



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Point of order by the representative of Colombia.....	445
Agenda item 9:	
General debate (<i>continued</i>).....	445
Speeches by Mr. Kiselev (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Montero de Vargas (Paraguay) and Mr. Cosgrave (Ireland)	

**President: Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON
(Thailand).**

Point of order by the representative of Colombia

1. THE PRESIDENT: Before calling on the first speaker inscribed on the list for the general debate, I call on the representative of Colombia, who wishes to raise a point of order.

2. Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): I have asked for the floor in order to raise a point which is really a point of order. In the past few days we have had in this Assembly unexpected discussions of matters of substance by representatives who had asked to speak on points of order. I fully appreciate that in the first few days of this session, the circumstances of the moment made it difficult to insist upon strict adherence to the rules of procedure. But I think the time has come to introduce some order into our discussions, and I should like to recall that the Special Committee on Measures to Limit the Duration of Regular Sessions of the General Assembly submitted a report which seems to us to define what may be considered a point of order. I am going to read the relevant passage of the document:

"A point of order is, basically, an intervention directed to the presiding officer requesting him to make use of some power inherent in his office or specifically given him under the rules of procedure. It may, for example, relate to the material conditions under which the meeting is taking place. It may be a request that the presiding officer should accord the speaker some privilege which it is in the officer's power to grant. Under a point of order, a representative may request the presiding officer to apply a certain rule of procedure or he may refer to the manner in which the presiding officer should apply a given rule, or the rules of procedure as a whole."¹

3. If there is no objection, and I am sure that there will be none, the President might rule that in future only representatives wishing to raise as points of order matters covered in the passage I have just read may take the floor.

4. The PRESIDENT: I appreciate the observations made by the representative of Colombia and I hope that members of the Assembly will take them to heart. Of course, the representative of Colombia was quite right, and what he read out is also authoritative. I had occasion to point out that in normal circumstances the intervention the other day would not have been a point of order, but in view of the precedent set by the special sessions I allowed it.

5. If I allowed another point of order yesterday, it was because the point of order was for the purpose of interrupting the general debate in order to make a statement. As we are engaged in a general debate, any representative may speak on any subject. However, I took the precaution of not allowing the debate to be interrupted in the middle and allowed intervention on the point of order only after the speeches in the general debate had come to an end for that particular meeting. Sometimes, when the dessert has been served, you think the meal is all over, but then a savoury is served. So I allowed the point of order as a kind of savoury.

6. I quite agree that as a precedent it is not very desirable and that we should make use of this exceptional procedure as little as possible. I hope that Members of the Assembly will lend me their co-operation by doing their best to conform to the rules indicated by the representative of Colombia.

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

SPEECHES BY MR. KISELEV (BYELORUSSIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC), MR. MONTERO DE VARGAS (PARAGUAY) AND MR. COSGRAVE (IRELAND)

7. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR, like other delegations whose representatives have already taken the floor, deems it necessary to express its views on the basic questions raised by the present international situation and on the work of the United Nations during the period under consideration.

8. Recent international developments have led to increased tension in relations between States. The armed aggression by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt must be regarded as one of these developments. In their statements the representatives of a whole series of countries have quoted many convincing facts by virtue of which the aggressors stand revealed to world public opinion in their true colours. Mr. Fawzi, the representative of Egypt, in his brilliant speech of 28 November 1956 during the general debate [*597th meeting*], gave us a moving description of the tragedy through which the Egyptian people is now living.

9. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR has already had an opportunity to express its views on the aggres-

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Session, Annexes, agenda item 54, document A/2402, para. 41.

sion carried out by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt; I shall therefore be brief.

10. As will be recalled, on 24 November 1956 the General Assembly by an overwhelming majority adopted a resolution in which it reiterated its call to the United Kingdom, France and Israel for the complete and immediate withdrawal of their forces from Egyptian territory. The question naturally arises: what have the Governments of the United Kingdom, France and Israel done to comply with this and earlier resolutions and when do they intend to withdraw their troops from Egyptian territory?

11. Unfortunately it must be noted that, in their statements here, the representatives of the United Kingdom, France and Israel have not answered this question clearly. Mr. Lloyd, the United Kingdom representative, who has made several statements from this rostrum, endeavoured to mislead the General Assembly, to deceive world public opinion and, by his deliberately incorrect interpretation of the word "immediately", to justify the continued presence of the armed forces of the aggressors on Egyptian territory. The statements of the United Kingdom, French and Israel representatives give the impression that the original plan of the Western Powers to remove the Suez Canal from Egyptian control and place it under international control in the form of an "association of canal users" or in some other form, is still in force.

12. Faced with the determined opposition of the Egyptian people, supported by all peace-loving nations, the aggressors suffered a setback. Now they are trying to achieve their ends indirectly. That is why the United Kingdom, France and Israel want the United Nations Emergency Force to be stationed throughout the Suez Canal zone and remain there until the plan for the "internationalization" of the Canal has been imposed upon Egypt. Our delegation considers that the General Assembly should not allow the Force to become a tool in the hands of the United Kingdom, France and Israel and a means of bringing pressure to bear on Egypt in connexion with the general settlement of the problems relating to the Suez Canal and the Arab-Israel dispute.

13. Speaking on 22 November 1956 in the general debate [589th meeting], Mr. Pineau, the representative of France, accused the Soviet Union of trying to hamper any settlement of the Suez problem and to aggravate the situation in the Middle East. This assertion by Mr. Pineau is a crude distortion of reality and is nothing more than slander directed against the Soviet Union. The whole world knows that it was the Soviet Union which consistently tried and is still trying to bring about the peaceful settlement of the Suez problem with due regard to the interests of Egypt and of the other States concerned. It is enough to recall the Soviet Union's efforts to find a generally acceptable procedure for the peaceful settlement of the Suez question, at the London Conference, in the Security Council and here in the General Assembly.

14. Speaking on 26 November, [595th meeting], Mr. Casey, the Australian representative, alleged that the nationalization of the Suez Canal by the Egyptian Government had in the final analysis led to war. According to Mr. Casey it would appear that the Egyptian Government is responsible for the outbreak of war, although we are all aware that those really responsible for the war are the United Kingdom, France and Israel. This is simply shifting the blame from the guilty to the innocent. Yet this is not the first time that Mr. Casey

has assumed the role of advocate for the most aggressive circles of the Western Powers.

