

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

Tuesday, 13 December 1960,  
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 87:</i>	
<i>Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (continued) . . .</i>	1231

**President:** Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Hasan (Pakistan), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

## AGENDA ITEM 87

## Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker on my list this morning is the representative of Portugal, in exercise of the right of reply.

2. Mr. GARIN (Portugal): Using the most insulting language, the baseness of which I can only guess at from the English translation, the Soviet representative, at the 939th meeting, unrestrainedly insulted Portugal and the Portuguese people from this rostrum. Pursuing his Government's well-known policy of injecting falsehoods and distortions into any issue, the Soviet representative embarked the other day on a rampant and vicious attack against many countries. My own country was included, and the Soviet representative unleashed against us unprovoked, unjustified, unwarranted, gratuitous and thoroughly malevolent accusations. This abuse by the Soviet delegation of a self-respecting Member of this Organization cannot go unanswered.

3. The Soviet representative began his false allegations by asserting that in the Portuguese Overseas Provinces are found " . . . American banks and companies like Standard Oil, the Chase National Bank, the National City Bank of New York and the Gulf Oil Corporation, which control most of the Portuguese diamond, petroleum, rubber and other companies" [939th meeting, para. 58]. None of these allegations is true. Neither the National City Bank nor the Standard Oil Company nor the Chase National Bank controls anything in Portuguese territory, nor have they in any territory even an agency. All those who know the Portuguese economy and who are acting in good faith are very much aware that there is no American control, nor any foreign control for that matter, over any Portuguese enterprises or companies, and that any American interests, as they may exist, are negligible. Besides, in accordance with Portuguese law, the administration of any company or enterprise, even though it may have some foreign capital, must always remain in Portuguese hands; and under the provisions of the current Portuguese legislation,

foreign capital is not allowed to hold more than 40 per cent of the total social capital. Therefore, we have here a plain falsehood and a plain distortion of the true facts.

4. The Soviet representative also placed before the Assembly the question whether or not it was a fact that in Portuguese territory " . . . a brutal system of racial discrimination and of forced slave labour exists . . ." [ibid., para. 59]. No, it is not a fact. It is merely another falsehood, and we firmly and strongly repudiate it. I am not going to burden the Assembly with details, but I must say that there is absolute freedom of labour and absolute freedom of choice of employment. Furthermore, my Government has ratified the Convention concerning Forced or Compulsory Labour of 1930<sup>1/</sup> and the Convention concerning the Abolition of Forced labour of 1957<sup>2/</sup> of the International Labour Organisation. Also, the Portuguese Constitution and the labour laws explicitly prohibit forced labour, or any other form of compulsory labour, which is considered by us as a crime. Anyone wishing to do so can consult our laws.

5. As for the allegation concerning racial discrimination, no imagination, no matter how fertile, could conceive of any more unjust and unfounded accusation, nor of any accusation which could have hurt us more deeply had it come from a responsible source. Let me quote a responsible source, the renowned historian Arnold Toynbee, who in an article published in The New York Times magazine section of 7 August 1960 wrote:

"There are large and important sections of the human race in which race prejudice is conspicuous by its absence: I am thinking particularly of the Moslems and of the Spanish-speaking and Portuguese-speaking peoples."

And again, the same historian wrote in the same article:

"Anyway, the freedom of the Spanish- and of the Portuguese-speaking peoples from race feeling is an unquestionable fact, whatever its historic origins may be."

6. I could quote many other independent and responsible authorities, but I doubt that the Soviet representative would be much interested in independent and responsible sources.

7. Here is another accusation by the Soviet delegation:

"Neither in the Fourth Committee nor in the plenary General Assembly has the Portuguese representative even attempted to deny that in the Portuguese colonies all the inhabitants are classified as

<sup>1/</sup> International Labour Conference, Conventions and Recommendations, 1919-1949 (Geneva, International Labour Office, 1949), Convention No. 29.

<sup>2/</sup> International Labour Office, Official Bulletin, vol. XL (1957), No. 1, Convention No. 105.

'civilized' (assimilated) or 'uncivilized'." [939th meeting, para. 59.]

The Portuguese delegation has done more than try to deny; we have strongly denied it, and, what is more, the Portuguese delegation has explained in detail that such accusations have no foundation whatever in Portuguese law or practice. The indisputable fact is that the distinction between "civilized" and "uncivilized" is unknown to Portuguese law and if others, like the Soviet delegation, have framed such an invention for reasons of propaganda and political expediency, the fault is not ours and we reject any such blame.

8. For those who may be interested in more details, I would refer them to the debates in the Fourth Committee on this question in which this point was fully explained beyond doubt.

9. Then the Soviet delegation has stated that in one Portuguese territory there has been carried on "a veritable policy of bloody intimidation" and "mass murders" [*ibid.*, para. 61]. Those were the actual words. This is a most outrageous accusation and, unless the Soviet delegation is accustomed to taking such things lightly, it seems to my delegation inconceivable that any responsible member of this Assembly should make such preposterous statements without substantiation and without the vaguest proof.

10. I strongly protest against these outrageous accusations made by the Soviet delegation. There is still another falsehood. The Soviet representative said that the inhabitants of our overseas territories "have no representation in any single administrative organ or in the metropolitan legislative organs" [*ibid.*, para. 59]. It is not true; they have such representation. The Soviet representative said that the population "may be arbitrarily expelled from lands which have been theirs from time immemorial" [*ibid.*]. It is not true; they cannot.

11. Shall I go on? I do not wish to try the patience of the Assembly. I submit that it would be a divine miracle if the Soviet Government which, by ruthless and violent means, has consistently denied freedom, and whose record of oppression is second to none, were truly interested in what it calls the freedom of colonial peoples. Actually, we are left with the same old story of Soviet manoeuvres in this Assembly. They will use anything—that is, anything but the truth—or anyone, to plant the seeds of hatred and chaos on earth so that the ground will be ripe for communist conquest and exploitation, through penetration in Africa and elsewhere in the world, so as to carry out the "prophecy of the great Lenin" to which the Soviet representative referred at the same meeting [*ibid.*, para. 65].

12. These matters of the subjugation of peoples and territories, physical and moral slavery complete with political repression, deportations of people en masse, forced immigration, absolute lack of political and intellectual freedom, constant threats against other nations and peoples, exploitation of the weak, of which the Soviet representative spoke at length in his slanderous speech, are well known characteristics of the new type of colonialism which the world is facing: Soviet colonialism. It is tragically ironical that the Soviet representative carried his effrontery to the point of accusing the Portuguese nation of murderous activities. And who is making this accusation? It is the representative of the Soviet empire, if you please.

13. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Argentina to exercise his right of reply.

14. Mr. AMADEO (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): In his speech made on 7 December [939th meeting] the representative of the Soviet Union referred to the attitude adopted by the Argentine delegation in this debate.

15. The Soviet representative has blatantly distorted the views expressed by Argentina by asserting that, inasmuch as my speech showed, as he puts it, that we were opposed to the artificial acceleration of the decolonization process, it was encouraging the colonial Powers to refuse independence to their colonies.

16. The position of the Argentine delegation regarding the liquidation of the colonial system has been so clearly expounded that it does not need to be explained. In my speech I said:

"The important thing to note is that whatever judgement may be passed on the system now or by future historians, colonialism no longer fits into the political structure of our time. . . . It does not matter now what explanation or justification those systems may have had in the past. What is important is that in our day and age we should refuse to allow them to continue." [927th meeting, para. 17.]

17. This point of view is sufficiently clear-cut to require no clarification. The fact that we believe that the transfer of power to the new States must be effected as far as possible peacefully and in accord with the former metropolitan Powers and within the time-limits that are most convenient to the liberated countries, does not in any way mean that we modify the statement of principle affirming our opposition to the existence of the colonial system.

18. Accordingly, our vote in favour of the African-Asian draft resolution [A/L.323 and Add.1-6] is based on the conviction that the immediate steps referred to in paragraph 5 of the declaration imply the creation without delay of the conditions requisite for independence. We do not believe, on the other hand, that they presuppose an obligation to transform the existing juridical system.

19. It seems to us that the countries most directly interested in these problems have adopted a much more realistic attitude and one, undoubtedly, that will prove more advantageous to the non-self-governing peoples than those countries which have made a propaganda slogan out of the colonial problem.

20. As far as our attitude is concerned, we will allow no one to interpret it in a sense that is contrary to the letter and the spirit of our own words. We can accept criticism of the views we express but we reject interpretations which, whether from fair or from unfair motives, seek to change them.

21. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Spain to exercise his right of reply.

