 1948, when the United Nations drafted its famous Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, in 1960, when it drafted its famous Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, there was one people which was suffering and which still is suffering and which is forgotten by many, namely, the Arab people of Palestine. This is a people whose right to self-determination must be recognized, for if there is a right to self-determination, it must exist for the whole world.

255. Consequently, for anyone to come to this rostrum and say that the Arab countries have been guilty of sabre-rattling and have—as Mr. Comay put it—espoused a concept of arbitrament by the sword, for anyone to come and make such a statement is nothing less than an attempt to distort the facts. The Arab countries whose representatives have spoken here had no intention of doing any sabre-rattling; their intention was rather that the voice of reason, justice, equality and fairness should prevail.

256. The Palestine question cannot be settled in the way indicated by Mr. Comay. The issue before us is not, as he said, simply one of "war or peace"; it is one of "justice or injustice". If justice is desired, the first step must be to recognize the right of the Arab people to self-determination and to allow them to return home. It is false to claim that Israel is not the same as Algeria or Yemen.

257. I have no wish to detain the Assembly any longer, but I want to say that the Palestine question is a matter that concerns the Arab people of Palestine. The rights of these people must be recognized. To speak of a round-table conference and to claim, because of the easing of tension that has begun this year, particularly since the signing of the Moscow Treaty, that the Arabs are out of step is simply to fail to recognize the facts. The situation as it really exists is as follows.

258. Despite the armistice agreements which were signed simultaneously by the Arab States and Israel and which prohibit the use of force, who, we ask, has thus far used force? I can tell you frankly and sincerely that it has not been the Arabs but Israel. Who was behind imperialism in 1956, at the time of the tripartite aggression against Egypt? It was Israel. The Arabs were not guilty of attacking Israel. Who was behind all the attempts of imperialism to prevent the Arabs from realizing their lawful aspirations? I am speaking not only of the Arabs of Palestine but of all who make up the Arab nation. Israel was the one behind all that; Israel, which, as I said in my statement last Tuesday [1233rd meeting], is merely the outpost of imperialism in the Middle East.

259. Since Mr. Comay chose to speak this evening, I shall tell him that before there can be any talk of peace, there must be peace itself, and before there can be any talk of proposals for peace, there must be respect for the armistice agreements. The records of the Security Council and the General Assembly will show that Israel has always been the aggressor. Israel cannot win out by coming here and uttering words which will perhaps be reproduced in most of tomorrow morning's newspapers, whereas the words of the Arab countries are rarely reproduced, nor can Israel win out by speaking fine phrases. In the end truth will triumph.

260. Sir Senerat GUNWARDENE (Ceylon): I want to assure my very esteemed friend and colleague, the representative of Thailand, that the delegation of Ceylon had at no time a desire to attack the territorial integrity of the friendly Government of Thailand. Much less did the delegation of Ceylon desire to transfer a part of the territory of Thailand to the friendly Government of Malaysia. The inaccurate sketch has been withdrawn. I regret the inadvertent error. I have already apologized to the delegation of Thailand earlier.

261. Mr. ALAINI (Yemen): In reply to the representative of the Israel authorities, I would like to draw attention to two things. First, when we talk about an Algerian solution to the Palestinian question we mean precisely that the people of Palestine themselves will continue their struggle to regain their country and their rights, of course with the help of the United Nations and all freedom-loving peoples in the world, including naturally, their brothers, the Arabs.

262. We do not know what is strange in that. The Arab States have no relations whatsoever with the Zionist authorities, so such alleged problems do not arise at all between us and them. The whole question is therefore the question of the Palestinian people and their country. That is why we consider that there is a Palestinian question to be dealt with in the Assembly so long as the people of Palestine have not regained their rights and their homes.

263. Secondly, as to his reference to my country, I merely want to say to the representative of the

Zionist authorities that the foreign occupiers and intruders are the Zionists in Palestine. The sons of the United Arab Republic in Yemen are in their land and among their brothers. Even though the representative of the Zionist authorities insists that they are aliens, I would like to say once more that they have come to Yemen in accord with a mutual agreement between the two Governments, to face threats and dangers from foreigners.

