PART III

OTHER MATTERS

A. ATOMIC ENERGY

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN DEVELOPING THE PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

[In December 1953, President Eisenhower of the United States, in an address to the General Assembly, proposed the setting up of an international agency in order to develop peaceful uses of atomic energy. After consultations with Australia, Belgium, Canada, South Africa and the United Kingdom, the United States requested in 1954 that the General Assembly include in its agenda an item entitled "International co-operation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy."

On December 4, 1954, the Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution expressing the hope that the agency would soon be established, and requesting the Secretary-General to organise an international conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy was held in Geneva from 8 to 20 August 1955, with Dr. Homi J. Bhabha, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission of India, as President.

During discussion at the tenth session of the General Assembly in 1955, several resolutions were proposed on the convening of further international conferences and on the establishment of the proposed agency. India participated actively in the discussions and, along with other States, submitted two resolutions. After discussion, the Assembly unanimously adopted, on December 3, 1955, resolution 912(X) covering both matters. It decided inter alia that all States members of the United Nations and its specialised agencies would be invited to the conference to adopt the statue of the International Atomic Energy Agency.]

Statement in the First Committee of the General Assembly, November 17, 1954

(Summary)

Mr. Menon (India) stated that the reaction of his delegation to the plan presented by President Eisenhower on December 8, 1953, had been made known very soon after that speech had been delivered. Subsequently, on May 10, 1954, the Prime Minister of India, speaking in the Indian Parliament, had welcomed President Eisenhower's approach to the question...

The problem of the peaceful uses of atomic energy was of great importance, and it would create great changes in the economic and also, perhaps, political relations of the world. It was therefore absolutely necessary that it should be considered with objectivity and without emotion. The lack of emotion on the part of the Indian delegation should not be construed as a lack of enthusiasm for the proposal. While welcoming the proposal, the Prime Minister of India had already stated that the use of atomic energy was far more important for a country like India than it might be for other advanced countries.

The pattern of the current debate was that each delegation stated its position, its achievements, its resources and its desire to join in the effort to evolve a scheme for the peaceful utilisation of atomic energy. With regard to the joint draft resolution, there was a general willingness to accept the intentions of the sponsors and to wait to see how the details outlined in the draft resolution would be presented in the course of the debate.

Mr. Menon stated that in India there was fortunately no resistance of a mental or institutional character to scientific research. The notion that there was no difference between mass and energy which, from the point of view of actual reaction and approach, was perhaps revolutionary to the Western world, was not so to the Oriental mind. A child in India would speak of matter and energy as the same. Therefore the educated strata of his country were almost predisposed to adopt that approach. Moreover, the tradition of scientific investigation in India went back thousands of years. There had been a continuous spirit of scientific inquiry, the origin of which was lost in the remoteness of time. The system of writing numbers had been known to Indian civilisation many thousands of years before.

Mr. Menon enumerated the main contributions of ancient Indian scientists in the field of mathematics. The Indian mathematicians had also been the first to use the letters of the alphabet to denote unknowns, which had contributed to the advance of algebra. Mr. Menon then reviewed the contributions made by Indian scientists in the realm of physics. He added that translations and interpretations of ancient Indian writings in Sanskrit showed that the Indian scientists in those times had been familiar with the concept of motion, both atomic and molecular, as underlying the physical phenomena of sound, light and heat.

Mr. Menon then traced the progress of Indian scientific thought until the time that India came into contact with the industrial civilisation of the West. In 1784, the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal had been established, which had started a resurgence, and modern scientific methods had received an impetus in India. As a result of that, a number of scientific institutions had been established and considerable advance had been made in scientific research in various fields.

The emergence of an independent India in 1947 had given further impetus to the establishment of new institutions for carrying on research in the various fields of

science. The two most important of India's institutions were the Indian Institute of Science at Bangalore and the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research at Bombay. The Institute at Bangalore was associated with the name of Sir Chandrasekhara Venkata Raman, the discoverer of what was known as the Raman ray and the Raman effect. The revolutionary discovery in 1928 of the Raman lines had been of the greatest importance for molecular research. Beside Raman, other Indian scientists, prominent among whom were Dr. Saha, Dr. Kothari, Dr. Bose, Sir Kariamanikkam Srinivasa Krishnan, and Dr. Bhabha, had also made important contributions to scientific research in the atomic field.

In 1948, the Indian Parliament had passed the Atomic Energy Act for the development and control of atomic energy. As a result of the passage of that Act, an Atomic Energy Commission had been established in August 1948 under the chairmanship of Dr. Bhabha. The Commission was directly responsible to the Prime Minister of India. The functions of the Commission included the promotion and control of research in nuclear sciences and the survey and development of the mineral and other resources of the country which might be of use in the production of atomic energy. The research programme of the Commission was being carried out at the Tata Institute and several other institutions. Mr. Menon then quoted from a book by Mr. Gordon Dean,[1] former Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, in which it was stated that, among the nations in Asia, India had the largest and most advanced atomic energy programme, that India had made considerable progress in recent years in cosmic ray research, that it had the world's richest deposits of monazite, which contained thorium, and that, under the leadership of some very able scientists, India was making a determined effort to keep itself informed about nuclear research developments all over the world.

The Indian Government was fully aware that no great advance could be made in the field of atomic research by having only a few well-known scientists, and it had therefore established a number of well-provided and well-staffed laboratories where research could be carried on by younger scientists. Similarly, most of the Indian universities were receiving grants from the Government or from public institutions for the encouragement of nuclear research. As a result, there were today in Indian universities 96,000 students being trained in scientific study and research and 116,000 in technical projects.

Describing India's atomic energy resources, Mr. Menon stated that very big deposits of low-grade uranium ore had already been found in various parts of the country. In addition, there were monazite reserves estimated at over one million tons, containing over 0.3 per cent uranium. Uranium-bearing belts had also been discovered in eastern and central India. To stimulate the mining of uranium by private concerns, the Atomic Energy Commission had offered to buy all stocks of uranium ore. As a further incentive, rewards were offered for the discovery of

[1] Dean, Gordon, *Report on the atom; what you should know about the atomic energy program of the United States*, Knopf, New York, 1953.

new deposits, and grants-in-aid were given for mine development. The government geologists also gave advice to private prospectors and samples of ore brought by them were analysed free of charge. The Indian Rare Earths Ltd. was also exploiting other material resources in that field. The Raw Material Division of the Atomic Energy Commission was also carrying out extensive survey and drilling operations for atomic minerals.

A plant with a capacity of 3,000 tons of monazite per annum had been set up in 1952 in southern India and another plant to process thorium and uranium to commercial purity was also in an advanced stage of construction and would be in operation in 1955.

The Indian Atomic Energy Commission laid great stress on the application of its work to the population as a whole and to the development of applied science. It had added a biological and medical research department, which was working in close co-operation with the Indian Cancer Research Centre. The application of atomic energy to agriculture was also in progress.

India had made considerable progress in cosmic ray research, for which its geographical position was particularly favourable. A major development in that field had been the establishment of a laboratory at Gulmarg, in Kashmir, 9000 feet above sea level; other research centres existed in different parts of the country. Cosmic ray research in India had received further impetus with the launching of a joint Indian-American programme of research, in October 1952, on the nature and behaviour of cosmic rays in the thin air region nearly twenty miles above the earth. The programme was sponsored by two American institutions, the National Geographic Society and the Franklin Institute, and by the Aligarh University of India.