22. Mr. DE LEQUERICA (Spain) (translated from Spanish): At the meeting on Wednesday last, 7 December [939th meeting], the representative of the Soviet Union made a speech which was heard by several members of the Spanish delegation, including myself personally, in its Spanish interpretation. We found not the slightest mention in it of the Canary Islands. Neither is any reference made in the Spanish text of the Soviet speech as it appeared in the pro-

visional verbatim record to this province of Spain. But, on studying the English and French texts, we find a list which the Soviet representative gave of the various territories, some of them Spanish, which are customarily quoted in such cases, which could serve as bases for colonialism in countries other than the metropolitan countries, and we find cited in this list the Canary Islands.

23. I do not desire to offend the intelligence of fellow representatives, for you are all well aware of the fact that the Canaries are a very ancient Spanish province, an older member of the Spanish national community than some of the provinces in the European peninsula. Christopher Columbus stopped at the Canaries when he was sailing to America and the Canaries were a real centre for spreading the creative work of Spain in the Western hemisphere. In America, during the centuries when it was united with the Spanish crown, people talked constantly of "peninsular Spaniards" and "Canarian Spaniards". Many Americans of Central and South America come from the Canaries, speak our language and belong to our race. The greatest Spanish novelist of the nineteenth century, Galdós, came from the Canaries. It is, therefore, a historical monstrosity, unworthy of the culture of the Soviet delegation, to say what was stated by its spokesman. It is to manifest ignorance of something that any schoolboy with a slight knowledge of European geography knows.

24. A Minister of the Spanish Government, Mr. Carrero Blanco, gave a good definition of the historical and geographical character of Spain when he said that the Spanish nation is, geographically, a peninsula that has a tenuous link with the European continent and various islands and territories in the Atlantic and Mediterranean that are Spanish land. The peninsula, the Minister went on, has a great resemblance to an island. The sole bond of union of our nation is the sea, and he concluded by saying that we are an immense archipelago.

25. But, above all, the Soviet Union representative's statement implies an attack on Spain's sovereignty and integrity, which are guaranteed by the Charter of the United Nations, and against this we enter a most energetic protest and we deeply regret that such an act of aggression should have occurred in these discussions.

26. When the United Kingdom representative referred [925th meeting] to mass deportations of whole populations of the Soviet Union and to the suppression of nationality which accompanied those deportations, pointing out that this had happened to the Crimean Tartars, the Kalmucks and other smaller communities, the representative of the Soviet Union violently protested and, bursting with indignation, came to this platform to declare that it was a violation of the principles generally recognized as governing the proceedings of this Assembly. And he requested the President to protect the Soviet delegation and the delegations of other States against such an attempt to interfere in the domestic affairs of a country. I take the opportunity of making the same appeal in this case and, following the precedent thus established, I appeal to you, in the spirit and the letter of our Charter, to take cognizance of this unspeakable attack made by the delegation of the Soviet Union, which obviously has no respect for the law nor for the text, that we all know so well, of the Charter. The

Soviet Union has two quite different methods of approach to a problem; whenever any reference is made to the notorious Soviet imperialism or colonialism, it immediately voices a loud protest but, at the same time, it does not hesitate, as the whole history of the Soviet régime shows, to intervene in the domestic affairs of other countries and to attack the territorial integrity of my country, as it did last Wednesday.

27. As we are only very indirectly affected by colonial problems, we can speak on the subject in an impartial and disinterested fashion. I take advantage of this occasion—though I had not intended to intervene in this discussion—to pay tribute to the honest way in which the African and Asian countries, in spite of the major interest they have in the problem, have avoided making the same mistake in this discussion as the Soviet delegation and have maintained the debate on colonialism on the appropriate intellectual and political level, without resorting to the acrobatic tricks of those who seek not to achieve the progress of mankind but to find pretexts for confusing the issue.

28. As I have this opportunity here, I cannot refrain from mentioning that the peoples of Central and Southern America have given recognition in moving terms—and these are gratefully acknowledged—and on a high intellectual and critical level to the past history of Spain and have maintained their links with the old European peninsula and its Canary Islands, Balearic Islands and other island provinces.

29. Before concluding, I must say that God forbid I should follow the bad example set by the Soviet Union, as that would only mean interrupting the very important discussions that have been begun and which, as I have already said, concern the social advancement of the whole world. Were I to be tempted, however—which God forbid—merely to read an article in The New York Times of 24 September 1960, we would find subject matter to talk about Soviet colonialism for many more meetings. This article enumerates all the countries which have been "colonized" by violence by Soviet Russia, and I have no desire to mention the nations that figure among us here as independent nations since we have very definite scruples on this point. There was a discussion in this Assembly on the question of Tibet and, as we were not sure that Tibet was independent of Chinese suzerainty, we abstained from voting out of respect for the Charter, although the aggression committed there was obvious. In the article in The New York Times, as I was saying, you will find listed, among the countries colonized by the Soviet Union, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Kirgizia, Tadzhikistan, Kazakstan, Tartu and the Yakut and Buriat territories. What a long time we could spend discussing each and every one of these problems and submitting proposals designed to alleviate the lot of those peoples. But, I repeat, it would never occur to us to do so.

30. And without going such a distance or delving into all the complications of human geography, we could, with reference to Sir Leslie Munro's report,<sup>3/</sup> cite the case of the Hungarians. And we could, by merely taking a glance at the map, mention Eastern Germany. But we prefer for the moment not to trouble this

<sup>3/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 74, document A/4304.

meeting with such superfluous references which do little honour to those who make them and would carry no more serious weight than would be implicit in, say, a request by us to free Odessa or Leningrad from Soviet colonialism.

31. Mr. RAKOTOMALALA (Madagascar) (translated from French): The speakers who have preceded me at this rostrum have defined in very lofty intellectual phrases the object and purposes of the discussion which is now proceeding in the United Nations General Assembly and is being attentively followed by the whole world. The peoples who are longing for their emancipation are turning hopefully towards us and are expecting that speedy and positive solutions will emerge from our proceedings.

32. I shall now deal briefly with the substance of the problem.

33. With the advent of the eighteenth century and the French Revolution, despotic régimes disappeared and the rights of man were affirmed.

34. Slavery was abolished in the nineteenth century.

35. The twentieth century should see the triumph of equality as between all peoples. In the first half of this century human folly led men to kill their fellow-men in two terrible wars. Now, in the second half of the century, the peoples, having reached the age of reason, will no longer, so we hope, seek to subjugate one another.

36. The hearts of all who yearned for independence were filled with immense joy when, fifteen years ago, the Charter of the United Nations drafted at San Francisco solemnly declared that the Powers which had control over non-self-governing peoples had the obligation to lead them towards self-government and democratic management of their own affairs. A fresh chapter was thus opened up in the book of the life of nations and we have the privilege now of writing the last pages which will prepare for the closing of this chapter.

37. The draft resolution of which Madagascar is a sponsor [A/L.323 and Add.1-6] is designed to give a firm reminder to the Powers who still administer Non-Self-Governing Territories that it is high time that the provisions of the Charter be implemented all over the world and that the United Nations resolutely follow the policy which is laid down in the Charter and which should end in the abolition of colonialism.

38. My country has regained its international sovereignty after a break of sixty-four years. Determined as it is to safeguard this priceless gift of independence, it has entered the big family of the United Nations firmly resolved to contribute unreservedly to the maintenance of peace and the territorial integrity of States, but also, and above all, to pursue the lofty ideal of fraternity and equality which is the very foundation of the United Nations.

39. My delegation sincerely hopes that the draft resolution which it submits to you jointly with all the other African and Asian States will be adopted unanimously or, at any rate, by such a large majority that it will have to be regarded as manifesting the determination of the peoples of the world not to accept any further useless and endless delays. It is convinced that the Powers who are still administering Non-Self-Governing Territories will loyally bow to this will and will immediately take steps to enable

the populations concerned to express their feelings freely. It considers that it is the duty of these Powers, in any case, to prepare all the peoples for democratic self-government. Preparations must forthwith be made by stages to ensure that changes of status are made in orderly fashion, to see that the essential organs of modern administration are installed as soon as possible and that fully qualified nationals get immediately accustomed to the exercise of authority.

40. It is only by following this peaceful procedure, which Madagascar itself was fortunate to experience when France granted her internal autonomy in 1957 and independence in 1960, that the struggles and disorders can be avoided which bring suffering on the populations and leave germs of hatred and xenophobia behind in peoples' hearts.

41. My delegation makes a very broad-based appeal, therefore, to the consciences of the administering Powers and begs them to comply not only with the letter but also with the spirit of our draft resolution.