15. The General Assembly should place full and entire responsibility for the situation in Egypt on the Governments of the United Kingdom, France and Israel, which, by their aggressive action, have shattered the peace and security of the Middle East and flagrantly violated the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

16. The Suez Canal rightly belonged, belongs and should belong to the Egyptian people.

17. It must be quite clear by now that any attempts to preserve colonial domination are doomed to failure. The United Nations should realize that tremendous changes have taken place in Asia and Africa during the post-war years and that a new situation has arisen.

18. The growth of the movement of national liberation is reflected even in the work of the United Nations. Proof of this is to be found in the fact that questions such as those of Algeria, Cyprus and West Irian have been submitted to the United Nations for consideration.

19. Peace-loving people throughout the world are impatiently waiting for international tension to be relaxed and the threat of another world war eliminated. The great responsibility of the United Nations to the peoples of the whole world compels us to set about solving the problems before it with great care and attention.

20. The representatives of Peru, Australia, Cuba and certain others who have spoken here, however, have a completely different approach—they are fanning the flames of hatred and enmity among peoples. In trying to bring the foreign policy of the Soviet Union into disrepute, they talked themselves into the absurd assertions that the peaceful deeds of the USSR and all the measures it has recently taken to relax international tension and improve relations between States are merely tactical manoeuvres and that the entire post-war history of the USSR betrays its aggressive intentions.

21. We all know that the task of strengthening peace and ensuring international security is for the Soviet Government not a matter of tactics or diplomatic manoeuvres but a corner-stone of foreign policy.

22. The Byelorussian people, like the peoples of other countries, vigorously reject all slanderous attacks on the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. And the Byelorussian delegation will continue to oppose any proposals to interfere in the internal affairs of Hungary. The task of solving the problems that have arisen in Hungary lies exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the Hungarian State.

23. Many representatives who have spoken in the general debate devoted great attention to the questions of reducing armaments and armed forces, prohibiting the production and use of atomic and hydrogen weapons and eliminating the threat of another war. It must be said that these problems are of prime importance among the outstanding international problems that at present perturb the peoples of the world. Throughout the entire post-war period the question of disarmament has been placed on the General Assembly's agenda and discussed year after year.

24. During these discussions there has, on more than one occasion, been a *rapprochement* between the views of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the USSR, but as can be seen by all, no agreement on this important problem has yet been reached. Ordinary people throughout the world naturally wonder why the disarmament problem remains unsolved.

25. In our opinion it has not been solved because in certain Western countries there are influential groups that do not desire a relaxation of international tension and stubbornly adhere to the bankrupt "from a position of strength" policy. These groups are counting on the perpetuation of the cold war, on a continued armaments race and on preparations for another world war.

26. I do not wish to be accused of making unfounded assertions and will therefore refer to specific examples. As the United Press agency reported on 23 February 1956, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization of the United States of America, Mr. Flemming, informed the United States Congress that the cold war could last for thirty to forty years and that the United States Government was making its plans accordingly. This statement shows what the ruling circles of the United States of America are dreaming about. The United States is not prepared to end the cold war.

27. I should also like to draw attention to the statements of highly-placed United States officials, especially military officials, who at regular intervals come forward with an apologia for war, the armaments race and nuclear weapons. Thus for example on 4 February 1956, Mr. Quarles, United States Secretary of the Air Force, stated at a conference on jet-age problems that the United States was prepared to use nuclear weapons in a local war as well as in a world war, and General Twining, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, stated on 28 January 1956 that the day is quickly drawing near when any conflict will involve the use of nuclear weapons.

28. These statements show that the military leaders of the United States intend to use nuclear weapons in local wars as well as in the third world war that they are planning.

29. It is well-known that all the time new military bases are being constructed round the peace-loving countries and that, as Mr. Brucker, the United States Secretary of the Army, said in February 1956 at a meeting of the National Press Club, the United States is actively helping to train 200 divisions in various countries. On 8 March 1956 the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives approved a bill for the appropriation of an additional \$2,000 million for the construction of 292 new military bases in foreign countries.

30. Military expenditures have been increased inordinately in a number of Western countries, diverting vast resources to non-productive purposes. This is particularly true in the case of the countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Since 1949 the military expenditure of the United States has increased almost four times and that of France three times. *The Times* of 9 March 1956 stated that the United Kingdom had spent £5,700 million sterling for military purposes over the last four years and that the country had not of course had sufficient resources for such expenditures. These are the facts and figures.

31. Mr. Belaúnde, the Peruvian representative, in his statement of 27 November 1956 during the general debate [597th meeting] took the liberty of stating that he had read with dismay the latest suggestion of the Soviet Union on disarmament. The fears aroused in Mr. Belaúnde by the Soviet Union's constructive new disarmament proposals are understandable because Mr. Belaúnde is the spokesman for Western monopolistic groups, which fear any kind of real disarmament as much as the devil fears holy water. For them the arma-

ments race is a most profitable business, pouring as it does a stream of gold into their coffers.

32. Mr. Martino, the representative of Italy, in his statement during the general debate, said that international events had seriously undermined international confidence. He added that:

"In order to smooth the path towards such agreement [on disarmament], which is eagerly awaited by all peoples, it is necessary that some specific action should be taken . . . to restore confidence." [588th meeting, para. 122.]

33. Mr. Martino's argument is not new. It was repeatedly advanced by the United States and the United Kingdom representatives when the disarmament question was being examined in the Disarmament Commission and the Disarmament Sub-Committee. In this connexion we would merely ask whether the aggression committed by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt does not constitute a serious blow to international confidence.

34. The Soviet Union, the main objective of whose foreign policy is to maintain and strengthen peace and to avert another world war, is exerting unremitting efforts in the United Nations to achieve a solution of the disarmament problem. It has given abundant tangible proof of its desire to solve, once and for all, the question of disarmament and the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, which is of vital importance to the peoples of all countries.

35. The Soviet Government, desiring to make a decisive contribution towards reducing and relaxing international tension and eliminating the threat of another war, recently took a number of practical steps in the field of disarmament. The most important of these is the Soviet Government's decision to reduce the armed forces of the USSR by almost two million men. The people's democracies have also reduced their armed forces. The Western Powers, however, did not follow the example of the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. The next move is therefore not up to the Soviet Union but the Western Powers, which should agree to reduce their armaments and armed forces and to renounce and completely prohibit the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons. The first step in this direction would be for the Western Powers to agree to stop testing nuclear weapons. Peace-loving peoples are waiting for these steps to be taken; they expect not words but deeds from the Western Powers.