Turning to the plan initiated by President Eisenhower, Mr. Menon stated that his Government saw no reason why the development of the industrial uses of atomic energy should not take place irrespective of the question of banning atomic weapons. The banning of atomic weapons was an absolute necessity in itself, but should not be confused with the other question.

Mr. Menon wished to deal next with the question of the relationship of raw materials to industrial expansion in the modern world. He drew attention to the fact that certain countries, like his own, possessed vast resources of raw materials, and emphasised that those countries must not be placed in the position where they supplied their raw materials to the industrially advanced countries, receiving in return processed material, and even complete atomic reactors. The United Nations should not, directly or indirectly, find itself in a situation of assisting colonial exploitation. It must therefore be emphasised that any country which contributed raw materials to the international pool must have the right progressively to contribute those materials in a more processed and finished form, and that no impediment should be put in the way of its technical and industrial

development.

On behalf of his Government, Mr. Menon declared that India had no objection to supplying considerable quantities of uranium- or thorium-containing substances, provided it was clearly understood that India would deliver such supplies, with the passage of time, in a more and more finished form. The ultimate criterion should be self-sufficiency; that criterion should be accepted as a basic principle, although it did not in any way preclude exchange or co-operation with other countries. The Indian delegation only wanted to make sure that in the atomic age there should not be a repetition of the former relationship between the manufacturing country and the country which produced raw material, the latter remaining permanently a supplier of raw material, and no more.

Mr. Menon then declared that his country must have some assurance that the material it supplied would not even indirectly be used for manufacturing atomic weapons; as for the question of the direct use of such material for such purposes, that would be covered by bilateral agreements.

Referring to the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.105),[2] Mr. Menon stated that he had the assurances of its sponsors that it was not their desire to exclude any part of the world. As far as his country was concerned, it was in a position to make a proper contribution to the present task from the beginning. Mr. Menon wished to point out that India possessed natural, scientific, technical and financial resources to develop atomic energy on its own, without any assistance from any foreign country; at the same time, its programme would, of course, be expedited through co-operation with other nations...

Statement in the First Committee of the General Assembly, October 25, 1955

(Summary)

Mr. Menon (India) emphasised that his delegation had entered the debate with the desire that the Committee and the Assembly should reach a unanimous decision. That was still the fervent hope of his delegation...

Twenty-two months had been devoted to what might be called "preliminary talks." Since the conclusion of the debate at the previous session, when the Committee had agreed that the negotiations concerning the establishment of an International Atomic Energy Agency should proceed, and that suggestions thereon should be extended to the United States Government, India had sent out some communications in order to obtain all the information possible. Subsequent to the Indian communication of August 8, 1955, to the Secretary-General, a draft

[2] The joint draft resolution was proposed by Australia, Belgium, Canada, South Africa, United Kingdom and the United States.

statute for the International Atomic Energy Agency had been circulated.

Although in the last ten years progress in atomic development had been made, particularly in destructive fields, nations and scientists had not forgotten its more useful value. Besides technical advance, there had also been some progress in the understanding of the relation between technical discoveries and social conditions. However, no one should think that debate on the problem of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, or the establishment of the Agency, or even the large-scale development of such peaceful uses, constituted in themselves a solution to the problem of preventing the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes. The two problems were separate, though related, and where they related, their relation was of a rather ominous character. Although he had no desire to trespass on the field of disarmament at the present stage, he wanted to mention that fact because he thought it would be a great mistake to be guided by the escapist belief that building on one side solved the problem of destruction on the other.

He stressed that, following the pattern set by previous speakers, he would consider the item under three separate headings and deal first with the general question of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, then with the question of holding scientific conferences, and thereafter with the question of establishing an International Atomic Energy Agency.

Turning to the first of those questions, he emphasised that his Government did not look upon the question of the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes fundamentally and primarily as a technical problem. It was necessary to bear in mind that the problem had vast social and economic significance. His delegation's approach was based on the view that the world was at the dawn of a new era where social values, industrial techniques and social purposes faced a great revolution. India recognised that any approach made to the problem could not be confined within national frontiers. That was true not only in the field of destruction, where the possession of destructive atomic weapons was of consequence to people who were far removed from them - indeed, it was probably more ominously of concern to those who were far away from them.

The search for energy derived from the atom had been brought to the fore by two factors. First of all, in order to raise the standard of living, it was necessary to consume more energy. It had been stated by the President of the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy[3] that, at the present rate of consumption, the available sources of energy would be used up in less than a century. Secondly, the fact was that the people of the world had to learn from the occurrence of a calamity the ways to turn that calamity to useful purposes. Since the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and the events that followed, an urge had been created to find more and more methods of exploiting and harnessing atomic energy. He wished in that connection to stress that India's position in favour of the total prohibition of the use of atomic and other weapons

[3] Dr. Homi J. Bhabha

of mass destruction remained unchanged.

In connection with the problems of the new era, it was useful to recall a few facts in connection with the industrial revolution in the nineteenth century. Mr. Menon mentioned in that respect the production of machine tools by the Western centuries, such as the United Kingdom; the division of the world into two camps - those who produced consumer goods and those who provided raw materials and a market for those goods; changes in agriculture; the institution of forced labour and slavery; and the discovery of new land and the sharing of the unexplored parts of the world among the great Powers, who were the pioneers in the industrial revolution. Those were historical facts which had a strong bearing on the attitude that countries like India took in the approach to the present problem. Those experiences should be remembered in order that humanity might be saved from the consequences of the atomic revolution in so far as its evil aspects were concerned, and might turn that revolution to more useful purposes.

In any arrangements made for the future, there must be, first of all, equity between nation and nation as well as between the social groups inside each country. It was necessary for the proposed International Atomic Energy Agency to place emphasis on the protection of those who worked with atomic energy, in view of the grave consequences involved and the ominous burden they undertook.

Turning to the development of atomic resources in India, Mr. Menon stressed that his Government's pursuit of knowledge about atomic energy would be restricted to its peaceful uses. In a short survey he described the political, administrative and scientific establishments in the atomic field in India, and gave details regarding the resources of atomic raw material, their extraction and processing, the training of scientists, the creation of scientific laboratories, and the reactor programme in which India was being assisted by Canada and the United States which provided it, respectively, with an NRX reactor and heavy water. India also co-operated in that field with Norway, Sweden and certain other countries. His country was thus making its contribution to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. It was the policy of his Government that the facilities available in India should be open to those other States which were willing and able to make use of them.

Speaking on the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, held at Geneva, he stated that his Government wished to express its appreciation for the services rendered by the Secretary-General, the Advisory Committee, and the Secretary-General and the Assistant Secretary-General of the Conference, as well as the members of the Secretariat, all of whom had contributed to its success. His country had been happy to provide the services of Mr. Bhabha as President of the Conference. Mr. Menon also recalled the contribution made to the Conference in various fields by young Indian scientists. Apart from all its material achievements and the exchange of knowledge which had taken place, the Conference had not only been a great exercise in international co-operation, but had also furthered the great idea of an open world. In lifting the veil of secrecy

from atomic research, a new channel of international co-operation had been opened. Another great achievement of the Conference had been the momentum it had itself generated for the continuation of its work. The Conference had also been characterised by a spirit of recognition and generosity; if some of that spirit could be brought into the field of political discussion, considerable progress would be made. Finally, another great achievement of the Conference had been to make potent the desire for the establishment of the Agency, which his Government supported with enthusiasm.