42. My delegation also trusts that the peoples who will be called upon to choose their future lot will fully realize the obligations they will have to assume on gaining their freedom. As they evoke and strengthen their national feelings and their patriotism, let them also try to ensure that their accession to international sovereignty is not accompanied by disorder, for the accession to such sovereignty should not be motivated by hatred but should form an important contribution to friendship and concord between men and nations.

43. It is with this prospect in mind that the Malagasy delegation, having given its support to the forty-three-Power draft resolution, will refuse to accept any amendment which would alter its meaning or scope, and will support it fervently, realizing that in so doing it is helping to promote the ideal of justice and peace throughout the world.

44. Mr. WACHUKU (Nigeria): I thank the President for giving me the opportunity to make a short statement with regard to the subject under consideration, that is, the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

45. First of all, I want to express the gratitude of my delegation to the delegation of the Soviet Union, which took the initiative in having this subject placed on the agenda of the plenary meetings of the General Assembly. I also want to express my thanks to the delegations of the United Kingdom, the United States and all those non-African countries who are not bound by the force of circumstances as intimately with this subject as we are, but have expressed their support for the drive against this nefarious practice which holds mainly Africa in thralldom.

46. I speak as one who is more closely concerned with the subject. The main colonial area of the world today is Africa. Therefore when one discusses colonialism, it is of greater concern to African States than to any other States. Indeed, other countries can abstain; they can walk away. They can say, "Well, it does not concern us." And they would be quite entitled to do so. But no African State can do likewise. For my delegation and for Nigeria the total liberation of African territory from foreign domination and imperialism is of primary concern. Indeed, that is one of the pillars and canons of our future policies. He who is not with us in this matter must be considered to be against us.

47. As I have said before, along with colonialism there is also the question of the humiliation of peoples of African descent throughout the world; in other words, racial discrimination against people of African descent.

48. As far as Nigeria is concerned, the time has come when this subject will no longer be considered an internal affair of any State but indeed as something quite intimately connected with our foreign policy. Anybody who is not prepared to eradicate the humiliation that has been meted out to people of African descent or people of our racial stock cannot claim to love us.

49. Colonialism and imperialism go hand in hand, and for Nigeria independence is not an end in itself but a means to an end: Nigeria is prepared to be the guinea pig, the sacrificial lamb, for the purpose of the total liberation of the African continent. There are so many millions of our people of Africa today who are under foreign domination. Therefore, when you see the name of Nigeria as one of the sponsors of the draft resolution submitted by the African-Asian group [A/L.323 and Add.1-6] you can appreciate why we whole-heartedly support this resolution.

50. Africa was broken up by European Powers at the Conference of Berlin in 1884-1885. At that time, no African was there; no representative of Africa was there. Those who were present sat down and used a carving knife and divided up the whole continent, each taking its own share, as though it were a Christmas turkey.

51. But now Africa is coming back into its own, and it is only right that we who constitute the largest single country in Africa, the most populous country in Africa and one that is not badly off as far as resources are concerned, should, in the very early stages of our independence, make our position in this matter very, very clear. There should be no doubt where Nigeria stands in this matter.

52. I take this opportunity once more, as I have done before, to address certain colonial Powers which still believe in certain strange ideologies. I must mention Portugal categorically. I want to tell Portugal not to deceive itself any longer when it tells us here that Angola, Mozambique and other African territories are part and parcel of Portugal's metropolitan territory. That is nonsense. Nigeria will never accept that fictitious doctrine. Portugal, all along, has been behaving as if it is not aware of the changes that are taking place in the world today. We do not hate it, but we love our Africans more. And I am taking this opportunity to serve notice upon Portugal that, while Nigeria does not hate Portugal, Nigeria can never agree with Portugal on an issue which means that the people of Africa in Angola will be held in thralldom and that no attempt will be made to give them an opportunity to live life more abundantly.

53. Portugal should learn a lesson from what is happening in the Congo. It is because Leopold II regarded the Congo as his private estate and, when the Belgians took it over, regarded it as a farm and trained people only as farmhands to produce wealth for the Belgian State, that, when the time came for nationalism to take its turn, Belgium was not up to dealing with the problem that was raised. And what have we on our hands now as far as the Congo is concerned? Chaos.

54. It is because we want to avoid a repetition of this type of anarchy and chaos elsewhere on the continent of Africa that we come here today to speak on this subject. Those who have ears to hear should hear—but those who have none, or those who have ears and are prepared to block them, should not be surprised when history repeats itself.

55. Since we came to this Assembly, we have read all sorts of things. In fact, there was a circular letter that we received at one time from a strange organization in this great country—when we demand total liquidation of all colonies, it is this type of thing that makes us do so unhesitatingly—and I think it is right that I should read that document so that everybody will know its contents. I know that it is the work of certain marginal individuals, but the fact that such marginal individuals can exist and that such organizations can exist in a democratic society, in a society that is governed by law—individuals and organizations aiming at the destruction or humiliation of people different from themselves because they regard them as colonials—acts as a stimulus to us. It does not generate hate in our hearts. Rather than that, it serves as a challenge to us to insist that, from now on, every square inch of African territory and every square inch of Asian territory and every square inch of any colonial territory must be liberated from foreign domination.

56. By doing that, we will be contributing to the establishment of peace and tranquillity in the world. There can never be any peace in our world until all colonial territories are liberated from colonialism. Let us not deceive ourselves. So long as any State believes that it can hold another State in bondage and exploit the resources of that other country to its own advantage—not utilizing the resources of that other country to the advantage of that country's people, but hoping to build up its own economy at the expense of the economy and well-being of other people—there can never be peace in our world. Let no one deceive himself about that. These people want the good things of this world; they want to develop their culture, their traditions and their institutions; they want to develop their spiritual, intellectual and moral qualities. For one nation to hold another in bondage, to repress it and suppress it and subjugate it, is to sow the seeds of world catastrophe.

57. The most unpredictable thing in the world is man himself. You can predict the weather these days, but you cannot say exactly what a man is likely to do so long as he has a mind of his own. In other words, the most uncertain thing in the world is man, and, so long as there is the fire of God and the divine element in man, he always has potentialities for good or bad.

58. If you repress the people for too long there comes a time when they do not count the cost and are prepared to die for a cause which they believe to be very dear to their hearts. I am saying this in relation to South Africa. Today colonialism is not confined to Europe. The Union of South Africa is one of those imperialistic States where a minority of 3 million people decide to subjugate, humiliate and virtually destroy the souls of 11 million others.

59. I say, just as I have told Portugal—and the same thing refers to Spain and other countries of Europe who think of Africa as the target of their ambitions—

that the minority in South Africa that has had an opportunity to do good has decided to do evil all along. Nigeria takes this opportunity to serve notice on the minority elements that Nigeria cannot accept indefinitely the present position. But Nigeria is broad-minded enough to appreciate the forces of history. We do not want to treat the minority elements as aliens of South Africa to be driven into the sea or destroyed or expropriated.

60. I have said this before and I want to repeat it in this august Assembly: all we want South African rulers to practise today is the rule of law. There must be one law for all the people in South Africa. Those who are in power in South Africa must appreciate that if they are to survive in the near future they must acknowledge the rule of law and make use of the powers and the resources at their disposal to enable the majority to re-establish themselves so as to regain the confidence that they have lost because of years of oppression and repression. If they do not take the hint it is not Nigeria that will start the ball rolling; there will come a time when the majority will revolt, and we have already read of a number of incidents occurring in South Africa. There will be a time when the majority will revolt, and if those in power should be so indiscreet as to allow such an incident to occur, I cannot say nor can I imagine what the consequences may be. I can only say mildly that it will be a great disaster.

61. In order to avoid this holocaust Nigeria takes this opportunity to ask the minority rulers of South Africa to eradicate the colonialism and imperialism which have persisted in that territory for so long, and the humiliation that has been the lot of the people of Africa.

62. There is no use in telling Nigeria that this is an internal affair. We will never accept that as an internal affair of the Union of South Africa. As long as we live on a continent where there is racial discrimination against people of African descent—or as long as there is discrimination against people of African descent anywhere in the world—it can never be considered by Nigeria as an internal affair of any country. The sooner it is understood the better. That is one of the pillars of our policy in relation to all countries, and the sooner the United Nations puts an end to colonialism, imperialism and all that goes with them—which are so obnoxious, objectionable and unacceptable in a polite society—the sooner that is done the better we will be preparing for the establishment of world peace and human understanding.

63. I said that I was going to read a document. This was circulated to the new African States and the Asian States. This came to my office and I think it is necessary that we should put it on record. It is headed "White America rejects a bastardized United Nations".

"A foul stench spreads out from the East River and hangs over New York like a pall. It is the smell of sweat, the greasiest sweat of the black races of Africa and yellow races of Asia which have invaded the United Nations. It is enough to make every white Protestant American vomit.