264. Mr. BHUTTO (Pakistan): It is rather astonishing that the representative of the Government of India should question the right of the delegation of Pakistan to exercise its right of reply. The representative of India opened his statement by saying that the Pakistan delegation did not have this inherent right which is recognized in the Charter, in the rules of procedure and in the practices of the United Nations. This is the inherent right of every Member, and it is a duty which every country owes to its people.

265. In my general policy statement of 30 September 1963 [1220th meeting] my references to the fundamental dispute and to the question of the deportation of Muslims from the States of Assam and Tripura were brief and, objectively speaking, unprovocative. Kashmir is a matter of fundamental importance to Pakistan. It is the great divider between India and Pakistan. Therefore it was my duty to make reference to that dispute, if disputes are to be settled between States in a peaceful manner and in accordance with the norms of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. It was the leader of the Indian delegation that chose to enter into a battle of words, into polemics, and made various references to Kashmir and to other matters and also touched upon questions which are entirely within the domestic jurisdiction of Pakistan. Therefore it was again my duty to my country and my duty to this body and to the world at large to place the facts on record. The representative of India this afternoon has questioned my right to do so. Herein lies the attitude of the Government of India on disputes and matters that concern it. When it comes to the disputes of other States, India always takes the role of a preacher and admonishes countries that have disputes and tells them how to settle their disputes; but when a dispute affects India it refuses the right to a country that is also a party to the dispute even to mention the dispute or to exercise the right of reply. This is the attitude which unfortunately persists and it does not permit a settlement on the basis of negotiation, on the basis of understanding and on the basis of mutual accommodation.

266. So great is India's tradition of interfering in the affairs of other countries that this evening the representative of India said that the Hindu population of Pakistan should have increased by two-and-one-quarter per cent and the fact that this population had not increased by two-and-one-quarter per cent was something equally surprising. The Indian Government would now like to tell other States how their population should increase within a given period of time and it wants to interfere in the exercise of the conjugal rights of citizens of another country. I think this shows the Indian Government's attitude of interference in such fundamental issues as are entirely within the domestic jurisdiction of another country. We have 10 million Hindus living in East Pakistan and about a million or so living in West Pakistan. Now we have heard the Government of India tell us that that population is not large enough and should increase by two-and-one-quarter per cent. In acquiescence to the

demand of the representative of India, I shall convey it to my authorities and we shall try to oblige India in this and any other way in order to bring about mutual accommodation based on a common understanding between States.

267. The representatives of India today and on 30 September 1963 made references also to the system of government that exists in Pakistan and contrasted it with the system of government in India. The representative of India referred to India as a democracy and said that in Pakistan democracy does not exist and that, because democracy does not exist in Pakistan, the people of Kashmir should have no right to self-determination. This is weird logic, which we cannot understand. As far as democracy in India is concerned, I am not going to go into that matter in detail, for it is not my concern what form or system of government exists in India. Nor am I going to quote any of the Indian leaders on whether or not democracy exists in India or on whether there is only inform a democracy and in substance a dictatorship there. I will not refer to the patina of evidence in that respect. I will only mention what the President of the Republic of India said on 1 October 1963, as was reported in The New York Times. The President of the Republic of India, that great philosopher, said:

"What we have in India today is not real democracy but only a phoney democracy. If we were real democrats—which, I may say, we are not—there would not be so much discontent and ill-will".

That statement was made by the Head of State of India only a few days ago on the brand of democracy that exists in India.