With regard to the draft statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency, he did not wish to go into detail at the present stage. His Government had communicated its views in that respect to the United States Government... the draft resolution submitted by India and five other Governments contained some ideas that were basic, but that did not mean that they were incompatible with other basic ideas...

In going through a great revolution, India and countries like it did not wish to find themselves merely hewers of wood and drawers of water. India would not be in favour of an economy in which there were "haves" and "have-nots," which was the foundation of international conflict and war. His country would not be a party to any organisation that, either by implication or by its economic consequences, would confine large areas of the world which were the producers of raw materials and were at present backward in their economic development, to that scale of the economic ladder. India was in favour of a scheme of international co-operation. So long as there were under-developed countries that could not keep pace with other countries, as their standards of living were lower, they became the weak link in the chain of international progress.

Mr. Menon recalled the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 758th meeting of the Committee to the effect that the United Kingdom had, for many years, as a matter of international co-operation provided international services in banking, insurance, and shipping, but that it was now moving towards a new era of international atomic co-operation. Mr. Menon said that his country favoured international co-operation in atomic matters, but that India and countries like it were not moving into a period in which a monopoly on shipping, banking, insurance, or atomic energy was going to be held by any country. It was his delegation's desire to see that the circumstances which came in the wake of the industrial revolution and some of the unhappy conditions which followed were not repeated. That was why his delegation, in putting forward its proposals, wished to give some guidance to the General Assembly as to the nature of the relations which should exist between the United Nations and the Agency. The United Nations should see that the preparatory work in that connection was spread out in such a way that, even at the formative stage, the contributions of different parts of the world would come into the Agency. India would like to see the International Atomic Energy Agency established in such a way that no country could be excluded. Mr. Menon said that what he was asking for was an

"open forum." India did not look upon compromise as a sign of weakness; at the same time, however, it had no desire to seek unanimity when it did not mean consensus of minds.

In conclusion, he pledged that his delegation and Government would endeavour to assist in reaching unanimous agreement on a draft resolution which would enable the world conference to meet and discuss a draft statute which would command wide acceptance in the world. That conference should be a deliberative assembly. He had no doubt that in a few days it could be announced to the world that the nations, in spite of their differences, were prepared to venture on that great experiment in a spirit of harmony and, if not necessarily in agreement in every detail, with a commonness of objective in order that humanity might be the better served.

EFFECTS OF ATOMIC RADIATION

Statement in the First Committee of the General Assembly, October 31, 1955

[In 1955, the United States proposed, for the agenda of the General Assembly, an item entitled "Co-ordination of information relating to the effects of radiation upon human health and safety." India proposed an item entitled "Dissemination of information on the effects of atomic radiation and on the effects of experimental explosions of thermonuclear bombs." The two items were considered together.]

(Summary)

Mr. Menon (India) stated that his delegation had insisted on raising the question of the effects of atomic radiation in its entirety, and not solely the effects of such radiation on human beings, first, because that specific aspect of the question was little known and, secondly, because man was conditioned by his environment. The question of the co-ordination of information had been dealt with at the 773rd meeting by the United States representative; in recent months, there had been consultation between the two delegations which gave cause to hope that they might be able, jointly, to present certain conclusions.

For its part, India considered it essential to approach the problem from the point of view that the difference between the atomic age and the age which had preceded it was as great as the difference between the latter age and pastoral civilisations. India's concern in the matter was not new; on April 2, 1954, the Prime Minister of India had asked that full publicity should be given to the known

or probable effects of atomic radiation, and had stressed the risks incurred by those who sailed what had once been the open ocean. Then, on April 8, the Indian Government had communicated to the Secretary-General certain proposals for circulation to the Disarmament Commission. Finally, in July, the Indian delegation had raised the matter again in the Trusteeship Council and had emphasised the serious consequences of certain explosions and their effects, at a distance of more than 175 miles, on 28 Americans and 236 inhabitants of the Marshall Islands.

In his statement at the 700th meeting, he recalled, he had referred to a statement by Dr. Adrian on the possible effects of atomic radiation.

At the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, the Prime Minister of India had suggested the establishment of a chain of stations to keep a continuous watch on radio-activity, and the Conference had endorsed that proposal.

Thus, India was approaching the problem not from the point of view of partisan agitation, but from the point of view of making constructive contributions. It had, for example, declared its readiness to place at the disposal of the international community the facilities for observation which it possessed and which were by no means negligible. The basic consideration, in that matter, was not to recognise any political or social barrier, and even, if it proved feasible, to go so far as to observe other planets.

Mr. Menon paid a tribute to the positions taken by Lord Russell and the late Professor Einstein, who had called for measures to evaluate the intensity of atomic radiation, and to the efforts made in the United States, particularly by the National Academy of Sciences and the Federation of American Scientists. The Federation had expressed the hope that the United Nations might participate by setting up a monitoring service.

Scientific opinion on the problem was divided: while some felt that the effects of atomic radiation, although harmful, could be tolerated, others considered that beyond a certain limit there would be serious consequences.

It would be a great mistake to believe that the Indian delegation was concerned only with the effects of nuclear explosions; the peaceful use of atomic energy also created problems, and, while it was not being suggested, for example, that radio-active isotopes should no longer be used, the consequences of their use in medicine or agriculture should be investigated. Besides, the problem was not new if the difficulties caused by X-ray therapy were considered.

The basic problem was to determine whether the effects of atomic radiation could be inherited; if so, the whole human race would be affected. Consequently, contamination from radiation should be prevented in the same way as steps had been taken the world over to pasteurise milk. Already, an American scientist had

mentioned the possibility that radiation might be a cause of cancer.

In other words, all that had to be established for the present was a *prima facie* case to show that radiation might have far-reaching consequences. In the days of the industrial revolution, workers had had to be protected against certain occupational diseases. Similarly, with the use of radio-active elements, measures should be taken, not to halt progress, but to make provision against harmful consequences resulting, not only from bombs, but from the medical, agricultural or industrial use of atomic energy. It was no secret that, at the time certain explosions had taken place, scientists themselves had admitted that they had miscalculated the consequences. Finally, the world was in the grip of a psychosis which caused people to believe that the mildest storm was an effect of nuclear explosions, and that uneasiness, based as it was on ignorance, also produced undesirable effects which should be dispelled.

The problem of atomic wastes should also be studied by any organisation to be set up by the United Nations. Like oil wastes and smoke, atomic wastes presented problems which should not be underestimated, as had been done in the past when there were only a very few factory smokestacks. The proposal to create "atomic graveyards," where wastes collected in containers would be buried, might be acceptable in a world which had renounced war, but might prove dangerous if the burial-grounds were ever subjected to aerial attack. As to the suggestion that the wastes should be emptied into the ocean, it should be borne in mind that a considerable proportion of the world's inhabitants made their living from the seas and were entitled to expect respect for the freedom of the seas which, as the Prime Minister of India had said, had already been imperilled by atomic experiments.

If radio-activity were communicable to another generation, there was a danger of a chain reaction being set up. The United States representative had, it was true, pointed out that there was already radio-activity in the human system. But there was a limit to everything. Man was already subjected to atmospheric pressure, for instance, but that did not mean that the pressure could be increased with impunity.