"These sub-humans have come down from the trees and out of the swamps to lord it over the white race. Are they going to get away with it?"

"The degenerate French, the Latin nations dominated by the Roman Pope and the Jew Slavs have already yielded, but we say America is white. We shall keep it white, no matter if the rest of the world is mongolized we shall keep our America pure.

"The Ku Klux Klan is on guard against the black and yellow peril sweeping in from across the seas.

"The present session of the General Assembly of the United Nations is controlled by the inferior races. It is a meeting of blacks and their brown and yellow brethren who are plotting to overthrow white Protestant America.

"What an insult to the founding fathers of our Republic for the black Nkrumah, the brown Nehru, the tan Nasser, the yellow Sukarno and the communist-atheistic Tito, a traitor to God and the white race, to try to force President Eisenhower into a summit with the anti-Christ Khrushchev. These monkeys should have been tanned and feathered.

"The Lord in his infinite wisdom created the white race to rule over the animal kingdom and the lower races. Our Saviour Jesus Christ taught us to love and cherish even the slave, but he did not preach the domination of the slave over the master.

"The Ku Klux Klan wants the black and yellow delegates to stay close to the buildings of the United Nations and the brothels of Harlem and not to defile the hotels and restaurants of our white city. Our police will not relax their vigilance against the lawless acts of Africans like the delegate from Cameroon and other umpty blacks, and if you don't like it, get out. There is no welcome in America for a black and yellow United Nations. The fiery crosses shall burn."

64. I have read this document not with a view to engendering ill feeling, but to point out to this Assembly what greater reason we have for our determination to see to it that colonialism in all its forms is eradicated from the surface of this world.

65. I know that this organization, as I said, is composed of marginal individuals who cannot be considered to express the general will of the people of this great country. I know that this organization is composed of some men who are so warped in their outlook that they cannot see history—and perhaps they have not read history and have not had the opportunity of appreciating the lesson of history. They forget that even the wealth of the country of which they are proud to be loyal citizens was built with the sweat, blood and tears of these very blacks. Without them the economy and the greatness and even the creation of their great country would not have been possible, and the country could not be what it is today. That is history; we know that. I am prepared to acknowledge that this is due more to ignorance than to anything else, because Europe has dominated the course of history for so many centuries, and it is only recently that the Asian and African countries have come into the picture, in our twentieth century. These people with warped intellects have come to believe that there were no other people than themselves.

66. However, we find in the United Nations a mirror reflecting the various segments of the world. The United Nations is trying to bring about a balanced picture, and it is because of the resistance of such

people to the simple truths that are shown here through the presence of the diverse nations and diverse races working in harmony for common humanity that such elements are afraid of the truth and are prepared to die in their ignorance. I have read this in order to enable the representatives of the great country that acts as our host to appreciate the amount of harm such organizations can do to a relationship between itself and other nations, so that they may exercise themselves in sending a message to their nation to take steps to eradicate this type of cancer in their political midst. I have not read it because I am embittered; rather I take it in my stride, because I have read worse than this, written even by men of learning, professors, who have prostituted their knowledge to serve imperialistic purposes. We have read and analysed these things, and our reading has not deviated us from the course we have set ourselves.

67. It is when we see this type of thing happening, when we see the justification of injustice because of fallacious theories and fallacious concepts, that we realize that the only way to prove conclusively that these things are erroneous is not by hate or bitterness against anybody but by organized effort to eradicate those things that make such warped thinking exist at all. One of the ways of doing that is the complete liquidation of all forms of colonialism in all the areas that are dominated by others. I am certain that when that happens the goodness that is in man will be liberated, the finer aspects of humanity will come to the surface, and the world will benefit by the diversity of the contributions that come from all sections of the world. We will have a world with many facets contributing to the totality of world culture, a world in which the mutual appreciation of one another and the mutual appreciation of diverse cultures and the recognition of the contribution of others in other spheres will bring a sense of balance and bring peace and harmony between State and State and between man and man.

68. We, the delegation of Nigeria, look at the future with confidence. It has been said that the world looks at us and expects us to play an important role in Africa and in the world. It is our intention to play this role—if it is our lot to play such a role—honestly, sincerely, fearlessly, with the truth as our guiding light. When it comes to a situation of this nature, one must face it, and face it boldly. It is in that light that I have read this document, so that those who have ears to hear may hear, those who have thoughts may think and those that have capacity to reflect may reflect and find a solution to this problem before it becomes too late.

69. The other races of mankind are determined to have the right to live in their territories, to make use of the good things that are located within their territories, to organize them, to exploit them, to build their institutions, to perpetuate their kind and their culture and their traditions and to be able to come to an assembly of this nature to contribute to the well-being of the world. They cannot do that if, by any fictitious doctrine or by any dubious means, any nation puts forth an idea that it has any divine right to govern another one. We know that this is not true. We know it is false. We know that throughout history the rise and fall of empires have been due to this very thing. It is said that history repeats itself, but history does not repeat itself necessarily. As long

as men refuse to learn the lesson of history, that lesson still remains there until it is learnt. If it is not learnt, then it repeats itself because it has not been learnt. It is an assignment that has not been done. Then history repeats itself, and the lesson is learnt in a very expensive way.

70. The sponsors of the African-Asian draft resolution hope and believe that, following the trend of the discussion here, the Assembly will adopt this draft resolution unanimously, without any equivocation, so as to give hope to those countries that have been subjugated, those countries that have been deprived of their wherewithal, those countries that have been held in bondage, those countries that have been kept under heel, those countries that have not been allowed to exercise their God-given right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I sincerely hope that the great Powers who profess democracy, who profess high ideals, who desire peace in the world, will see that by eradicating all forms of colonialism and opposing all forms of imperialism we will be achieving one of the objectives, indeed one of the corner-stones, in the achievement of world peace.

71. Colonialism and imperialism go hand in hand with war and destruction. You cannot maintain imperialism by peaceful means. It is always maintained by brute force. And brute force is the brother and the sister of war. That being the case, I take this opportunity to ask the great Powers and the small Powers, the medium Powers and the baby Powers, to go hand in hand in voting for this resolution, so that this Assembly can look back to this session with a feeling of satisfaction that something has been achieved.

72. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to make a brief statement concerning the letter read by the representative of Nigeria.

73. Mr. MORSE (United States of America): In behalf of my delegation and my Government I have asked for this opportunity to make a brief reply to the representative of Nigeria, Ambassador Jaja Wachuku. I want him to know that I speak out of a great personal fondness and a very high respect for him.

74. He has read this very unfortunate letter that was circulated to delegates. And I am glad that he read it because it gets it out on top of the table, so to speak, and gives us an opportunity to reply to it.

75. I want to say that we share his appraisal of the letter. We think it is a shocking epistle. I want him to know that we think it is not only an affront to the delegates from Africa and Asia and the other countries which it attacks, but it is an affront to the American people. I want to assure the representative from Nigeria that it does not represent the point of view of the American people but represents apparently the bias and the prejudice and the bigotry of some fringe group in America, if it was written by a fringe group in America.

76. This delegation of the United States at the United Nations is headed by a great American who believes in the dignity of man and in the equality of man and who has demonstrated, time and time again, these great qualities in his leadership of this delegation. On the very day this shocking, bigoted letter was sent to certain delegates at the United Nations, Mr. James Wadsworth, on 28 November, issued a statement

which I am about to read. I think in fairness to this great American, who is the Chairman of our delegation, that our delegation owes it to him this morning to read his reply to the letter into the record in view of the fact that the representative of Nigeria has made it now a matter of public record—and I say quite rightly so. Mr. Wadsworth said on 28 November:

"It has come to my attention that a number of delegates received by mail today a scurrilous letter, purportedly originating from the Ku Klux Klan, which contains an outrageous racist attack. The author of this letter may be a crackpot. All societies have their crackpots, and the United States has laws designed to protect all members of society against vicious and threatening abuse created in sick minds.

"Whether this is the work of a crackpot or the work of others who seek to embarrass the United States, it is not possible to say at this time. I therefore ask that all those who have received this shocking letter be good enough to give me the envelopes, the letters and any other pertinent information. I have already asked the Federal Bureau of Investigation to launch an immediate investigation, and it is imperative that we receive as much evidence as is available in order to identify the source so that appropriate steps can be taken by United States authorities."

I think this answer by Mr. Wadsworth speaks for itself.