268. Then we are told that I protested from this rostrum against the incarceration of that great Kashmiri leader, Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah. To justify the imprisonment of Sheikh Abdullah the representative of India said that at one stage or other Pakistan called Sheikh Abdullah a quisling. The question here is not what Pakistan at one stage or other called Sheikh Abdullah. Is Sheikh Abdullah in prison because we called him a quisling? This is a very interesting situation. Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah, the great leader of the people of Kashmir, has been rotting in gaol for the past ten years. It is true that he is having a trial—a trial after a fashion. Here, again, the Indians excel in maintaining the forms of democracy but having in substance a dictatorship and arbitrary authority. Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah is undergoing trial, we are told—a trial that has been going on for ten years. So far, out of 3,000 witnesses, only 30 witnesses have been examined. It must be a complicated trial, and obviously it will take time for the proceedings to end, but when the proceedings will end is something that neither you nor I can contemplate, for the patience of the Indian people is well known in history. This trial will go on indefinitely. Sheikh Abdullah will receive justice, because so far 30 witnesses have given evidence in a trial where 3,000 witnesses are involved.

269. I refer to this unjust incarceration of Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah, not because we wish to interfere in the internal affairs of India; I refer to it because Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah is not an Indian citizen. His nationality has yet to be determined. Therefore I have a right to refer to the imprisonment of Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah. However, the Indian representative, again with a logic which the Indians can best understand, has referred, by way of defence or by way of an answer, to the imprisonment of a Pakistani

national, Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan. As the latter is a Pakistani national, this is a matter which is entirely within the domestic jurisdiction of Pakistan, and India has no right to make reference to his imprisonment. Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan's brother was a Chief Minister of our province recently—right up to 1955. But he himself was against the establishment of Pakistan. At any rate India has no right to refer to the imprisonment of a man who is not a national of the Indian Government and who does not come from a disputed territory.

270. Again distortion reached its climax and apogee when we were told a few moments ago that I said that we had held the MacMahon line in dispute. One can imagine the justice and the fairness with which India analyses a situation, because I had hardly left the rostrum when this utter distortion took place. I did not say anything of the kind, I said that the Indian Government claims the MacMahon line to be the dividing line between India and China and that this is denied by the People's Republic of China. I said that the dispute arose because the Government of India recognizes it as the legal dividing line between India and China and the People's Republic of China does not recognize it. How did I establish in any way that Pakistan has pronounced its opinion on the MacMahon line?

271. We were told that India made no reference whatsoever to Kashmir, and as India had made no reference to Kashmir, then it was our bounden duty also to make no reference to Kashmir. It is very convenient for India not to make reference to Kashmir. It is obvious why India would not like to make any reference to Kashmir. It is because India has grabbed Kashmir, because India has been holding Kashmir in bondage and because India does not want the world to know the facts about Kashmir, India wants no light to be thrown on this ugly problem, whereas it is our duty, a duty that we owe to our people and to the people of Kashmir, to mention the Kashmir problem.

272. If the people of Kashmir had exercised their right to self-determination and if the matter had been settled, I too would have made no reference to Kashmir. So India has not shown any magnanimity in not making reference to Kashmir.

273. And then we are told that, instead of responding to a gesture, we have talked about it and have entered into a dialogue on the subject. But here again today another very invidious accusation was made against Pakistan.

274. The representative of India has accused Pakistan of unprincipled behaviour, of making friends with erstwhile enemies and of seeking strange alliances for collusion and aggression, and has said that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, representing his country, has no right to exercise his right of reply.

275. Now I ask you, Mr. President, if this is to be the conduct of India, if these are the edicts with which the world has to comply, then I am afraid that justice will never truly be achieved.

276. Other important implications are also involved here. It must not be forgotten that the Sino-Indian conflict took place on the Ladakh front, Ladakh is a part of Kashmir. There are three subdivisions of Ladakh: Skardu, Kargil and Ladakh—and fighting took place in Ladakh. Ladakh is a part of Kashmir and Kashmir is a territory held in dispute. With all the implications in these sinister charges, we are none

the less told by the representative of India that we have no right to exercise our right of reply.