Estimates of the level at which radio-activity could influence heredity might, understandably, differ. Nevertheless, it must not be forgotten that explosions brought in their wake not only radio-active matter, but substances surface-covered by radio-active matter. And such radio-active elements circled the earth threatening all countries indiscriminately. Some believed that exploding the bombs under the sea would solve the problem; but in that case the sea might also become radio-active.

Quoting the remarks made at the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy by Mr. Hermann Mueller, of the University of Indiana, on the question of chromosome aberrations and, the more important point, mutations, he said, with reference to the effects of the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima, that it was not merely persons actually exposed to the radiation, but

their children's children who might show induced mutations as a result. In any case, from the standpoint, not merely of nuclear explosions, but also of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the question was quite as worthy of study as, say, the problem of deforestation in India. If it were ignored, the benefits of atomic energy would be outweighed by its disastrous genetic repercussions.

There was, admittedly, a more or less official school of thought in the United States and the United Kingdom which held that what was now being done was not harmful - and he, for one, was far from wishing to imply that such scientists were influenced by political considerations. Sir John Cockcroft, for example, while not minimising the problem, had stated before the United Kingdom Parliament that the present effects of nuclear explosions were negligible. Other, equally reputable, scientists, however, considered the atomic radiation to be ten times more intense. Sir John Cockcroft, in any case, acknowledged the need for long-term genetic studies in that connection. Finally, common sense suggested that peoples living in flimsy houses, as in India for instance, would be more exposed to radiation than others. According to the United States Atomic Energy Commission, nuclear weapons tests had made the waters of the Pacific north of the Equator ten times as radio-active as before.

In one United States publication it had been stated that, if atomic radiation continued to increase, about a third of the children born in the United States alone each year would carry undesirable characteristics. Radiation could not, therefore, be alleged to constitute no danger to the individual and the species. The radiation increase due to the present tests was capable of producing one deleterious mutation per 50,000 conceptions, or about 78 mutated germ cells a year among children born in the United States.

Mr. Libby, of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, had stated that the maximum tolerance exposure for workers in the Commission's plants was 15,000 times as great as the radiation to which the rest of the population was normally exposed, and that such concentrated radiation on a selected group would not have any immediate repercussion. Even if that were so, the fact remained that a problem would arise, not immediately, but in the long run.

There was, hence, every justification for bringing the problem before the Committee. The Indian delegation had, therefore, proposed placing on the Assembly's agenda the question of dissemination of information on the effects of atomic radiation and on the effects of experimental explosions of thermonuclear bombs... It was stated in the explanatory memorandum submitted by India (A/2949/Add. 1) that the use of radio-active materials had presented to the world a powerful new tool but that the use of those materials was attended by serious hazards to the persons working with them. It was, therefore, essential that the data about the biological and other effects of radiation should be studied with scientific objectivity and thoroughness.

There was a divergence of opinion among scientists on the long-term consequences of detonating nuclear and thermo-nuclear bombs for experimental purposes, in particular in regard to the possible genetic effects. It was accordingly essential to set up immediately an international unit which would collect and co-ordinate data on the immediate and long-term consequences of atomic radiation, as well as on the known effects of experimental explosions of hydrogen or atomic bombs, and bring that information to the knowledge of the world.

In a word, there was a *prima facie* case for inquiry. For the moment it was a question not of creating a doctrine or bolstering up a particular thesis, but simply of seeking the truth and making it known. Whatever procedure were adopted, the main task was to set up a body which would enable the Secretary-General to fulfil his mission.

The evaluation of data and the conclusions must be objective and international in character, even though the material might come from national or even private sources. The conclusions should, furthermore, be brought to the attention of public opinion through the medium of the General Assembly. Finally, the principle of universality must be strictly observed in applying the conclusions.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF UNDER-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Statement in the Second Committee of the General Assembly, November 6, 1959[4]

(Summary)

Mr. Menon (India) said that he might depart somewhat from the agenda item - the economic development of under-developed countries - but would endeavour to consider it in the context of the international political situation. The present tendency towards a relaxation of tension associated with the efforts to deal with the basic issues of disarmament would have social and economic, as well as political consequences.

Discussion had long centred on the economic causes and consequences of war, but now the basic challenge confronting mankind appeared to be the balanced expansion of the world economy. It involved not only balanced economic growth within nations, difficult to achieve as that aim was in itself, but, even more, balanced economic growth among nations, and would thus affect the relations among all nations. It would therefore be a mistake to suppose that the main problem was the economic development of under-developed countries, for the world did not consist only of under-developed countries, and the latter could not transform their economies solely by means of the help or charity of other countries. Even when the under-developed countries succeeded in becoming consumers of many manufactured goods produced by other countries, their economic situation would still remain much the same and the same problems would confront them with equal urgency. Consequently all countries, developed and undeveloped alike, must deal with the world problem of balanced economic expansion.

Fortunately it appeared that elemental forces or perhaps destiny were now urging mankind towards closer co-operation, as the Prime Minister of India had pointed out. The time was past when each country could attempt to fend for itself in the economic field, when countries had been free to destroy goods in order to maintain price levels or to prevent other countries from producing certain goods. The spread of democracy, in other words the influence of the people and of public opinion in every country, made it impossible for Governments to resort to such methods. The policy of every country, whatever its economic and social system, must now be based not on considerations of national power, but on due regard for general prosperity and plenty.

Recent statements of world leaders had shown that they had understood that

[4] Source: *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourteenth Session, Second Committee*, pages 171-72

requirement. Mr. Eisenhower had said that peoples of the world were no longer prepared to resign themselves to poverty, disease and oppression, that the problem of the under-developed countries was more important to Western civilisation than the problem of the conflict between the West and the Communist world, and that all the more developed countries should work together in helping the less fortunate nations. Mr. Khrushchev, for his part, had proposed a programme of general and complete disarmament that would make it possible to devote enormous sums of money to constructive activities and to aid for the under-developed countries; he had stated that even a small part of the funds that the great Powers spent on arms would make it possible to begin to change the face of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

There was a paradoxical situation in the present world; although in one sense it was shrinking in another it might be said to be expanding, since millions of men who had been mere chattels were now growing into a full awareness of life and the discovery of new resources and technological progress were enlarging the frontiers of the world. Mankind's paramount task was now to plan for plenty, in order to meet the needs and aspirations of the world population of 5,600 million that would be reached by the end of the century.

THE WORLD POPULATION HAD STEADILY INCREASED ever since the beginning of the Christian era, as a result of the change in the means of production and in patterns of trade, and neither birth control nor any other method would halt the population expansion now taking place, which was not confined to the under-developed countries. Far from taking a pessimistic view and believing that man had reached the limit of what could be done to increase food production, he considered that the advances of science and modern technology would make it possible to prevent any food shortage. Even at the present time mankind was producing more than it would consume. Two-thirds of the food produced was eaten by the animal population; that included creatures that were harmful or useless, but they could be wiped out only by international planning, as had been demonstrated in the case of locust control. Furthermore, some countries obtained a higher yield per acre, because they had reached a more advanced stage of technological development.

As a result of the spread of scientific knowledge and modern techniques, mankind would soon be able to change methods of cultivation everywhere, to make more use of fertilisers and even of isotopes to fertilise land that was now unproductive, to undertake the essential task of reforestation, perhaps one day to irrigate deserts, and remove the salts from sea water, thus providing additional water resources. A combination of technological and meteorological knowledge would make it possible to control the weather, and to obtain beneficial rainfall when and where required, always provided that planning was done at the international level.