77. Let me add only this in addition. The internal contents of this letter are strange in some of its wordings. For example, it refers to "tan and feather". Let me say that if it were actually written by a bigoted group, such as the Ku Klux Klan, that group would well understand the meaning of "tar and feather" rather than "tan and feather". And this linguistic mistake in the letter, I think, speaks a great deal to the premise which we contend as to who produced the letter, namely, that it came from some obviously sick mind.

78. May I say further, as one in the Senate of the United States, who for many years in the Senate has been in the forefront of the fight against all discrimination in my country based upon race, colour or creed, that I can give assurance to this Assembly that this letter referred to by the representative from Nigeria does not bespeak the point of view of the American people.

79. I also want to say a word in behalf of a very distinguished member of our delegation, one of the great Negro women of America, Mrs. George. Dr. George is a personification, I think, of proof to this Assembly that we in our country and we as a Government believe in the elimination of any discrimination based upon race, colour or creed. And I know I bespeak the point of view of Dr. George when I give you further assurance that this letter does not represent either the point of view of the great Negro leaders in our society.

80. It is very difficult to apologize in behalf of people whom you do not know. But if this letter really were written by an American crackpot, I think that it is only fitting and proper on this occasion, in behalf of our delegation and of our Government, to express to the General Assembly our apologies that anyone in our country would see fit to spread such vicious bigotry.

81. I want to assure the representative of Nigeria that we have taken no offence over the fact that the letter was read into the record. In fact, as I said in the beginning, it is a good thing that it was done. But I want to give him assurance that this delegation and this Government stand behind him and every delegation here to do everything that we can to see to it that their stay in our country is pleasant. We are at their service, and we want them to know that this letter in no way bespeaks the point of view of any responsible citizen of the United States of America.

82. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): We are now coming very near to the end of a great debate which has taken several days of the working time of this Assembly, over fifty speaking hours, and in which some seventy speakers have participated. Now, it is easy to say that words do not have a real effect, but the very fact that the Assembly, in the seriousness of its business, has devoted its time to this item, and that a number of nations have participated in the debate—both those who have been here for a long time and those others who have recently joined, on whom the impact of the subject which we are discussing is more recent than on some of the others—is eloquent in itself. It should not be forgotten, however, that some of the more powerful nations of today who are here have also gone through the phase of being under colonial rule, and it is much to their credit and the advantage of the world as a whole that they still have memories of it and of their effort to throw it off, and are aware of its impact upon the history of the world.

83. Now, the subject comes before us this time, thanks to the initiative of the Soviet Union, in the shape of an item on the agenda; but it is by no means a new matter to the United Nations, being written into the Charter. I will not read these words and clauses, which are so familiar to everyone. Not only is it written into the Charter, but a Chapter of the Charter deals with this problem of Non-Self-Governing Territories, though perhaps in 1960 not as adequately, in the present circumstances of the world, as may have appeared in 1945.

84. Again that reminds us that even the Charter, good as it is, is not like the proverbial law of the Medes and the Persians, unalterable, but has to be vivified, has to be made more useful, by being responsive to the developing conditions of the world.

85. Colonialism, as it is called, the expansion of countries outside their borders, usually into far-off lands, resulting either in conquest or occupation, and what is called government from a distance—that is what it used to be called in the nineteenth century—is no new phenomenon, so far as we are concerned. I do not want to go into all the ancient history of this. It goes back perhaps to the early stages of the pre-Christian era, when Alexander the Great embarked upon his expeditions right to the frontiers of our own country, where he won his battle, but from where he returned without establishing an empire there. And then we had the whole period of the development of Europe, where they were concerned with their own internal troubles, European nations either coalescing with each other or throwing the yoke of one on the other, so that the present colonial lands of Asia and Africa did not attract their attention for a long time except in connexion with trade.



86. Now we come to the more important period of today. I say this because we should not think that suddenly, with the industrial civilization, a new idea developed in the mind of man, because then we are likely to think that we should not have to guard against these evils in the future. So in more recent times there has been expansion. This expansion took place partly as a result of exploration, partly in an attempt to gain riches, partly in order to provide for migration, and for dozens of causes—through the merchant; the explorer; the promoter of enterprises; the missionary; the political leaders of some countries; the advancing might of armies; more and more in recent years, particularly since the industrial revolution, the engineer; and also sometimes the very nationalistic, patriotic expansionist who saw in the conquest of other territories the glory of his own. All this is depicted by—I will not call it the newer surge of nationalism.

87. I want to say a word about this conception of nationalism, because it is at once the cause, the soul of empire and the mainspring of the resistance to it. After all, colonialism, as we understand it, is the attempt to expand power from one's own territory into another area. Europe particularly, having gone through the phase somewhere about the sixteenth century, or perhaps a little earlier, of having evolved into nations from small tribal states, found in that unification the possibility of greater unity. Now, as then, it was often coloured by idealism: either it could be talked about in the shape of pan-Christian ideas or the spreading of some universal doctrines, or the spread of the gospel, or whatever it may be. In fact, you will find that in the expansion of all these areas the source of authority has come from charters or other instruments granted to explorers which give the sovereign power of life and death over non-Christian peoples. It appears in the clauses of the charter of the East India Company in regard to India, in which Queen Elizabeth gave these merchants, who were private citizens in her kingdom at that time, sovereign rights of life and death over non-Christian people. That is how her empire began. But it is a great mistake to think that one motive or another can explain this.

88. And so we go through various phases where people explore everywhere in search of wealth and do not find it, or as in the case of Columbus, they stumble by mistake upon another land of vast riches, and so on. Skipping over this period from the early times of the explorers, or the Phoenician period, we hear of the discoveries that gave America its name by the Italian explorer, as it is said—I do not vouch for this. Afterwards there came the expansion to the four great territories of Asia, Africa, the Caribbean, and the American continent, resulting in what today—or yesterday, I should say—what yesterday was the situation, where a small number of people in each of these metropolitan countries ruled a very considerable number of people in other areas. But fortunately this phenomenon, with the exception of one or two countries, or one or two combinations, is on the way out. If I may submit without being misunderstood, one of the most potent hindrances, one of the greatest impediments in the way of progress, is not to recognize that progress is being made, because if we do not recognize that progress is being made, we are likely to apply the same remedies, have the same reactions to the changed conditions as to the previous con-

ditions and thereby get all our orientation and our policies misrepresented, misunderstood and misapplied. Similarly, if we do not recognize that progress is being made, it is very likely that those who have been pressured into progress either by the agitations of colonial peoples or by liberal sentiments in their own countries will be encouraged to fall back and say to their own peoples, "Wetoldyouso." Therefore, we have to recognize that some progress has been made.

89. In modern times, since the fall of Constantinople, the European peoples, not knowing how to preserve their meat, had to resort to spices, and it was about that time that they learned the art of cooking properly. At the time when Constantinople went out of the Christian ambit as such, the sea routes became open and then all the European population, led by the Portuguese and the Spaniards, followed by the Dutch and the French, and the English last, came into all these areas. They spread out into the new world in America, they spread out into Asia, and later on, much later on, in some cases they spread out into Africa. At first this exploration was carried out by people with a real desire to travel to these lands, the great sea dogs of the time, people who just wanted to explore for the sake of exploration. But these exploration enterprises remind us of some of our modern sports tournaments; that is to say, some person who wants to establish himself in a very big way in some sport and wants to play in tournaments abroad gets promoted by the manufacturer of some commodity used in that sport. In the same way, behind the explorer gathered those interests who could gain by his explorations; thus economic interests got tied up with the pioneering spirit. But again, we must not forget that the great urge was nationalism, that it was the birth of nationalism in the European nation States, pride in a flag, rivalry with other nations, the fear that other nations may establish themselves in areas to the disadvantage of themselves, that pushed people forward time after time.

90. First we have the phase—and when we speak about phases we have to look for clear-cut, sharp lines of division—first we have the phase of the empires of settlement. Those empires of settlement may have arisen either as a result of a deliberate policy of sending people out or because—I will not mention names—in some cases of great imperial countries they used these far-away places to deport personalities whose liberal ideas were not acceptable at home; therefore the convict settlements, as they were called at that time, were composed of miscreants and anti-social people, as we would call them now. But they were probably the pioneers of revolutions, those who rebelled against the old order at home, so they were sent abroad to the colonies of settlement. In those areas the indigenous populations—and we will draw a curtain over their history—by and large became extinct and the settlements became practically patches of the old country in a new area. They were the colonies of settlement which are now full-fledged nations, and they have in various ways contributed both to progress and to regress in regard to this colonial system.

91. Then we come to the period from the beginning of the third phase, from the nineteenth century onward, when, as a result of the second industrial revolution and the growth of technology and, what is more, through mercantile expansion, the search for markets

and raw materials began. Machines produced large quantities of goods. Sweated labour was available in the home country for some time. However, that source did not last because the people who were drawn from the rural part of the countryside in countries like the United Kingdom, for example, into the towns saw the attractions of industry and a way to live better, and so they began to put pressure on those who owned the machines because they wanted higher wages.