277. It is not only a question of the exercise of their inherent right of self-determination by the people of Kashmir to which India is a party and has pledged its word. The tragedy has become all the more poignant because these poor Kashmiris, who have nothing whatsoever to do with the disputes of the giants that are involved in a clash of today, became the battlefield of India's clash with China. If the poor people of Kashmir had been allowed to exercise their right of self-determination and if they had determined their destiny by now, they would not be involved in that clash which does not really concern them today, because the Kashmiris are not truly a part of India. They have been made into guinea pigs, because India is waging its war with the Chinese in Ladakh, which is a part of Kashmir. These peaceful people, who have always known peace and tranquillity in their land, have today become the pawns of a conflict which does not concern them in any way. If they had exercised their right of self-determination and had chosen to be a part of Pakistan, they would have lived as peacefully in Pakistan as the rest of the people of Pakistan.

278. So this adds painfully to the tragedy that is taking place. In this clash of two great giants, this beautiful vale of Kashmir has been unnecessarily involved.

279. We have also been told that the doctrine of rebus sic stantibus applies to treaties but not to commitments. Now a treaty is also a commitment. It is the commitment of a State. We are told that the resolutions of the United Nations can be flouted, that the resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly can be flouted because there is a difference between a treaty and a commitment. This shows grotesque and flagrant contempt for the Charter of the United Nations. It was recently said that Charter or no Charter, when India embarks on its aggression, then whether there is international law or not, it is nobody's concern. The world must take what India wants, and there is no international law in that event. It is a terrifying statement to say that rebus sic stantibus means you can break your word in the United Nations with respect to resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, but that perhaps you cannot break your word with respect to treaties.

280. So today we have been told that as far as the United Nations is concerned, whether it is the General Assembly or the Security Council upon which rests the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, commitments made by States do not have to be honoured. How then are we to proceed if the United Nations is no longer a forum for adjudication and settlement of disputes? Commitments are made in the United Nations and confirmed and reiterated by the Prime Minister of a country, and a few years later we are told that these commitments were not honourable commitments and are therefore not pledges which have to be honoured.

281. This places the world in a great state of confusion. This shows an utter lack of respect for the United Nations. This shows that all our efforts to build a better peace through the role of the United Nations are null and void. This is a matter which causes us grave concern.

282. It has also been said that Pakistan has not implemented the resolutions of the United Nations.

Here we have time and again said that a third party should determine who has and who has not implemented the resolutions. We are still anxious to settle this unfortunate dispute through the United Nations, or through any other acceptable principle of international law. Is this an unreasonable stand? If we are charged by India with not complying with the resolutions, we say: let the United Nations or let an impartial international body determine whether or not we have complied with the resolutions. It is India that does not comply with the resolutions and then charges Pakistan with not complying with the resolutions. Why should we not want to comply with the resolutions? We want to see an end to this problem, because we want to live in peace with them. We are a small country and India is a large country which has ambitions from the Hindu Kush to the Mekong River. We would not like to have a dispute with them. But justice must be done in order to live in peace with them, and peace can only come through respect for international law and adherence to international obligations and commitments, and not by the dictates of a great Power against a small Power. The world would be menaced if the great Powers or the semi-great Powers were to dictate to the small Powers. We resent the dictation of the great Powers—all of us resent it—and why should Pakistan be an exception in this case? We do not accept that India should determine whether or not we have complied with the resolutions—let the United Nations decide or let an impartial third party decide whether or not Pakistan has complied with them.

283. Again I make this offer here: let us break the impasse. It is not beyond the scope of ingenuity or the efforts of men to find an honourable and equitable solution of this problem. We were told, as far as Tripura is concerned, that an exodus is taking place there, that Pakistan has been avoiding a settlement of the problem, and that at the bilateral negotiations on behalf of Pakistan, conducted by me over there, we refused to accept a settlement of this issue. This also, with due respect, I would say is not the correct position. At those bilateral negotiations we submitted that efforts should be made first to settle Kashmir and then the other issues, because the Kashmir dispute is the root of all evil and if that problem were settled, then all these symptoms would almost automatically subside. This is not an unreasonable submission. But when we found that the intransigence was as complete as it had been in the past we said: since we cannot make progress on this matter, let us take up the other question and discuss it at a ministerial level. Again the Government of India refused to have it at the ministerial level. If it is left to the officials, we know what happens; the question drags on ad infinitum.