From the time when man discovered that energy and matter were one, and that

every gramme of matter contained 25 million kilowatt-hours of energy, there was no further possibility of any shortage of power, and consequently of any shortage of food or other supplies, since once mankind had learned how to tap the energy that lay hidden in matter, he would have access to infinitely greater world resources than at present. Formerly States had attempted to deal with population expansion by extending their living space through immigration and conquest; now what was needed was more power, instead of more space. Nuclear fusion would soon make it possible to use resources hitherto lying idle, such as the tar oil buried deep in the soil of Canada that required underground explosions for its exploitation. The energy in the heart of volcanoes, and in the sea, the wind and the sun, could all the harnessed in the service of mankind. In view of all those potentialities, it became evident that the most valuable and sorely needed of resources was a supply of technicians; the training of technicians was the most urgent need of the present age and one of the conditions of mankind's survival. Consequently the advancement of technical studies should also be the subject of serious planning throughout the world.

It was clear, however, that mankind would be unable to use all those sources of power or to exploit all the earth's resources if the present disputes and imbalances continued. The most serious imbalance appeared to be that resulting from the enormous disparity between levels of living in the more advanced and the under-developed countries. Mr. Black, the President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, had said that the resulting tension might become serious enough to overshadow the problem of the cold war. He had said that the time had gone when money could be the sinews of diplomacy and the means of winning friends and allies... The development of the under-developed countries was an objective of vital importance in itself, and it was worth while making unceasing efforts to achieve it regardless of the ups and downs of the world political situation or the fluctuations of international trade.

Economic aid and trade alone would not suffice to solve the problems of the under-developed countries and enable them to raise their levels of living; they must also be able to industrialise. For example, it was desirable in order to meet the needs of mankind that all countries should produce as much steel, in proportion, as the United States of America. But it was obvious that it would be necessary to plan the world economy so as to prevent any conflict, between the more advanced countries and the currently less developed countries which would eventually become industrialised, over the raw materials that all would need. Increasing industrialisation throughout the world and automation would create further problems, in regard, for example, to full employment and the use of leisure, and steps should be taken now to find solutions.

But in order to ensure peace, on which the progress of mankind depended, it was also necessary to make an immediate attack on all the causes of instability and tension, to improve the terms of trade of the under-developed countries, to eliminate the barriers to the international exchange of goods and ideas, to produce

with a view to general prosperity rather than in terms of existing patterns of production and to strive to increase *per caput* incomes in the poorest countries. In practice all those problems would have to be tackled one by one.

In the meantime... he proposed that the Second Committee should undertake a study to determine how the world's resources could be utilised to free mankind from want. Wisdom demanded that mankind should endeavour to plan for future generations. Mankind could survive, achieve its aspirations and at last live in a world of plenty, provided that it learned how to use the discoveries of science for constructive purposes. It was for the Second Committee to begin to guide men's activities towards that promising goal.

C. UNITED NATIONS

AMENDMENT OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS: EXPANSION OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Statement in the Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly, December 17, 1956[5]

[In 1956, the General Assembly considered, at the request of Latin American States and Spain, the question of amending the United Nations Charter to increase the membership of the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations in view of the increase in the membership of the Organisation. They presented a draft resolution to increase the membership of the Security Council from 11 to 13, and to allocate the eight non-permanent seats as follows: Latin America, 2; Asia and Africa, 2; Western and Southern Europe, 2; Eastern Europe, 1; Commonwealth, 1.

In this speech, Mr. Menon commented on the proposal and suggested further study of the matter.

No action was taken at that session of the General Assembly. Agreement on the expansion of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council was reached several years later. Amendments to the Charter were approved by the General Assembly in 1963 and came into force in 1965.]

...The Security Council came into existence as a result of the decisions taken in San Francisco in 1945 on the basis of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals; and those proposals provided for the present five permanent members, as well as for six others. Later, in London, there was what is called London agreement which is not in writing with regard to the allocation of these non-permanent seats to different geographical areas of the world...

My delegation wishes to draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that, when the United Nations was established, large numbers of States of the world were less concerned with the problems with which we are faced today.

There have emerged in the world new countries and, what is more, Asia and Africa have acquired new significance. At the time the United Nations was founded, there were only two Asian countries which were members of it, namely, China and the Philippines. India was also one of the members that assisted in the founding of the United Nations, but then it was not independent at the time. It was represented by the then Government of India, and its representation came

[5] Source: *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, pages 716-20

through what is called the Commonwealth group. Therefore, even taking India into account, there were only three Asian countries. Instead of three Asian countries, today from Asia and Africa we have here seventeen new entrants and probably somewhere around twenty-seven countries belonging to the unrepresented area.

Now, looking at the United Nations as a whole, we find that certain areas of the world are totally neglected, as in the case of Africa, or very much under-represented, as in the case of the whole area of Asia and Africa. Naturally, when certain areas are under-represented, it means, in relation to that position, that certain other areas are over-represented.

The considerations governing the composition of the Security Council were in the minds of the framers of the Charter, for when this question of conferring powers on the Security Council was discussed at San Francisco, the Assembly agreed that the Security Council should have wide powers; and one of the reasons adduced was that the non-permanent members were elected by the Assembly and represented the Assembly as a whole. In other words, in the composition of the Security Council, the six non-permanent members were assumed to represent the remainder of the membership of the Assembly, that is, the world as the United Nations then knew it. This of course casts upon us the responsibility of taking into account these considerations.

It is well known that when a country is elected to the Security Council, it does not always, and certainly not necessarily, represent the area. There are very well-known instances where the contrary is the case. It is doubtful whether we could totally remedy it, having regard to the sovereign character of our governments and the necessity for every country casting its vote after consultation with or in accordance with the wishes of its government. It is, of course, to be argued that the governments themselves would have to take into account the position that, in view of the intent of this article, and according to the San Francisco discussions and the London agreement, their views should be representative not merely of themselves but of certain groups...

MY DELEGATION WISHES TO PLACE BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY not all, but a number of considerations that should go into the composition of the Security Council and its strength.

A great many references have been made to geographical representation. From reading Article 23, it is quite plain that geographical representation is not the only factor; but just because it is not the only factor, it cannot be dismissed as merely a factor. It is a very important factor, since the Security Council is concerned with international peace and security, in which geography plays such an important part, and large parts of the world cannot be left unrepresented in this way.

The article also takes into account the contributions made by members to the maintenance of peace and security. That contribution, in the realistic terms of the world as it is, is not to be assessed merely by the positive contributions which they will make, but also by how much world peace and security will be endangered if their co-operation is not forthcoming.

It is unsafe to argue that because members of the Security Council, or certain States, have not contributed recently - or might have done the reverse - for that reason they have to be kept out. In that case we would have a very tragic situation at the present time, with certain permanent members of the Security Council not being available.

Therefore it is not merely a question whether they make a positive contribution; it is the weight, the economic, the military, the political and geographical weight, that comes into the position of a country in relation to the rest of the world that has to be taken into account. We take all these considerations into account when we invite members to make financial contributions. The financial contributions are judged on capacity to pay, on population, on importance - all kinds of considerations go into it. And we have the countries charged with respective percentages of our total amount.