92. However, there was overseas a source of this underpaid labour and there was no particular difficulty in obtaining labourers. Most of these territories were not democratic. Public opinion of course always exists but agreements were reached with individual rulers which were to the advantage of the colonizing nations.

93. So we have a period where raw materials were produced by sweat-shop labour and where there were vast markets of underpaid people whose purchasing power was small but who made up for it by their numbers. Thus you have an empire which it is generally argued is an empire of profit. That was so in the old days, because it is most unlikely that most of these colonizing expeditions would have taken place if there had been no profit involved and thus no incentive.

94. Then came the break with imperialism, in which there have been many pioneers from distant times up to more modern times. The first break with imperialism was when some of the colonies revolted and in other cases the colonies—as I said, they were colonies of settlement—began to organize themselves into communities and as a result of the breakaway of others, some concession had to be made to them. I will not go into great detail about this or into the controversies that prevailed in the home countries. The most outstanding instance of this is the breakaway of the thirteen American colonies which was achieved under conditions which are well known in history by this time. This however had an effect—I suppose I may be wrong—on the expansion of the United States in later times because right through history you will find that the consolidation of that territory as it is today was by and large not achieved by the process of conquest but by methods which today perhaps we would decry but which at that time were regarded as progressive, namely, the purchase of territories. Thus we have the purchase of Florida, of Alaska, Louisiana or Rhode Island, which is very different from the way the colonial frontiers expanded in the case of other imperial territories.

95. In more modern times the most outstanding instance of the abdication of colonialism was soon after the 1917 revolution in Russia when the imperial possessions of the Czar were dispossessed by the Russians themselves. I will not go into the details of it, and this is no reference to modern history, it is only a historical survey of a situation. However, by that time other events had taken place. In more modern times the rule of colonial people has been of one race over another and thus, apart from the economic factor, the racial element was important, and gave rise to a racial doctrine, which now persists in South Africa and other places: "There are some people who are born to rule and some others to be ruled, and it is not possible to train people of certain racial origins to practise self-government". As against that, there was both in the metropolitan countries and

in the countries so ruled a revolt against it. So there was some opposition to the racial doctrine, which however was responsible for the growth of slavery. But with the abolition of slavery on the one hand and the progress of liberal doctrines in the home country on the other, the situation changed.

96. However, the most outstanding instance in the context of our thinking was the blow to this racial superiority which was struck—though it seems far-fetched today—when in 1905 the Japanese defeated the Russians in the Russo-Japanese War. In those days we did not think of economic, ideological and other questions as we do today. But the whole of Asia saw this as the defeat of a European empire by a small, short-statured Asiatic people. I am not going into the question of the relevance of this struggle or the title to Port Arthur or anything of that kind. I am only dealing with the psychological aspect.

97. All through that period, when we were but children, this idea—which may have been a very half-cooked idea—that there was no longer a superiority of race spread. Then it was further developed in the period of the First World War. I am not for a moment suggesting that wars are to be prepared for or that they should take place in order that colonies should be liberated. But at the time of the First World War a great part of the world—I would not like to say how much, but the greater part of the world—was under colonial domination or something of that kind. Here I should like to say that a colony is a colony—I would not say as I have defined it, but as I have described it before—whatever it may be called. The British system, with which I am more familiar, has many types of colonies, such as crown colonies, which in the beginning were the private property of the crown, dependencies—India was called a dependency, not a colony—protectorates, and protected States. There are places like Malta which thirty years ago was called a British ship. Then there are other areas, but from an economic, social or political point of view all these are really part of the colonial empire.

98. So in modern times we have the great colonial Powers, the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, Portugal and Spain. It is interesting that it is the most powerful of these empires that have given way first; this has been due to a large number of circumstances, and world organizations played their part in this—and I mention the International Labour Organisation in Geneva in this connexion. This was one of the survivors of the League of Nations which even survived the outbreak of the Second World War. With the impact of the International Labour Organisation it became difficult for countries that respected conventions to maintain the standards of labour in dependent countries, and impossible for them to do so formally.

99. Secondly, there was the spread of movements devoted to the emancipation and elevation of the working classes. This also made it difficult for the continuation of this process; so that in some instances, not all of them, you will find that empires have ceased to pay. Although empires have ceased to pay, this does not mean that some people did not make considerable profits on account of political power or that some countries did not do so. However, what is usually forgotten is that the great military arm of the Powers, the item that goes under the consolidated account with regard to obligations undertaken for these

st it. So there doctrine, which rth of slavery. e one hand and home country

stance in the to this racial it seems far- se defeated the In those days ical and other le of Asia saw ire by a small, not going into struggle or the kind. I am only

re but children, ry half-cooked riority of race d in the period for a moment red for or that colonies should rst World War like to say how rld—was under hat kind. Here is a colony—I it as I have de- be called. The e familiar, has own colonies, ate property of called a de-, and protected ich thirty years there are other al or political of the colonial

great colonial he Netherlands, g that it is the have given way ber of circum- ed their part in Labour Organi- s was one of the h even survived With the impact ion it became conventions to in dependent do so formally.

of movements levation of the difficult for the some instances, res have ceased ed to pay, this not make cor- al power or that, what is usually n of the Powers, lidated account ken for these

purposes, also comes under the cost of empire. So while it is quite true that it could be said that such and such a country spent so much on a territory, and that its balance of trade is favourable or unfavourable, that presents only one part of the picture. But at any rate there is very little doubt that this was one of the considerations.

100. Then later, when the world began to be divided up—one of those things that we must take care of in the future—between the great Powers, yet another category of empire was introduced, or came into existence, that usually called "spheres of influence", and the modern expression "filling a power vacuum" is a descendant of these "spheres of influence". So when France and Germany and Great Britain claimed various spheres of influence in various places, those territories, while sovereign, still did not have independence.

101. Now, there are cousins, descendants, of this today. As I said, there are "vacuums" being filled in the way of ambassadors in some countries who are not viceroys there, but who sometimes function as such. There is also the attempted penetration or conquest of the mind, as it is called—or conquest of the body, it may be. These things still resurrect themselves in various forms.

102. Now, why do I say all these things? Because, looking at the figures, we would find a vast liquidation process—I will give you the figures in a moment—a vast liquidation process where we are told that these great, enormous empires are now shrunken. But as to independence of the former colonies, we have to see whether the real substance is there, and if it is there, whether it is likely to last. In that connexion one would like to say that while we debate here day after day—and seventy speakers have taken part in the discussion—there is an air of unreality about the whole business, considering what happened in Algeria only two days ago; when there are countries today like France and Portugal that claim the people of these places are nationals of the metropolitan countries. As I have repeatedly said to this Assembly the British did not insult us by calling us Englishmen; the Portuguese and the French do the equivalent of that.

103. The war that has been raging in Algeria for seven or eight years could not be called a Moslem revolt, an Arab revolt or a revolt of anybody else: it is really a war of colonial independence, of the same type that occurred in this country, of the same type that has occurred in China. This has not occurred in our country because we achieved our independence by other methods, though you could also call it a war in some other form if you like. It is the resistance of the people against the force of arms, against the armed might of great empires.

104. That brings us to the consideration of several other problems concerned with world politics, and I want to spend the little time I have, not in the description either of the balance-sheet of empire in terms of pounds and pence or dollars and cents, or of the costs of this, that or the other. I think we must be realistic; we must realize that empires can flourish only in one way, and that is by imperialist methods. That is to say, when you want to suppress somebody, you will suppress them. So we have to take this in our stride and see how the modern world

is likely to assist in the survival or the liquidation of imperialism.

105. On the one hand, after the period of the First World War, with the break-up of the Ottoman Empire the greater part of western Asia began to achieve its freedom irrespective of whatever internal progress in democracy might have been made. The Ottoman Empire, defeated in the war, in the old days would have had its territories annexed; but with the revolution in Czarist Russia, one of the great Allies in the war was removed from the context of the empire. With the emergence of the United States as one of the great Allies, having one of the strongest voices in the making of the peace treaties, its President brought up that conception once more before the world, but it was called "the sacred trust"—I am not talking about trusteeship at the moment. But there were no other peoples in the world that professed this. This brought in what, in the future, would emerge as a new theory of sovereignty, that is, sovereignty thrust on the people but not conferred upon them. What the empire does is just to oppress them; it remains latent and legal. And then the empire is lifted and the sovereign people come into their own. This really should be the modern theory of sovereignty instead of the command of a sovereign, anyway in the modern period.