36. The Byelorussian delegation fully supports the statement made by Mr. Shepilov, Chairman of the Soviet delegation. It wholeheartedly endorses the Soviet Government's proposals of 17 November 1956 on disarmament and the relaxation of international tension. These proposals reflect the ardent desire of the peoples of the Soviet Union to avert another world war, to strengthen peace and security throughout the world and to restore confidence and co-operation among states. Our delegation expresses the hope that the USSR proposals will be supported by the Member States of the United Nations, since they correspond to what all nations desire and are designed to strengthen peace and security throughout the world.

37. I should now like to say a few words about the situation in West Germany. This is a particular source of concern to us, because in the first half of the twentieth century Byelorussia was twice the victim of an invasion launched by German militarists and suffered enormous material and manpower losses. The Byelorussian people, as one of Germany's closest neighbours, cannot view

with indifference what is now happening in West Germany. Our people are vitally interested in averting another war in Europe and resolutely opposed to the rearmament of West Germany. We cannot remain indifferent to the law recently adopted by the *Bundestag* introducing universal military service in the Federal Republic of Germany. The adoption of this law paves the way for the creation of the largest army in Western Europe at a time when the Governments of many countries are trying to find specific means of achieving disarmament and when certain States have already reduced their armed forces.

38. The ruling circles of West Germany have embarked upon the same course as that taken by German Nazism. At this moment a new aggressive *Wehrmacht* is being formed, led by Hitlerite generals and made up of half a million men, with armoured and air force units; and the production of armaments is being increased considerably.

39. The Adenauer Government has already made detailed plans for the organization of the West German armed forces. According to the West German Press, steps are being taken to establish twelve divisions, which will later be increased to sixty.

40. West Germany will have an air force of about 2,500 modern aircraft. Plans are also being made to establish a navy consisting of 50,000 men at the outset, a figure which will later be increased. The task of creating an army is entirely in the hands of former fascist generals such as Heusinger, Kesselring, Manteuffel and Ramke, whose names are all too familiar to us.

41. It should also be noted that the armaments industry has been re-established in West Germany with the encouragement and assistance of the United States. In 1955, the country had over 40 factories and plants producing armaments. Persons who are well known to all and who financed Hitler's army and supplied it with weapons, namely Krupp, Schacht, Flick, Abs and others, have seized control of the West Germany economy. There is now much talk in West Germany of providing the newly-created army with atomic weapons.

42. Experience has taught us to be vigilant and not to sit idly by but to do everything in our power to ensure that Europe will never again be the scene of war. German imperialists and *revanchistes* following in Hitler's footsteps should be given due notice that the peace-loving peoples will never again allow West Germany to become a hotbed of war in Europe.

43. The elimination of artificial barriers to the expansion of international trade would considerably strengthen friendly relations between States and promote their peoples' welfare. The Economic and Social Council, as we know, has the duty to consider means of fostering international trade, to promote the industrialization of the under-developed countries, and the development of their national economies and to examine ways of raising levels of employment and levels of living. The Council has certainly done some useful work in this field. It has, for example, begun to pay greater attention to economic conditions in under-developed countries and has set up a commission on international commodity trade.

44. At the same time it should be noted that the Economic and Social Council has not yet taken any constructive steps to promote unhampered international trade on the basis of mutual economic advantage. It has not done enough to promote international economic

co-operation based on the principle of equal rights, and has not always done all it should to defend the interests of the under-developed countries and to support their efforts to develop their national economies.

45. As is known, the Soviet Union has consistently tried to achieve broad economic co-operation with all countries regardless of their social systems. We have always believed that the peoples of different countries should share their production experience and scientific, artistic and technical achievements.

46. The United Nations should take steps to create favourable conditions for the development of unhampered international trade and economic co-operation among States. The illegal decision imposing an embargo on trade with the People's Republic of China must be repealed.

47. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers that the grant of technical assistance to economically under-developed countries can be a valuable means of supplementing those countries' own efforts to develop their national economies.

48. The Government of the Byelorussian SSR, for its part, has already contributed 800,000 roubles to the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance during the past few years.

49. We consider that in future a larger number of countries must be induced to provide such assistance by sending experts and offering fellowships for the purpose of training national cadres in the under-developed countries. This will promote international co-operation in the interchange of scientific and technical knowledge and production techniques, to the economically under-developed countries' undoubted benefit.

50. At every session of the General Assembly the Byelorussian delegation has advocated the creation of favourable conditions for unhampered international trade and economic co-operation on the basis of the principle of the equality of all the countries concerned. We have always attached great importance to efforts to extend international economic co-operation as an important factor in the peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems. The United Nations must condemn discrimination in economic relations and particularly in trade.

51. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR supports the Soviet delegation's proposal to convene a world economic conference in 1957 to discuss the further development of international trade and the setting up of an international trade organization within the framework of the United Nations. A conference of this kind would help to restore to normal the flow of international trade and would contribute towards the relaxation of international tension and the establishment of friendly relations between States.

52. International contacts play an important part in strengthening friendly relations between States and establishing international confidence. Meetings between statesmen of countries with different social and political systems and visits of parliamentary and other delegations and of tourists are no longer a rarity. We welcome the expansion of personal contacts and for our part are doing everything possible to enable more delegations and tourists from all countries of the world to visit our Republic. Suffice it to say that many delegations and tourists have recently visited the Byelorussian SSR; they were all given every opportunity to establish broad contacts with the population without any restrictions whatsoever, and everywhere they went

the Byelorussian people met them with great friendliness and hospitality.

53. We must not, however, rest on our laurels. The United Nations should help to develop contacts among people of different nations, encourage exchanges of parliamentary, social, scientific and business delegations and promote international tourism, festivals and sporting and theatrical events. The constructive value of these international contacts is that they will undoubtedly strengthen friendship among peoples, and as long as this friendship exists and develops, the forces of war will be kept in check.

54. The responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace and for the future of the world has never been so great as it is today. World public opinion expects the activities of the United Nations to be completely and fully in accordance with the noble purposes and principles of its Charter, which are designed to maintain universal peace and security.

55. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR, for its part, has at every session of the General Assembly vigorously supported and will in future support measures to develop international co-operation, to strengthen mutual understanding and confidence among States, to relax international tension and to promote peace throughout the world.

56. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR is confident that the General Assembly will discharge its duties and will make a worthy contribution to the noble cause of eliminating the threat of another world war and strengthening international peace and friendship.

57. Mr. MONTERO DE VARGAS (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): At its eleventh session the General Assembly is facing critical and difficult problems which demand our full attention. We have before us various matters which must be examined strictly in accordance with the terms of the Charter. My delegation will try to give its views on the most important of these matters so as to establish its position in regard to them.