In this draft resolution (A/3446), it is stated that new members have come into the Organisation and that the Security Council should be enlarged by two members. As I said a while ago, when the Security Council was established, there were 50 members of the United Nations. Now there are 79 members. If 11 was considered sufficient for 50 members, it appears that the addition of two certainly is not a considerable one; it is doubtful whether it is proportionate.

When the League of Nations was founded, it had 42 members. Its strength varied from time to time, because some new members joined and others were expelled or left the League; but its strength varied from 42 to 58 members. And the strength of the League Council varied from 10 to 14 members. Therefore, whether we take the proportionate strength and compare it to the strength of the members of this Assembly in terms of the history of the United Nations, or in terms of the history of the League of Nations, the present Security Council is much too small for this purpose.

It is quite true that at San Francisco, as well as at other places where there was discussion, it was pointed out that the size of the Security Council should not be such as to prevent the urgent dispatch of business. With very great respect, I submit that the lack of urgency in the dispatch of business has not come about so much from the size of the Security Council as from the general nature of political conflict in the world and the irreconcilability of points of view, and perhaps from certain procedural arrangements. So we should not lay too much stress upon the relation of size to expedition. Of course, there is a point that is reached when size becomes a very important factor.

I should like next to refer to the suggestion in the draft resolution with regard to the new members. The implication obviously is to the new entrants, and when the addition of two members is suggested, this draft resolution does not stand merely by the words that are on paper. So much conversation has gone on, so much discussion has taken place, and it is common knowledge that the idea is that there should be one Asian member added - there is no Asian representation now; that is to say, if Asia is regarded as strictly excluding the Middle East and restricted to east, south-east and northern Asia. But, of course, if the Middle East was to be included in the geographical definition of Asia, then it would become necessary to include Eastern Europe in the definition of Europe. It would also be necessary to include Latin America in the definition of America.

But, out of the 20 new members, 11 have come from these areas - the unrepresented areas. Therefore, if there is an enlargement, the whole of this enlargement has to go to that area. On this basis, the purpose of the enlargement is to make the Security Council more representative, reflecting more the membership of the General Assembly. And we say that the Security Council, as at present constituted, is very ill-balanced, and that the addition of these two members on this basis, instead of correcting that imbalance, will accentuate it. The fact that you add one and one equally at the present time does not offset the fact that there is already a preponderating imbalance existing, and also that the equal seats that are being allocated represent two regions of unequal importance. That is to say, there are more members from Asia and Africa which should be the recipients of this.

There are other considerations also which should be taken into account. My delegation would be the last to argue that we could have political influence in this place, or voting power in this place, or anything else, merely or even preponderatingly on the basis of population. That would be a very fallacious argument, and it would vitiate the foundation of the United Nations, which is that of sovereign equal States. But when we are considering questions of security, when we are considering the functions of the Security Council, just as geography cannot be brushed away, so a large weight of population cannot be brushed away. And if we look at the world as it is, 1,304 million people lived in Asia in 1951 out of a total world population of about 2,300 million.

Whatever amendment is brought in is not only for this year and, irrespective of all the votes that can be rallied, no power in the world, if the United Nations is to survive, can keep the real Government of China out of this place for a very long time - I doubt if it can keep it out even for a short time. Therefore, for the present purpose, let us include China as being represented - the representation is not necessarily correct, but our views are well known in this matter. Even then, there is one Asian country - or two, including the Middle Eastern countries, representing 14 Member States in Asia and 10 Member States in the Middle East...

Now, we should like to compare this with other regions. There is Africa, with a population of 200 million, and from which there are today four members in the United Nations. It is quite true that the Union of South Africa could possibly come in as a member of the Security Council, through the Commonwealth group, but I am afraid that the masses of the African population would not regard representation of them by the Union as the representation of Africa. Add to that what can happen in the next four or five years. There is the Federation of Rhodesia, there is the new State of Ghana which will come about in March 1957, there is Nigeria, there are the countries of East Africa and, irrespective of the desires of the administrators and irrespective of the difficulties, there is Algeria. Now all these countries would become members of the United Nations within a very short period of time, so that there is a large and increasing number of constituents in Africa, and their representation is nil. Egypt, which geographically is in Africa, comes within the Middle Eastern franchise. That is the position in Africa.

Now let us take Western Europe. Western Europe today has three seats: the United Kingdom, France and one non-permanent seat. It is not sufficient, in fact, it is not correct, in this context to argue that the draft resolution refers only to the non-permanent seats. We are referring to increasing the strength of the Security Council, and therefore the permanent and non-permanent seats come into question. There are three seats for 161 million people: that is, one for 53,600,000 people. We would be the last people in the world to minimise the contribution made by Western Europe to civilisation during the last 2,000 years and to material civilisation in the last 500 years, but I think it would be very difficult for us to adopt the argument of the nineteenth century that one European is equal to ten others. That is not an argument that should be promoted in this Organisation.

Now, if you add one more seat to this representation, that would make four seats for 161 million people, but let us look at it the other way, if you like. Let us consider that the permanent seats are taken out of this calculation; then there would be one seat for 77 million people in Western Europe as at present, or, if the new suggestions are carried through, there would be two seats for 77 million people in Western Europe, or 12 countries. That is to say, one seat for six countries, which includes large and small.

I have with me a table of members elected to the Security Council, and it is of some significance to note that it is only from Western Europe that a country has been able to occupy a non-permanent seat twice. The Netherlands was elected twice, Belgium was elected twice. That is to say, there are more seats there, comparatively speaking, than people to contest them, otherwise no country would be elected twice, where in every other part of the world the difficulty is to make it go around once.

Therefore there is this very considerable imbalance, and any change that is made

must have for its prime consideration that this imbalance must be corrected. While no mathematical distribution is possible, the Security Council must reflect the conditions of the world - as it is.

Asia and Africa, politically and economically, and from the point of view of security and peace, have become tremendously important in the last ten years, and, as recent experience has shown, unless these areas and their views are taken into account in our deliberations, the peace of the world will not be as secure as it otherwise might be...

There are 319 million people, including the nearly 200 million in the Soviet Union, for whom there are two seats provided. On the continent of America, there are 348 million people and there are three seats, and four when Canada held the seat of the Commonwealth. So, from the picture I have presented to you, you will see that the representation on the Security Council is very disproportionate...

If India were, for example, to seek election through a group of Asian countries, then we would be here, under present calculations, once in 26 years. Furthermore, in view of the political changes taking place, in three years` time India would be here once in 36 years. We are, of course, hopeful that the United Nations will last much longer than that, but still for any country 26 years is quite a long time.

Pakistan, our neighbour, with 70 million people and a very strategic position - that country would be here under the same conditions. Now we are elected from the Commonwealth group, we will be here once in 14 years, next year it would be once in 16 years, and in the following period once in 24 years.

I submit that this does not represent the state of the world. It is not sufficient to say that to go from 11 to 13 is a very considerable advance in correcting this position. First of all, as I say, there is the question of imbalance - disproportion. When you look, not only into the geographical conditions, but into the political alignments, it becomes even more disproportionate, because the Security Council does not function in the way it should function.

My delegation therefore regards this problem as one which requires very careful consideration because, once it is amended this year, we cannot come back and amend it next year. The amendment must, therefore, take into account all these factors. We would not be agreeable to any amendment which provided one of the new seats for Asia and the other for Europe, in fact providing one new seat for Italy, Spain and Portugal together. That would not be a correct representation.

We cannot sell to our people the idea that it takes twenty other nations to make up for one European nation, which was the theory in days gone by. It is very difficult to sell that today and we have no desire to sell it - so that is that.