106. So first of all there was this conception that there would be no annexations of territory, and though the discussions at Versailles and Geneva did not produce the results that were required, there was a break with imperialism; and so you find a third phase, where the attempt is made—at least in words—to expand or transform empires into what may be called "brotherhoods".

107. This is all the positive side of it. But at the same time there is the other side of the picture. There is Algeria; there is South Africa, where there is a situation of another type—I am not referring to the Union itself—where a Trust Territory has been misappropriated by the administering Power and treated as part of an empire; there is the situation in the Portuguese territories, where alone in the world today forced labour bordering on slavery prevails; there is, again, the attempt by France by force of arms to subjugate a people who are as capable of and as much entitled to freedom as any community sitting here, and who have, what is more, demonstrated to the world that their sacrifices and capacities, in spite of their limitations, could be as great as their aspiration for independence.

108. But in this matter we must not forget—and this is where, perhaps, there should be some soul-searching on the part of the people concerned—that the great military alliances of the world are an aid to these empires. It so happens that these great colonial Powers like France and Portugal depend on these alliances. Let us take Portugal as an example. Portugal is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and this organization definitely states that these alliances are not only in regard to the metropolitan countries but in regard to the whole of the sovereign areas. Now, it is quite difficult for a country like the United States, which has no colonies except for the territories in the Pacific area which could be considered in this broad category—it is quite difficult for them to say that they will make an alliance, but minus these territories. Whether or not there is

going to be any such alliance, that would be a matter which I would not wish to go into. But it becomes an alliance with an empire. It is as though a free man were making a friendly agreement with a slave-master in regard to both his own free possessions and the master's possessions.

109. So these great military alliances, whether in the North or in Europe or elsewhere, become part of an agreement with colonialists of the worst type. It is not only in theory that this is bad—and here, now, there may be reservations on this; we believe that the resources of metropolitan France and Portugal for the oppression of the colonies, their moral power to maintain them, the size of the opposition that the revolting people have to face, are all affected by this factor. Portugal has proclaimed before that its presence in NATO attracts the friendship of its oldest ally, the United Kingdom. One of the oldest treaties in existence is that between the United Kingdom and Portugal.

110. Although the United Kingdom has made great strides in advancing independence—sometimes tardily, sometimes under pressure, sometimes under various circumstances as in the case of our own country, or, as in the case of the United States, by revolt followed by agreement—there still remain vast possessions. And these vast possessions have to become free countries.

111. Certain problems have to be considered at this stage. First, what is to happen to small areas of 50,000, 100,000 or 200,000 people who are as conscious of nationalism as any large country? To say to them that they are only a small speck of land somewhere and that they cannot be independent would neither fit into the Charter nor satisfy their desire for liberty in their own lands. That is one of the problems that both the United Nations and the metropolitan countries have to face. And I would like to submit that any attempt either to disregard their desire for national independence on the one hand, or to tell them they will be free in their master's home on the other hand, would not in the long run meet the bill. The Assembly will remember the recent example of Cyprus. Cyprus, incidentally, brought modern Greece into the context of anti-colonialism—and I hope it remains there. We found one of those great European countries, a NATO ally, standing up ultimately for colonial independence; but when they first came here, the idea was to divert attention from the agitation in the colony by presenting it either as a defence problem or a security problem for some people, or making the Cypriots a bargain for a cut-up among two or three people.

112. My own Government took the view that there was no question of this being anything but a colonial matter. Cyprus, by law and by circumstance, by economic factors, political factors, sociological factors, was a colony and nothing but a colony and, therefore, had to be treated as a colonial country entitled to full independence, and although it took a great deal of struggle in the United Nations—perhaps not always with the assistance of everybody concerned—Cyprus ultimately attained its independence, though on that basis it has been vitiated by circumstances. What I want to point out is that in the attempt to argue against the people who want freedom, often extraneous circumstances are introduced, which may perhaps provide some help for some time, but ultimately the people claim their own; and all that is left behind is a great deal of ill will and newer problems,

newer complications which, if subject peoples do not take enough care, will become what will be called a joint imperialism.

113. I think it is right to say that a mandate, or a trusteeship, certainly represents the idea of the sacred trust and of divesting the old country of its colonial territories, but if the United Nations does not stick to the principles of the Charter and its spirit and intent, then it is likely to become a joint domination of a helpless people by a more powerful people. This is always in the minds of the colonial peoples.

114. Next I should like to say, before I come to specific problems, that sometime in 1939 the colonial territories of the great Powers were the following: the United Kingdom alone had about 13 million square miles; France had a huge empire of about 4 million square miles, eighty times that of Belgium; the Netherlands had its own colonies. All that is now dispersed, but still there are in this world somewhere about 75 million people who are under colonial rule. Out of the 75 million people, some 20 million belong to the British hegemony and are on the path towards self-government. Therefore, there actually remain some 50 million people still to be liberated; and when we think that out of this 50 million, 14,871,195 belong to the empire of Portugal, we have the situation that the Portuguese are the biggest imperial Power in the world. And it would be no answer to say that these people are not colonials, that they are Portuguese citizens, as I think has been argued here. So the greater part of these 50 million people are the 14 to 15 million in the Portuguese empire and the 11 to 12 million in Algeria. Thus, between France and Portugal are divided the largest colonial possessions—not the most scattered, but the largest colonial possessions.

115. In regard to their position in Africa, certain new problems are faced. Unless colonialism is totally liquidated on the African continent, it is more prone to become the scene of contending ambitions, either real or suspected, which will place the fortunes and development of the African people in serious jeopardy. Therefore, the total withdrawal of the empire from these territories is necessary and, as in the case of peace and war, there is no half-way house in this: either you have an empire or you do not have an empire. And that is why we do not believe that it would be possible to progress from stage to stage at this period of world evolution.

116. There is no country in the world that is not capable of governing itself. We have all had the experience of being asked, just before our imperial rulers left us: "Who will command your armies? Who will command your air force and your fleet? Who will administer? Who will run the finance ministry?", and so on. None of us found very serious difficulties with it any more than other countries, and I believe that these problems are common to independent countries as well. But then we are told that there are countries in Asia, such as Pakistan, India and Ceylon, which have ancient civilizations and, therefore, have had long periods of the rule of law, and so on, but it is our submission that civilization is not a peculiar monopoly of any part of the world. All we mean by making this distinction is that those of us who speak about it probably do not understand other people's civilizations; so we must abandon this distinction also and go straight to the position that this world must really be free in that sense. There should be

no territory under foreign rule, no country whose territory can be used by someone else for purposes that have no relation to the benefit or the advantage of the people who inhabit it. That is why, particularly in this present time of vast military alliances, when the old system of strategic points, lifelines of empire, etc. is being transformed into the position of holding the strategic areas for purposes which are not strictly germane to the progress of the country, we must present our opposition.

117. As a result of this debate, whatever may have been the nature of the facts presented, the attention of the world which we represent is largely focused upon this question. We have also the situation that the resources of the world are attracting greater attention than ever before; and in this question of world development, every item of liberation, the more people we bring into the area of dynamic freedom, then the more people there are for constructive endeavour.

118. Let us take the case of Africa: the vast untold resources of the world are in Africa. This is not a counsel for other people to go and exploit them. In an area of somewhere about 11 million square miles with a population of about 222 million, 98 per cent of all the diamonds in the world, 94 per cent of all the columbite, 84 per cent of the copper, 55 per cent of the gold, 45 per cent of the radium, 33 per cent of the manganese, and so on, are in this continent; and these are required not necessarily for the purpose of building armaments, but in order that the world may move to higher standards of civilization. Therefore, even from the point of view of making available the resources of the world, and making those resources available without the cost of blood and pressure—which is what a colonial war means—it would be to our advantage to introduce this gospel to implement the United Nations Charter in its reality. The Charter says this in what may be called more or less embryonic language, but it should be made a reality in that we must now address ourselves to the total liberation of these territories.

119. It is not a question of setting targets and dates. The only limitation of time on this should be the time required for transfer. And if one may say so, those people with the responsibility should not be permitted to take the attitude of the gauntlet with a gift in it: that is, to say as in the case of the Congo: "There is freedom"—and then to come back the other way because there had been no preparation for it. I think that the Belgian Congo as it was formerly is the most distressing instance of an empire of modern times. After seventy or eighty years of colonial rule nothing has been left in the political, administrative or other organizations, and what is more, after the withdrawal of the empire the former ruler comes back. That is one thing we have to guard against.