58. First of all, let me refer to agenda items 66 and 67 which are being considered in plenary session.

59. Item 66 is entitled "Question considered by the first emergency special session of the General Assembly from 1 to 10 November 1956".

60. At this stage of the general debate, having studied the various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, we consider it our duty as a Member of this international Organization, to state emphatically that we wish to see all forces still on Egyptian soil other than those of the United Nations, leave Egypt as soon as possible.

61. We insist that it is the duty of the Israel forces to return to the lines established by the Armistice Agreement of 1949 and that the other countries which still have troops on Egyptian soil should likewise withdraw them. It is the duty of the Governments of the United Kingdom and France, as Member States responsible for safeguarding international peace and security, to take immediately whatever measures may be necessary to ensure that the withdrawal of their forces is carried out as quickly as possible.

62. Paraguay, a country which will brook no compromise where its sovereignty is concerned, is adamant in its position on this aspect of international law. We maintain that the sovereignty of a people ends where the sovereignty of other peoples begins. There can be no international excuse for non-national forces, with

the exception of the supervisory forces of the United Nations, where necessary and by agreement, to occupy the territory of a free and sovereign nation.

63. The history of Paraguay written in heroism, suffering and blood that our people may be worthy of the heritage of our forefathers, is a call to the present generation and even more to its rulers. Paraguay has always been and will always be a jealous defender of its sovereignty. As such it cannot but protest when the right of sovereignty which it claims for itself is denied to another country or to other peoples.

64. For that reason it has supported and voted in favour of all the resolutions proposed in this Assembly to secure the earliest possible withdrawal of the United Kingdom, French and Israel forces from Egyptian territory. Let us hope that the support we have given to the United Nations will help to bring about the withdrawal of those forces.

65. Once that objective has been attained, we are firmly convinced that the United Nations must make an all-out effort to resolve the serious and long-standing problem of the Middle East, not in part but in its entirety, for it is apparent that unless we can be sure of an atmosphere of calm we shall never have peace and security in that part of the world.

66. Paraguay reiterates its faith and its confidence in the United Kingdom, France, Israel and Egypt. We hope that those nations, traditional friends of Paraguay, will return to the path of international understanding and that under the auspices of the United Nations they will resolve their problems with justice and with renewed faith in the future of the world.

67. The other aspect of the Middle East conflict is the practical matter of clearing the Suez Canal, as envisaged in the General Assembly resolution of 24 November 1956 of which Canada, Colombia, the United States of America, India, Norway and Yugoslavia had been the sponsors. The resolution "notes with approval the progress so far made by the Secretary-General in connexion with arrangements for clearing the Suez Canal, as set forth in his report" and "authorizes the Secretary-General to proceed with the exploration of practical arrangements and the negotiation of agreements so that the clearing operations may be speedily and effectively undertaken".

68. My delegation has already explained its abstention in the voting on this matter, but we feel obliged to press our point once more with regard to the scope of the resolution. With the best will in the world we do not feel that the expense of clearing the Suez Canal can or should be shared pro-rated by the Member States. We wish to state here and now that Paraguay cannot contribute to those costs, either under its regular budget or as an extraordinary item. Our peculiar economic problems make it impossible for us to undertake a commitment of this nature. The Secretary-General indicates in his preliminary report [A/3376] that he is not yet prepared to suggest how those costs should be allocated among the Member States of the United Nations. We hope that with his great ability and wisdom he can help to work out a fair way of meeting the expense of clearing the Suez Canal. We want to see that vital international waterway back in operation as quickly as possible so as to relieve the difficult situation in which the many Canal users now find themselves. But, we repeat, the solution must be fair and equitable toward countries like my own which are not in a position to undertake such expenditure. It was for that reason that my delegation abstained in the voting.

69. I now turn to item 67, entitled "Question examined by the General Assembly at its second emergency special session from 4 to 10 November 1956". This item was considered at the second emergency special session under the title "The situation in Hungary". The bloody repression of the Hungarian people, the mass deportation of Hungary's youth, and the debates stirred by those brutal acts of aggression committed by the Soviet forces are still fresh in our minds.

70. Ever since this tragic episode was first discussed by the Security Council and subsequently by the General Assembly at its second emergency session, the delegation of Paraguay has given its support to all the resolutions calling for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary. The reaction to those recommendations has been a systematic campaign of repression by the armed forces of the Soviet Union. The campaign has now been extended to include the mass deportation of Hungarian youth, which is thus paying the penalty for the crime of having aspired to freedom. In the United Nations the whole civilized world has given voice to its sense of outrage. These halls have echoed the anguish of all mankind at the fate of the brave Hungarian people. The abhorrence and condemnation of the massacre and extermination carried out by the armies of the Soviet Union are reflected in the various resolutions approved by the General Assembly at its emergency special session and at the eleventh session.

71. Never before has the United Nations been so unified in its efforts as in the search for a solution to the problem of Hungary. The international community has made an urgent appeal for justice and freedom on behalf of an entire nation which had called upon the United Nations for help to secure the withdrawal of the army of the Soviet Union from Hungarian soil. The moral forces of the world spoke as one in support of the desire of the Hungarians to rid themselves of the oppression of Soviet armed might.

72. So far, the reiterated appeals of the United Nations have been met with strong silence; or rather, the answer has been the slaughter and extermination of the Hungarian people. Occupation of Hungarian soil has meant savage repression, massacre and deportation. This is the outcome of the ruthless policy of the Soviet Union, a Member State of the United Nations and a country responsible, as a member of the Security Council, for peace, tranquillity, justice and security throughout the world.

73. The only praiseworthy aspect of the situation is the assistance being given by the United Nations to the thousands of Hungarian refugees who have been able to leave their country in search of help and a better life. Those who have remained in Hungary could also be assisted by the United Nations; but there are still many obstacles to be overcome in that direction. Let us hope that the Secretary-General will be able to obtain facilities, not from the Hungarian people but from the Soviet Union, to carry out this humanitarian work.

74. This is a suitable opportunity to express once more our profound sympathy for the brave people of Hungary in their misfortune, and to repeat that Paraguay supports unconditionally and without reservation their desire to be a free and sovereign nation with a Government of their own express choice.

75. With regard to agenda item 22 concerning the regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of armed forces and armaments, my delegation will support any

measure adopted with a view to bringing about world disarmament based on justice, logic and the balance of forces, but always under strict international control. We are keen advocates of disarmament, because the world needs peace and tranquillity. On this we are in agreement. It is only with regard to the way of bringing it about that there are differences of opinion.