THEREFORE, TO SUM UP OUR POSITION, we think that any such amendment should take into account geographical distribution as one of the factors...

Secondly, we think any changes must correct the present imbalance and maintain the proper balance of populations, not necessarily mathematically, but take this factor into account. I want to be clear: countries with small populations are as important to the United Nations as the very big countries, but we are in this particular matter, where the maintenance of international peace and security is concerned, taking into account the weight in terms of the peoples as one factor.

Thirdly, it is necessary that countries which, by and large, can be said to be able to express the views or the sentiments of groups of countries, or through which those sentiments can be channelled - should be represented on the Security Council, and that is why I told you that, if a large country could sit but once in 26 years, the Security Council would be rather out of touch with its constituents. And that is why, when an important problem arises, it shifts from the Security Council either to diplomatic discussions outside, or to the General Assembly. And since the General Assembly is not built for this purpose, we are having plenty of difficulties because the General Assembly has not taken on certain functions, for example, in regard to the Emergency Force and so on, for which it was not equipped.

Fourthly, the existing representation, which ignores the 525 millions of China, has to be rectified.....

Last year the Assembly appointed a committee of the whole [resolution 992 (x)] for the amendment of the Charter. We believe that this problem is part of the issues of the amendment of the Charter. Therefore this problem must receive consideration either by that committee, with the request that it should receive priority, or the Assembly should appoint some other representative group to go into the whole of this question. Because, as I said, there is not one consideration; there are large numbers of considerations. And a resolution that is put in this way, so that its provisions would require the ratification of two-thirds of the States, including the five permanent members, is subject to the danger that nothing very much may happen.

My delegation wants to throw out this suggestion, and this suggestion is not one for postponement. We share with everybody the view that this is not a matter to be shelved. It is a matter to be considered; but mere consideration is not enough, it must result in a remedy that is adequate...

PERSONNEL POLICY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Statement in the Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly, April 1, 1953[6]

[The personnel policy of the United Nations was discussed by the General Assembly, at the request of the Secretary-General, Trygve Lie.

Following attacks during the McCarthy era on alleged "subversives" in the staff of the United Nations, the Secretary-General had succumbed to United States opinion, and dismissed a number of staff members who had refused to answer questions by the Internal Security Sub-Committee of the United States Senate as to their membership of the Communist Party of the United States, invoking the protection against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution. He co-operated with the United States Government in its investigation of the United Nations staff of United States nationality and provided facilities for that purpose in the United Nations Headquarters. This created serious concern among delegations and others that the independence and integrity of the international civil service might be undermined.

The Secretary-General presented to the General Assembly the opinion of a commission of jurists he had appointed to advise him. It recommended the dismissal of staff members who had refused to answer questions on possible subversive activity against the "host country." Though the Secretary-General did not accept all the recommendations of this Commission, the report heightened concern as it gave a special position to the host country.

During the discussion of the matter in the General Assembly, thirteen Western States moved a resolution. India, together with eleven other Asian and Arab States, presented another resolution. The following is the speech by Mr. Menon on the resolution sponsored by India.

On April 1, 1953, the Asian-Arab resolution was rejected by 29 votes to 21, with 8 abstentions. The Western draft was adopted.]

...I propose to deal with the draft resolution before us paragraph by paragraph, explaining it and showing why we support it.

I feel sure that there is no need for me to argue that the second paragraph of the preamble will be one which the General Assembly will desire to record and vote on, namely, "*Taking note of* the satisfaction reported by the Secretary-General with respect to the efficiency and integrity of the Secretariat." While it is true that

---

6 Source: *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, pages 663-66

this sentiment is shared by all governments and delegations, and while it is true that all of us would want it to be proclaimed, it is equally true that numerous delegations, in the course of the debate, have expressed the view and this also seems to be the general impression that has long been created in the public mind that a considerable degree of unrest, or other bad feelings, exist in the Secretariat of the Organisation.

I should like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the Indian delegation and the other delegations which sponsored this draft resolution, to state publicly that we have the highest regard for the efficiency and integrity of the members of the Secretariat. Were it not so, this matter would have come up from one delegation or another long before there was a report from the Secretary-General. Indeed, when my delegation first wrote to the President on this matter, it was with a view to clearing up all these questions, so that this kind of atmosphere that surrounds the men and women who work for us, who make the work of our Assembly, the implementation of our decisions and the considerations of problems by us possible, should not go unnoticed and that they should not be under any suspicion. I therefore hope that those who have not subscribed to this draft resolution hitherto will consider that this aspect of it is worth recording and proclaiming.

Then we come to the third paragraph of the preamble, concerning the "importance of maintaining and developing an international civil service in accordance with the purposes and provisions of the Charter." What we have perhaps in too brief and abrupt form stated in this draft resolution is contained in the other draft resolution (A/L/146/Rev.1)[7] in its quotation from the Charter; we have no objection to the preamble as set forth there. It is significant, however, that one of the most important features of both these draft resolutions is this reference to the international character of the civil service, expressed either in terms of our having to conform to the provisions of the Charter, or as in our draft resolution. Here I should like to say that the discussion which has taken place has clearly shown that what we are discussing is really not some small matter that has come up, but the question of the whole of the administrative machinery, its temper, its calibre and the basis on which it should rest. I therefore find myself in disagreement with the representative of Canada, who told us:

> "Today our concern is not about millions but a few thousands of men and women in the Secretariat of the United Nations."

That may be the superficial aspect of it. What we are considering are the main principles on which the international civil service should be based.

If this is correct, then any review of the problem, which means an advance from the position already reached in the Charter, requires a close and detailed study, as indicated in the fourth paragraph of the preamble.

---

[7] Draft resolution by France, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and ten other Western and Latin American countries.

This item has come before us not quite in the usual way. I do not mean to say that it has come up in an improper way, but that it has come up for discussion in the Assembly without going before a committee. I do not for a moment suggest that there is anything improper, wrong or procedurally questionable in this, but it does give rise to difficulties in the sense that neither governments nor we ourselves in a collective way have had an opportunity to discuss and consider, comment or formulate any proposals on the legal, the political or the various other aspects of this problem.

If it is to be suggested that these aspects do not exist, the briefest way of my meeting that argument would be to try and quote from the speeches that have already been made. I would ask the representative of France to forgive me if I start with him first not because I want to single him out. The representative of France said:

> "It is the first time that, apart from the technical discussions in the Fifth Committee, the members of the United Nations have been called upon to pass judgement on the work, organisation, operation, merits and weaknesses of the Secretariat, and on the steps which should be taken to improve it."

That does not look as though we were dealing with a small problem of a few thousand people. Then he went on to say:

> "Official optimism is now no longer in place; and it would be wrong to ignore the serious crises through which the Secretariat has been passing for several months."

The French representative said further:

> "It is inevitable that such relations should not be easy. Obviously they raise very delicate problems owing to the intimacy and multiplicity of the contacts between the Secretariat and the host countries."

He said "host countries," in the plural. That goes to the root of the consideration of this problem. He also said:

> "Much energy could be used on more constructive and useful tasks than this ghost-hunt or witch-hunt."

These are not my words. The representative of France continued:

> "Many of the best members of the staff are thinking of resigning, while others are discouraged. Unless care is taken, the stability and efficiency of the Organisation may also be endangered."