120. The second thing is that no Trust Territory should be given independence merely on the intimation of the Administering Authority that it is ready for independence, without our being shown that it is so, and without the United Nations taking care that the transfer of power will be carried out in such a way as to make re-entry impossible. In the Fourth Committee soon we shall be discussing the problem of Ruanda-Urundi, and my Government takes a serious view of this question. I informed the Security Council only two days ago that, to the best of our knowledge,

there were two concentrations in Ruanda for the purpose of operations against the Congo. But over and above that, we have now been told that Ruanda-Urundi is fit for independence and, therefore, an election is to take place in a short time. I do not want to discuss the details here because it will come up in the Fourth Committee, but while we yield to no one in the passion to limit the period of transition, we do not want to see that used in such a way that independence becomes "independence"—that is, things change only to remain the same or become worse. That situation should not arise.

121. Thirdly, I would like to say that we of the colonial areas who have been liberated have to take to heart the lessons of the empires of the past, and the fate of the peoples who are still not liberated. Therefore the Assembly, and particularly those nations who have different views from ours on colonial questions, should bear with us when we feel moved, when we seem to concern ourselves with something that is not our own territory. The place of every liberated country—I am not speaking of the others—is with the struggle of the colonial peoples. It is the determined policy of the Government of India that while we shall not participate in external military or other movements, while we shall not promote trouble in any areas, while we believe that no revolutions can be exported, our sympathies and our solidarity are with those who struggle for independence. It is part and parcel of a country's attainment of national independence that it does not run away from the whole campaign for human freedom, for the freedom of colonial peoples.

122. Again, it is necessary that people like ourselves who have been liberated from colonial empires should see to it that our place in world politics is a functional position leading to progress rather than to regression. That is to say, our independent positions should not be used by us or by others in order to further aggressive causes or to fasten tutelage upon other people. It would be the greatest tragedy if some of our liberated countries found themselves aligned against the campaigns of independence or the liberation of other peoples. That independence is not real, even though it may have all the forms and the trappings of independence. The reality of independence must come from the people themselves. And that reality is really not only political but also economic.

123. We, ourselves, do not object—in fact, it is a good thing—if there are fraternities formed either among the liberated territories or with their former rulers on the basis of freedom. But this should not be merely another name for empire—whether you call it a commonwealth or co-operation, whatever it is—that would not meet the situation. Those of us who are liberated have to make use of our liberation. We should not be subject peoples under another name.

124. It is in the sense of the advancement of our territories in economic terms—more food, more shelter, more sanitation, more education and more use of liberation—that is the implementation of independence.

125. We constantly say in India that on 15 August 1947, what happened was not independence but the removal of the main obstacle to independence, namely foreign rule; independence had still to be attained. When people have adequate food, adequate shelter,

adequate sanitation, adequate dignity, the capacity to exercise them—that is independence.

126. No country should, under any circumstances, be drawn willy-nilly into any kind of alliance, any kind of alignment which promotes either war or the domination of that country. Far be it from me to say that sovereign territories which are independent cannot make their own policies. But we have the right to hope that people who have seen the consequences of the worst wars in history—the great wars have been imperialist wars, whatever form they may take—should contribute their might, their ideals, their moral authority, in order to extend the areas of peace.

127. That is why you will find, in spite of the great conflicts in the world, that colonial territories tend more and more to move into the position, even if they are formally members of an alliance, of asking to be left alone. And I think the most outstanding instance of this is the United States of America which for 150 years wanted to keep free from foreign entanglements and wanted to be left alone for its own economic development.

128. So it behooves those who are powerful people, who have other interests, not necessarily of a selfish character, but who see things in another way, to leave these territories alone to develop for themselves. The cause of world peace would be assisted by the contribution that liberated peoples can make with the enthusiasm which they bring, and what is more, by the evidence they give to the world that human efforts and human co-operation can lead to advancement.

129. It should not be forgotten that in the last few years, apart from all alliances, apart from all Charter provisions and so on, the conditions in the liberated territories, which have an economic impact upon other countries, have led to the process of co-operation. There is no country in the world today which either has refused to receive or does not receive or does not give assistance in one form or another. Therefore, willy-nilly, a form of world co-operation develops. But for all this, it is necessary that there should be no reservations in this matter: no giving with one hand and taking away with the other. That is why a young country like ours stands very strongly against any imperialist power making agreements before independence in regard to either political, territorial or other rights. That is to say, if these areas which are in tutelage before they become free agree, as the price of freedom, to the establishment of bases or to enter into trade agreements or military agreements, they have not gained real freedom.

130. What is more, the liberty that the liberated territories get is conditioned by the burdens which they cannot carry. And I think the great countries of the world must take the risk that in conditions of freedom, peoples would act sensibly, would act in the line of progress and not otherwise; and immediate advantages should not take precedence over these distant ideals.

131. It is one of the great phenomena of the world that while some forty or fifty years ago maybe 1,200 million or 1,600 million people were under one form of subjection or another and—if we exclude China which, though colonial in an economic and social sense, was not so in a literal sense—nearly 1,000 million people were under colonial rule. As I said,

only some 75 million people are left, but they are scattered all over the world. They form a cancer on the body politic of the world. So long as there is any place in the world which is not liberated, so long as the people struggle for liberation, no attempt to give colonial rule other names; no show of force, no military alliances or anything of that kind, would succeed.

132. We have made progress on this subject at the present session. That progress has resulted not only from the fact that we have debated these matters here, but from the fact that the United Nations has asked Portugal to supply information. Portugal is the last stronghold of colonialism, and that stronghold has not fallen but it is very badly beleaguered. Spain has agreed to accept the provisions of the Charter; Portugal has not agreed, and therefore stands today isolated. If this last stronghold falls, we shall have made another advance.

133. But we must not forget that the real objective is to abolish from this world any kind of rule by one nation or people of another nation or people, particularly if it is based on racial discrimination and similar considerations. After all, a people's own economic interests are more important to it than the economic interests of someone else.

134. There are various drafts before the Assembly on this subject. The first, the draft declaration in document A/4502, has been submitted by the Soviet Union. We have read that text, and we find nothing in it to which we can object. That is to say, we are in favour of national States' achieving their freedom in accordance with the freely expressed will and desire of their peoples; we are against extraterritoriality in any form; and we are in favour of the implementation of the principles of the Charter.

135. The second, the draft resolution in document A/L.323 and Add.1-6, is sponsored by my delegation, among others. It is quite true that the draft resolution could have been shorter; perhaps there is a certain amount of repetition. On the whole, however, it represents what I have been trying to submit to the Assembly. There is no attempt at recrimination, no attempt to place responsibility on anyone but the United Nations as a whole.

136. I would conclude by saying that the emergence of so many countries into freedom is one of the great assets of the United Nations. While we may not always say this in so many words—and it is not applicable to every country—we have to pay a tribute to those countries which, whatever their past, have in more recent times made progress. We must recognize that progress is being made, but it is not being made fast enough. And the fact that progress is being made is no argument for our stopping our efforts. In the next year or two we should see the liquidation of all these dependent and colonial territories. All these places—whether they be small, like the Island of Malta, or large, like Algeria—should emerge into complete statehood and become Members of this Organization, unless they themselves choose something else. We would be the last people to say that because a State is independent it should not seek its fraternity. In fact, that is our hope and it is the purpose of the present debate.

137. I hope that the drafts before the Assembly on the liquidation of colonialism will gain unanimous ap-

proval. It will be recalled that when the decision was taken to discuss this item my delegation said that we did not very much care where it was discussed so long as it was discussed. It was unanimously decided to discuss it in plenary meetings of the Assembly. That result was brought about by the arguments presented here and it is an index of our ca-

capacity to persuade each other and of the desire on all sides of this Assembly that colonial territories should be a thing of the past, that this world should become really free and that the process of peace and world co-operation should thus be facilitated.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*

but they are  
rm a cancer  
g as there is  
ated, so long  
o attempt to  
of force, no  
kind, would

subject at the  
lted not only  
atters here,  
as has asked  
l is the last  
ghold has not  
d. Spain has  
arter; Portu-  
s today iso-  
ll have made

real objective  
f rule by one  
ple, particu-  
on and simi-  
wn economic  
he economic

Assembly on  
tion in docu-  
Soviet Union.  
thing in it to  
re in favour  
edom in ac-  
nd desire of  
itoriality in  
plementation

in document  
y delegation,  
ft resolution  
is a certain  
er, it repre-  
t to the As-  
ation, no at-  
at the United

emergence  
of the great  
y not always  
t applicable  
ute to those  
ve in more  
t recognize  
being made  
being made  
forts. In the  
dation of all  
s. All these  
e Island of  
ge into com-  
his Organi-  
nothing else.  
at because a  
s fraternity.  
rpose of the

assembly on  
unanimous ap-