76. We advocate as a first step the establishment of an international control organ which is to guarantee in advance the disarmament measures to be taken later. Unlimited aerial photography control should also be established prior to any agreement on the suspension of nuclear bomb tests or the destruction of already existing stockpiles of such weapons.

77. The Soviet Union has submitted new proposals for disarmament [A/3366, para. 26]. First of all, the Soviet Union proposes the reduction of armed forces to specific figures within two years and recommends that armaments be reduced accordingly.

78. Secondly, it proposes that within the two-year period the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons should be effected together with the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons, the prohibition of their use, the complete destruction of stockpiles of these weapons and their removal from the armaments of States; and that as a first step, tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons should be discontinued forthwith.

79. The third proposal provides that the armed forces of the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France stationed in the territory of Germany should be reduced by one-third during 1957, with the establishment of the appropriate control over this reduction.

80. In its fourth proposal, the Soviet Union recommends that a considerable reduction in the armed forces of the United States, the United Kingdom and France stationed in the territory of the countries participating in NATO should be effected during 1957, and of the armed forces of the Soviet Union stationed in the territory of the Warsaw Treaty countries.

81. Under the fifth proposal, foreign military, naval and air bases in the territory of other States would be liquidated within two years.

82. The sixth proposal prescribes that the military expenditures of States should be reduced in the course of two years in conformity with the reduction of armed forces and armaments, the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and the liquidation of foreign military bases in the territory of other States.

83. Finally, the seventh proposal provides that, for supervision of the fulfilment of the disarmament obligations assumed by States, strict and effective international control should be established, with all the rights and functions necessary for these purposes. It goes on to say that "In order to prevent a surprise attack upon one State by another, control posts should be set up on a basis of reciprocity at large ports, railway junctions, motor highways and airfields, which will see to it that no dangerous concentration of armed forces and armaments occurs".

84. All these phrases are well known to the Western world. The Soviet Union has never consented to the prior establishment of an international organ, before the study of disarmament itself is taken up. This is the difference between what the two groups—West and East—would like to see. For the West, such a guarantee is essential, since it is only thus that a relative state of peace can be attained.

85. My delegation maintains that unless this organ for strict control is set up in advance, any disarmament promises or programmes submitted are nothing more than calculated propaganda.

86. The only new element in the disarmament programme now submitted by the Soviet Union is the acceptance in a limited form, of aerial photography control. This would apply, however, only to certain areas and would not have the scope of President Eisenhower's plan, which calls for the inspection of the entire territory of the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

87. The Soviet proposal for limited inspection does indicate an important shift in the attitude of the Soviet Union, since it formerly opposed the basic principle of President Eisenhower's plan. Let us hope that this shift may prove auspicious for the later study of the matter.

88. Turning to agenda item 27 concerning economic development of under-developed countries, my delegation considers it imperative to reach agreement as quickly as possible on the establishment of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development. It is our understanding that this body would in future carry out the plans drawn up and at present handled by the Technical Assistance Board. Once the under-developed countries have gone through the preparatory phase which technical assistance is designed to make possible, they will come up against difficulties in their schemes for establishing or improving their economic and social infrastructure.

89. We are definitely of the opinion that the Special Fund should begin its work by concentrating on the infrastructure, and then go on to other aspects of development or plans for industrial and agricultural production. In principle we agree that the Fund should begin its work with an initial capital of \$200 million to \$250 million, made up of voluntary contributions, in addition to the capital which will be diverted to it, in accordance with the resolution approved by the General Assembly, once an adequate programme of world disarmament has been put into operation.

90. With regard to the type of currency in which contributions should be made, we reserve the right to express our point of view when the time comes.

91. We consider that the Fund should be able to make grants and especially long-term, low-interest loans. We agree that the Fund should be an autonomous body functioning independently within the framework of the United Nations and co-operating closely with the various bodies.

92. We are convinced that the United Nations should give its utmost attention to this problem, the reason being that the improvement of living standards is essential if international peace and security are to be strengthened.

93. We now come to item 26 of the agenda concerning *programmes of technical assistance*. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to express its full satisfaction with the technical assistance offered by the United Nations and its specialized agencies, supplemented by the Expanded Programme.

94. For the under-developed countries the work done by the United Nations has been strikingly effective, inasmuch as it has gone hand-in-glove with the efforts of those countries themselves. In my country in particular, it has given new impetus to the programmes which were being planned for the immediate and more remote future. The training of new technicians and the

teaching of modern methods have made it possible to deal with economic, social and health problems in a manner more in keeping with the needs of the various countries and regions of the world.

95. Paraguay has always contributed its share to the technical assistance programme and will continue to do so, being convinced that the combined efforts of that programme and of the individual countries themselves will substantially improve the living standards of the needy peoples of the world.

96. We come now to items 56, 57 and 59. They concern the question of amending the United Nations Charter, to increase the number of non-permanent members of the Security Council, and to increase the membership of the Economic and Social Council, and the question of amending Article 2 of the statute of the International Law Commission to increase the membership of the Commission. The delegation of Paraguay will fully support these items, the more so as it co-sponsored their inclusion in the provisional agenda of the eleventh session. We did so because we felt that if new Members were to be admitted to the United Nations they must be given the opportunity to contribute the fruits of their culture and civilization to help to strengthen the Organization by their participation in the various Councils.

97. The goal of the United Nations is the well-being, security and happiness of all peoples; and we believe that all Member States must be given equal opportunities if those ends are to be achieved.

98. We are sure that an increase in the membership of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, and the inclusion in those bodies of the new Members of the United Nations, will do much to increase the prestige of our Organization.

99. In conclusion, on behalf of the people, the Government and the President of Paraguay, we reiterate our deep faith in the work of the United Nations and the high purposes it is pursuing with vigour and determination.

100. Mr. COSGRAVE (Ireland): Mr. President, I should first like to join the other speakers who have expressed the satisfaction which your well-deserved election to the Presidency of this Assembly has given to us all.

101. As this debate proceeds, I think that ordinary people throughout the world are becoming more and more conscious of the terrible dangers which hang over us. During the past six months extraordinary events have followed fast upon each other at a tempo which no one on any side seems able to predict or control. These events appear to be swept along by two great currents. The first current is the movement for freedom which is stirring peoples everywhere throughout the old overseas empires. The second current is the movement for freedom among the peoples which endure the twentieth century form of imperialism under various forms of Soviet domination.

102. Both of these currents are tremendously powerful because their source is the eternal and insuppressible desire of men and nations for freedom. No one who loves freedom, no one who respects the dignity of man can say that he wishes these movements did not exist. True, the world would be a quieter place if that were the case, but its quietness would be the quietness of the prison or of the grave.