284. On 30 September 1963 I said that Pakistan was willing to accept the adjudication of the United Nations or of an international commission, a commission composed of Commonwealth countries or any other third party acceptable to both India and Pakistan. On behalf of my Government, I again renew that offer, that the question of Tripura can be settled in this fashion because this is the only proper and correct way. We are disappointed and grieved that all our efforts to bring about a settlement with our great neighbour have so far been rebuffed by India.

285. We have accepted every single proposal that has been made so far for the settlement of the problem of Kashmir and the other questions. But India does not seek to settle them because India wants to continue its hold and its oppression of Kashmir.

286. We are told of collusion with China. What collusion? When India was in conflict with China and had to engage the bulk of its armed forces for the first time on the Chinese front, Pakistan did nothing at all, did not lift a finger, did not move a single soldier, did not fire a single bullet. And yet we are told of collusion with China against India. If these gestures of goodwill and neighbourliness are to be flouted and not appreciated, where can Pakistan go? What alternative have we got?

287. Pakistan has stood for the peaceful settlement of all disputes. We have seen former colonies become independent. In our own small way we have contributed to the efforts to decolonize them. For Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria it was Pakistan that made every effort to see that there should be justice and decolonization. In the case of Algeria, Pakistan offered recognition at a time when India had not. And the reasons in India's case were obvious—because of the Kashmir dispute in the Security Council where France is a permanent member. France, of course, has always supported the right of self-determination, and for this we are grateful, and we are grateful that that great country and its leader did not change that stand when we accorded recognition to Algeria, even risking perhaps a turn of events. But India did not accord recognition to Algeria because India thought that such a move might have some repercussions in the Security Council.

288. Pakistan has tried in every way to enhance international peace and security. We have welcomed all countries which have come here and become Members of the United Nations through the exercise of the right of self-determination. How can we not be concerned with the right of self-determination?

289. The people of Kashmir are our flesh and blood and therefore we will struggle for this right, and this right is bound to be achieved because it is a right which cannot be denied to the people of Kashmir. Some voices may be silent today on this issue but we know that international opinion will spread concerning this matter and that it will become the concern of the world because it is a grave issue which divides two neighbours and holds the people of Kashmir in bondage.

290. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India): The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has only been repeating what he has already said, and when the verbatim record is produced tomorrow he will probably see that for himself. He has not given any reply to the specific questions presented in our statement, presumably because he has none to offer.

291. I do not wish to continue further in this pointless debate.

292. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan): I apologize for having asked to speak at this late hour, but I assure you, Mr. President, and all Members of the General Assembly that I shall be extremely brief in my remarks. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan, in his statement quite rightly said that sometimes it becomes the duty of everyone to make certain statements, they owe it to their people to do so. And it is that duty which has brought me to this rostrum.

293. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan, in his reference to Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan, made a statement to the effect that he did not come from a disputed territory. I prefer to seek an explanation of this statement and also to give myself further time to consider it, and I shall seek this explanation in a

friendly way from the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. If I receive a satisfactory explanation, I shall not bother the Assembly with a right of reply, but if the explanation is not satisfactory, I reserve the right of my delegation to reply at a later stage.

294. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): There remain two delegations that wish to exercise their right of reply, the delegation of Iraq and the delegation of the United Arab Republic. In view of the

lateness of the hour, they have agreed to speak at the plenary meeting to be held at 10.30 a.m. on Monday, and they will be the first two representatives to be heard at that time. After that we shall turn immediately to the discussion of item 83 and then item 75. Both these items had been scheduled for this afternoon's meeting and could not be discussed. The agenda for Monday morning's meeting will also include item 80.

The meeting rose at 8.20 p.m.