103. At the same time, it would be folly not to recognize that these movements and the counter-movements

to which they give rise may be a source of danger and will test to the uttermost the statesmanship of all who are in positions of power. I refer here not only to those who control the destinies of the great Powers, but to those who rule the smaller newly-enfranchised States. In both cases, the common interest of us all, the preservation of world peace, enjoins policies of prudence and forbearance.

104. We are in the presence at the moment of a tragic example of what happens in a dispute where these virtues have not been conspicuously exercised on either side. I refer to the case of Egypt. Egypt is a country for which my country has traditional friendly feelings. Ireland applauded Egypt's struggle for freedom and rejoiced when it attained full sovereignty. We sympathized profoundly with Egypt in its recent struggle against the superior might of three invaders. We deplored and condemned the Anglo-French attack against Egypt both as a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and as a grave political blunder.

105. At the same time, one cannot help feeling that this terrible crisis, so heavy with consequences for Egypt and for the world, need never have arisen if the Government of Egypt had used its newly-won sovereignty with greater moderation and realism. The consequences for Egypt of attempting to encompass the destruction of Israel and of nationalizing the Suez Canal Company so abruptly have been extremely grave. I do not mean merely that these acts brought on the Anglo-French attack. I mean that they led to something which may in the long run prove more dangerous to Egypt than was that strange and brief foray. The more dangerous consequence is that Egypt has been brought to rely on Soviet arms and Soviet aid. We do not know exactly to what extent Egypt has yet invoked or is now invoking such aid. Whatever the extent, I hope, and I am sure that most of us in this Assembly hope, that there is yet time for Egypt to draw back from this dangerous involvement. I should like to ask the representative of Egypt, who has pleaded his country's cause in this Assembly with such dignity and moving eloquence, to note the feelings on this matter of a traditionally friendly and firmly anti-imperialist country.

106. We feel that Egypt's new-found friends may be more dangerous to its freedom than were its recent foes. I may perhaps be permitted to cite an example from the history of my own country. There was once an Irish prince who, for reasons affecting his personal prestige and honour, decided to invoke the military aid of friends from across the sea. His friends came very quickly, but it took us more than seven hundred years to induce them to depart again. That prince's name has gone down in our history as Diarmuid na nGall—Dermot of the Foreigners. That is not the sort of appellation, and not the sort of place in history, that so noteworthy a patriot as President Nasser would wish to earn. I find it hard to believe, therefore, that he—or for that matter, his Syrian neighbours—would incur the responsibility of deliberately drawing into their affairs a foreign Power whose terrible record is known to everyone.

107. As a result of unnecessary provocation, followed by excessive and ill-conceived retaliation, the world is now faced with a menacing crisis in the Middle East. The newly-independent peoples, especially in the Arab world, naturally felt outraged by the Anglo-French action. They felt that it was motivated, in part at least, by a residue of the old imperialist spirit. They felt that

it constituted a threat to their own hard-won freedom. In my country, we can easily understand those feelings and, indeed, we share them to a great extent. This action alarmed every small nation and, no doubt, many large ones also; it spread a sense of insecurity throughout the world; it shook the confidence of those in many lands who had considered England and France to be defenders of the rule of law and of the Charter of the United Nations. In this way, it brought about a rift among the free nations, a crack in the defences of peace and freedom, which it will take much time and patience to repair.

108. Conscious of all that, and deeply deploring it, I hope none the less that we may be forgiven if we urge certain other facts on the attention of those Arab and Asian lands which have been so incensed by the invasion of Egypt that they tend to minimize other dangers. Those peoples should surely not lose sight of the fact that England and France did, after all, heed this Assembly's resolution for a cease-fire; that they have, at least, begun a withdrawal of their forces from Egypt and that they are pledged to withdraw these forces entirely as soon as the United Nations is in a position to take over. The Governments of Britain and France, which reacted in this way when they found that their action met with general disapproval, are Governments which are accessible, and eventually amenable, to public opinion: public opinion in their own countries and public opinion in the world at large.

109. A very different and darker picture meets us if we turn to the other political storm centre of the world. In Hungary, the Soviet Union has paid no attention at all to the resolutions of this Assembly. Far from accepting a cease-fire, it used its enormous military power with absolute ruthlessness to crush the Hungarian people. It seems indifferent to the public opinion of the world, and its own people are bewildered and silent, or can only find expression in mysterious and devious ways which baffle our comprehension. Its representatives and its pro-consuls who claim to represent other countries have come to this rostrum day after day and have recited blandly and imperturbably, and at great length, their mendacious version of the events in Hungary. They do not even trouble to make their story plausible because what they rely on is, in reality, not argument, but sheer brute force. I should have thought that the representatives of countries which have undergone imperialist rule would have been the first to recognize Soviet actions and words for what they are: an instance of the colonial method and outlook in its most arrogant and ruthless phase. This is true even in detail. The representative of India, who is learned in history, will recall, for example, one technique of nineteenth century imperialism which we have now seen revived by the Soviet Union representative. That technique was to refute allegations of atrocities by solemnly reading out affirmations from your own local colonial officials that they had seen no such atrocities. The Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union stood at this rostrum the other day and read out dispatches from station-masters who, very naturally, said that they had seen no deportations. They were not free to say anything else. How is it possible not to hear in that reply the authentic accents of the worst kind of colonialism? How is it possible not to recognize in the Soviet Union Government the legitimate heir of the old imperialism at its most aggressive?

110. It is of tremendous importance for the peace of the world that the true nature of Soviet imperialism

should be clearly recognized while there is yet time. There are some encouraging signs that such a recognition is growing; such signs have been visible, indeed, during the present session of this Assembly. But that recognition should now inspire a search for a speedy, just and lasting solution of the Middle East problems. As regards Egypt, it is not enough to affirm that Anglo-French troops should get out. It is also essential to secure that the Soviet Union will not move in. It is surely not in the interest of the Arab peoples, any more than of the rest of the free world, that the power which governs Hungary should install itself in the Middle East. It is surely not in the interest of the Arab peoples, or of humanity as a whole, that the Middle East should become the theatre of an armed conflict between the great Powers. But if these calamities are to be avoided, new attitudes are needed.

111. I speak here with a certain hesitation, because I do not wish to put my own country forward as endowed with some peculiar intuition into what should be the right solution for all these complex problems. There are many nations represented here which have a much more detailed knowledge of these problems than we can have. But we have a historical background which may, perhaps, qualify us to make a relevant intervention in this matter.

112. Ireland is unique in that it is the only Western European country which has the long experience of having been treated as a colony—not just of having been temporarily occupied during a war, but of having been governed, during many generations, by a foreign country whose rule our people rejected and strove to shake off. The Foreign Minister of Tunisia referred to that fact in a very friendly fashion from this rostrum the other day.

113. Now, a Western country which has undergone foreign rule has, perhaps, a claim to understand something of the psychology of the two sides in the Middle East disputes. I hope, therefore, that, without offence and without presumption, I have addressed an appeal to both contestants.

114. To the British and French, I would appeal to make an effort at comprehension, to understand that, having done what they have done, they are not in a position to arbitrate in this region; to understand that their continued presence in Egypt is a provocation which may well bring on the very evils which it is intended to avert. As long as they are there, their presence will be a reminder both of a detested colonial past and of a very recent attempt to coerce an Arab country. Their presence there inflames the most dangerous emotions throughout the Arab lands. It supplies the Soviet propaganda machine with excellent and sorely needed ammunition. It gives the most reckless extremists their opening, and it silences the voices of those moderate men who see the new and terrible danger that is hanging over the Middle East. At the same time, it weakens the understanding and the unity which should prevail among the Western Powers in the face of the common and constant threat. For all these reasons, it is vitally important that England and France should implement this General Assembly's resolutions by withdrawing as promptly as possible.

115. As for the Egyptians and their friends in the Arab world, I would ask them not to let their understandable resentment blind them to some hard facts which, if ignored, may plunge them and the world into catastrophe. One such fact is that the Suez Canal is not just an Egyptian interest, not just an imperialist

interest; it is a world interest. The true users of the Canal are not just the Powers that own the shipping that passes through the Canal—in that connexion, the ill-starred Suez Canal Users Association was something of a misnomer. The true users of the Canal are the ordinary men and women everywhere who buy the tea or burn the oil that passes through the Canal. Life will be a little harder for these people as long as the Canal is blocked. Life is harder, for example, in my own country. The Irish people had no say in the events that led to the blocking of the Canal, but now that the Canal is blocked, they have to pay. They pay in the form of increased living costs. I may add that they have no intention of paying again by contributing to the cost of clearance. Representatives of other countries which had no hand in these events have made their position clear in that matter, and my delegation agrees with them. But, in the meantime, the blockage of the Canal sends up the cost of living for a great part of the world's population.

116. It is, therefore, urgent that the Canal should be reopened and kept open. I believe that the Egyptian authorities are conscious of the Canal's importance to the world, not just to a group of colonial Powers, and that they always meant to keep it open. It would not be blocked now had it not been for the rash intervention of England and France.

117. But the best earnest that the Egyptian authorities can give of their sincerity in this matter is to co-operate now in the rapid clearance of the Canal. It does not help their cause to impede this clearance or to treat the Canal as a sort of hostage in a reprisal policy against England and France. That is a mistaken policy because the Canal is of great importance to many other countries which are friendly to Egypt. On behalf of one such country, I appeal to the Egyptian authorities to reconsider their attitude in this matter and to co-operate in clearing the Canal. In that way, they can best reassure their friends and disarm their enemies; in that way, they can best avert the danger of further intervention in their affairs, from the East as well as from the West; in that way, they can best ensure that the eventual settlement of the status of the Canal will be one that absolutely respects Egyptian sovereignty.

118. The other grave question which keeps the Middle East in turmoil is, of course, the question of Israel. I can understand the feelings of the Arab world at the way in which the State of Israel came into being. I can understand the passions aroused by the plight of the Arab refugees from Palestine.

119. I have no wish to take sides or even to purport to mediate in the questions at issue between Israel and its neighbours.

120. I may say in parenthesis that my delegation's seat in this Assembly, by the fortune of the alphabet, is between Israel and Iraq, and I sometimes feel that our presence in that place is a small but real Irish contribution to the cause of peace.

121. Whatever we think of these questions, we must agree that it is in the interests of Israeli and Arab alike, and of us all, that a settlement should be reached, and quickly. The existence of a state of war, even a nominal state of war, between Israel and its neighbours constitutes a standing invitation for any great Power that wants to intervene. It also furnishes a standing stock of pretexts for such intervention. But, if the state of war is to be ended, Israel's neighbours, while they press for a just solution of the outstanding problems,

must be ready to accept as a fact the existence of Israel and must renounce their projects for the destruction of that country.

122. Here again I may perhaps venture a comparison with my own country. In Ireland we have also a grave problem: the problem of partition. The great majority of Irish men and women desire their country to be united under its own freely elected government, but, as a result of tactics resembling in some ways those that were taking place in Palestine at about the same time, Ireland was divided, and today six of its counties remain under British rule. We are determined that that situation shall be ended. We are determined that the unity of Ireland shall be achieved, but we are equally determined, as all our leaders have made clear, to achieve that end by peaceful means.

123. I am quite sure that, if we had decided to pursue a policy of violence in this matter, help and encouragement from a certain quarter would not be lacking. Communists in many countries—in Britain itself not least—have loudly declared their sympathy with Ireland's demand for unity. We know well what that sympathy means. They hope to exploit one more source of division in the free world. We do not want their sympathy any more than we want their guns. We do not want any form of assistance from them at all. We know that to invite such assistance would be to bring down on our people untold miseries and horrors.

124. We did not need the terrible example of Hungary to show us what to expect. We knew it already. We know that if we obtained Irish unity with Soviet support what kind of unity that would be. We do not want to see the day when the representative of an Ireland united but enslaved would have to speak at this tribune as the unfortunate man who calls himself the representative of Hungary has had to speak during these last days.

125. I would respectfully ask the representatives of the Arab countries to consider whether the same line of reasoning may not be to some extent applicable to their own case. People who solve a problem with Communist aid are apt to find that the solution is very much worse than the problem was.

126. It is a source of very great satisfaction to all of us that the United Nations has been able to play a useful part in this menacing crisis. It may not be too much to say that, were it not for the United Nations, humanity might today be plunged into the horrors of a third world war. This Assembly's resolution for a cease-fire in Egypt was heeded by the Powers concerned, and the immediate danger of a general conflict receded. Some people have asserted that this Assembly serves no useful purpose. I do not see how, in the face of these recent facts, anyone can continue to hold that position. Not only has the United Nations managed to bring about a cease-fire but it is now helping to ensure the departure of the invaders and thus to create the first condition for a lasting peace.

127. The United Nations Emergency Force, created under the able and imaginative guidance of the Secretary-General, may prove to be a turning-point in the history of the Middle East and of the world. We all hope so, and we hope that this device of a multi-national police force, implementing a resolution of this Assembly, may prove its worth in other critical areas. I do not, of course, refer to situations in which a large-scale military effort may be required, as in Korea, but to situations calling for a limited police action.

128. However, it is difficult for certain countries, even when they would like to give effect to a resolution of the Assembly, to participate in such actions at short notice. There are sometimes legal, as well as administrative, difficulties to be overcome. I should like to support the suggestion, which has been made before in this Assembly in a different context and which some representatives have raised again in the present debate, that Member States might consider placing some units of their defence forces on such a footing that they could quickly co-operate in an action of this kind. There would, of course, be no obligation on any Member to supply such a contingent, but it would be useful if Members generally were in a position to do so in cases where their Governments wished to act following a resolution of this Assembly.

129. In the case of the Egyptian crisis, the record of the United Nations is so far a favourable and encouraging one. As we all know, there are other problems, other critical areas, which give us no such evidence of progress or achievement—I must state that, when I looked down the long agenda of this eleventh session of the Assembly and compared it with the agendas and with the records of previous sessions, I became depressed. For a moment I had a vision of this Organization as a kind of political Sargasso Sea to which all the unsolved problems of the world seemed to drift, there to revolve forever in a whirlpool of unheeded resolutions. Unfair and distorted though such a vision may be, it does nonetheless evoke a real danger.

130. A debate in this Assembly is no solution to a problem. At the very most, such a debate can do no more than apply a certain moral pressure, the effects of which will be felt in later negotiations between the parties to the dispute. I do not underestimate the potentialities of such moral pressure—it can in certain situations be a very powerful influence indeed—but it has its limitations. One is that, if the same matter is debated here year after year, with no result except reiterated and fruitless resolutions, the moral authority of this Assembly suffers not only in relation to that matter but generally.

131. Another and more important limitation to the power of moral pressure is that, the more outrageously a Member State behaves and the more it deserves the moral condemnation of this Assembly, the less attention it is likely to pay to any kind of moral pressure at all. Because of that fact, this Assembly sometimes appears more apt to put pressure on countries that pay some heed to its resolutions than to consider the most flagrantly evil actions of powers which seem impervious to public opinion.

132. If Egypt comes to our mind when we think about the potentialities of the United Nations for good, the name of another country rises unbidden when we are forced to contemplate the tragic limitations of this Assembly's influence. The shadow of Hungary lies over this debate. We have not been able to save Hungary. We have not been able to check the deportations that still continue there. We have not even been allowed to send observers.

133. In the presence of that tragedy, I do not suppose there is anyone among the delegations of the free world that does not feel a painful sense of inadequacy and failure. We have adopted our resolutions condemning these acts, as it was our duty to do, but we cannot feel any elation at that fact, since our resolutions have been treated with contempt.

134. The best we may feel is that these debates, and especially the Communists' contributions to them, have done something to enlighten the so-called, non-committed countries about the real nature of the Soviet system. We may feel also that the reaction of this Assembly, and in particular of these non-committed nations, has been noted by the Soviet rulers and may influence them in the future to avoid displays of force against their satellites, and even to make some concessions in order to avoid the open use of force. That may be so—it may even prove in the long run to be of considerable importance—but at present it can bring no aid or comfort to the Hungarian people. The most we have been able to do has been to bring some small measure of relief by sending emergency supplies of food and medicines to Hungary and also by welcoming the refugees.

135. My own country is playing its part in that work. Our people, who have been very deeply moved by the Hungarian tragedy, have subscribed to a fund, which is still open, the sum of £57,000 sterling. We have also indicated our willingness to receive up to 1,000 Hungarian refugees, of whom the first groups have now begun to arrive.

136. Perhaps the best lesson the free nations can draw from the events in Hungary is to resolve that the power which perpetrated such things must not be allowed under any pretext whatever to extend its domain or its influence. I believe that it is in that spirit that the free nations should approach the disputes that exist among themselves. More than that, it is in that spirit, which is necessarily a spirit of conciliation, a spirit of solidarity among the non-Communist people, that the colonial Powers should confront the irresistible movement of the so-called dependent countries towards freedom.

137. It has been something of a fashion in imperial countries recently to equate independence movements in the colonies with communism. It is true that Communists always try to exploit such movements, whether in Cyprus or in Algeria or elsewhere. But the real way, the safe way and the sure way, to defeat communism in these countries is to come to prompt and reasonable terms with the legitimate, national independence movements. The later such a settlement is left, the greater the Communist danger grows. A great legist once expounded an important phase of human history in terms of an evolution from status to contract, from the fixed and unchangeable position of the serf to the position of the free man, bound only by agreements freely negotiated and capable of adjustment. This process of free

and responsible negotiation is the life process of liberty, not only for men but for nations. It must be made possible for the peoples who are not yet free to move towards liberty through such freely negotiated agreements. Agreements of this kind are formed steps in the kind of orderly advance by which the transition to freedom can best and most safely be carried out. Through such agreements, for example, after years of struggle, we in Ireland obtained freedom for the greater part of our island. Through such agreements in the future we are confident that we shall obtain the freedom of the entire country. Such a progress in our case, or in any similar case, can be achieved by negotiation based upon reasonable recognition by both sides of their common interest in finding a peaceful solution to their problem.

138. The debates and resolutions of this Assembly may prepare the way for such negotiations, but they cannot serve as a substitute for them. This Organization is not a super-State. We should not expect it to be a kind of god from the machine which can resolve all problems. It may help to avert disasters when negotiation has failed, but the first duty of responsible men who have to deal with the particular problem is to see that negotiation shall not fail. It is of a crucial importance to the free world that the spirit of moderation, which is essential to successful negotiation, should inform the actions of political men, especially in relation to colonial problems. Moderate statesmen, who act with courage, who are not intimidated by their own extremists, they are wise men who do much to save the free world by making it more fully deserve that name. There is a terrible example from an earlier phase of our civilization of what can happen when moderate men are coerced against their better judgement into a rash and impetuous course. In ancient Athens, in an evil hour, the counsels of extremists, of jingoists, and of chauvinists—as we should call them now—prevailed, and Athens launched the fatal expedition against Syracuse. The consequence of that expedition was the ruin, not alone of Athens, but of the whole Hellenic world—of civilization itself as it was then known.

139. It is a sobering thought that the recent Anglo-French adventure in Egypt might quite possibly have had an equivalent result. That thought should incite us not to vain recriminations but to renewed effort under divine Providence to adjust our differences—the differences that divide the free world—by rational negotiation in a spirit of Christian charity.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.