He went on to say further:

> "If, in connection with his work, a conflict arises between his obligations as an international civil servant and his duties as a citizen, his only choice is either to remain faithful to the Organisation or to submit his resignation."

The representative of France went on in that fashion. I do not propose to discuss this, but since I have quoted the delegation of France I should also like to quote one or two other people.

The representative of the Netherlands said that the Secretary-General, in paragraph 97 of his report, had endeavoured to define the expression "subversive activities," but Mr. Von Balluseck wondered whether that definition was precise enough. The same question could be raised, he said, with respect to paragraph 87. The Netherlands representative went on to say: "Furthermore, I have some doubts whether the report gives a full picture of the position taken by the Secretary-General." The representative of the Netherlands drew our attention to the point that staff members should not be automatically dismissed "exclusively on the grounds that they have used their constitutional privilege against self-incrimination in official inquiries concerned with subversive activities and espionage." He said he could not agree with that.

These matters have been referred to by delegation after delegation. My purpose in quoting them is not to try to throw the burden of proof upon delegations that do not support the draft resolution, but merely to point out that whatever conclusions we may reach, here is a problem with so many facets that even those who put their names on draft resolutions have not necessarily differing points of view, but views covering a very wide field - the jurisprudence of member States, their ideas of law, their ideas of public conduct and everything else...

The Secretary-General has been good enough to say that no charges of any character have been made, much less been proved, against any member of the secretariat. I am sure we are all happy to hear that. Therefore it appears that the problem before us is not one that can be easily disposed of without going into the question of principle.

A considerable amount of material has been sent to us. We had the Secretary-General's report before this debate opened. It was our general impression that it would largely be based upon what is now called the jurists' opinion. With great respect, I say that the jurists' opinion, so far as we are now concerned, is "out of court" because the Secretary-General has told us that he has not accepted it, that he has accepted only some parts of it. What we have is what the Secretary-General has made his own, and therefore it saves us the embarrassment of

discussing from a juridical point of view the propositions of law and jurisprudence that have been propounded in that report. Thus, that is out of the way.

We have also been provided with volumes of evidence and records of examinations conducted by committees sitting in this country. It is neither my desire, nor would I consider it proper and appropriate, to go into any detail of this or into the manner in which these hearings were conducted or anything of that character. It has nothing to do with me, but I am entitled to say that in these documents I find certain examples, of which I shall cite only one.

If a witness is asked whether he would be loyal to the United Nations or to his own country and is thus put on the horns of a dilemma, then I think it is appropriate for us to take that question into consideration and be able to instruct our servants as to the conditions of employment and what their obligations are and what they are not. I do not answer these questions. I simply say that problems of this character have been raised. It is equally necessary for us to consider whether or not it is appropriate, if a person withholds evidence in accordance with his constitutional right... that we, as employers, should use the economic pressure of employment in order that he may go back upon what he regards as his right.

I find it difficult to accept the idea that fear of incrimination is the same thing as having committed a crime. A crime must be proved beyond all reasonable doubt, so Sir Gladwyn Jebb[8] told us this morning. Now, what is reasonable doubt? It is doubt of reasonable minds. Reasonable minds are minds that are not inspired by passion, but by reason, according to law. What is more, it is possible to prove a crime beyond reasonable doubt only when the examination of witnesses is undertaken by counsel on one side and cross-examination takes place by the other, and there are no questions from the court itself. But these hearings are not conducted by courts...

In the very beginning, my delegation, in dealing with the principles of this matter, said that we did not accept this view of "host" country. We are all host countries and it is quite arguable that another country may have laws which the majority of the people in this Assembly may not be willing to understand in the same way.

At the same time, practical problems have arisen. The draft resolution we have put forward does not have the implication that the representative of the United Kingdom thought it had. I am sure that he does not think so as to its purpose, which is not to hamstring any action that the Secretary-General might take...

At the same time, I am fully aware of the fact that we have to take into account

[8] The representative of the United Kingdom

the great many misconceptions about this Organisation as a result of the kind of publicity to which the representative of France referred in his speech, and therefore something will have to be done. That is why we have produced this draft resolution. My delegation and others associated with us have put forward this draft resolution without placing any blame or responsibility. We have simply asked for a study of this question...

Before retiring from this rostrum, I should like to say, mainly on behalf of my own delegation because we have not had the opportunity of consulting the co-sponsors of this draft, that a new factor has recently entered the situation: that is, that the implementation of this resolution would fall to a new incumbent of the office of Secretary General.[9] In those circumstances, while I entirely agree that there is no personal question involved here, the reference being solely to the institution of Secretary-General, then, if the Assembly in its wisdom thinks that this discussion has provided adequate guidance and that nothing further is now required, I feel sure that those who have sponsored this draft resolution would be prepared to give every consideration to the idea that both these drafts should be shelved or withdrawn, or that some other draft should be substituted, saying simply that the Assembly has considered these problems and reaffirms the principles of the Charter...

TRIBUTE TO DAG HAMMARSKJOLD

Statement in the Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly, September 20, 1961[10]

[Mr. Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary-General of the United Nations, died on September 17, 1961, in a mysterious plane crash as he flew from Leopoldville, now Kinshasa, to Ndola to meet Mr. Moise Tshombe in order to secure an end to conflict in Katanga and resolve the problem of Katanga within the framework of the unity of the Congo.]

I come to the rostrum on this sad occasion to pay a tribute on behalf of the Government and the people of India to a great world statesman, a distinguished Secretary-General of the United Nations and a friend of all of us...

---

[9] On April 7, 1953, the General Assembly accepted the resignation of Trygve Lie and elected Dag Hammarskjold as the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

[10] Source: *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Plenary Meetings*, pages 13-14

We cannot, however, regard this as merely an occasion of personal loss, because men, once they are born, know that they will die some time. This is a great political event. It is an accident; it is a great international tragedy; if it is anything else it will become an international crime. It is the desire of my Government and people that there should be a complete investigation of this matter when the occasion arises, and as soon as it is possible, so that the world will be assured that those who travel around functioning on behalf of the United Nations shall be free from hostile action by those from whom it is not expected.

My country is very shocked by this event, but we hope that the void that has been left by the sudden departure of the Secretary-General will not leave us stunned in such a way as not to perform our duties. In a sense it is a test for the United Nations because there are no provisions laid down, but since we are here as leaders of the nations of the world it is our duty to find a way out.

To Dag Hammarskjold himself - for his great devotion to the cause of the United Nations and for the friendliness which he brought to bear among the nations of the Organisation - we pay our tribute. To the people of Sweden, who have now sacrificed the second of their great citizens to the cause of international peace,[11] our hearts go out, and I am quite sure that the Assembly will want to remember the colleagues of Dag Hammarskjold, the other servants of the United Nations, who perished with him in the same catastrophe, and I wish to convey our sympathy to their families on this occasion.

With regard to the Congo itself, the best tribute we can pay to the Secretary-General is to see that the Security Council resolutions are implemented. Just half an hour ago has come the news of a cease-fire in Katanga. That may be the beginning, or perhaps the completion, of the implementation of the resolution of the United Nations and a movement from struggle to peace.

For all these reasons we should do well to remember the service rendered by the late Secretary-General in this connection, often under criticism, and it is not to be wondered at that any person who is dynamic and who has a policy and ideas to put forward should some time incur hostility and criticism. Neither that person nor the critic, therefore, is to be regarded as being doomed to condemnation for all times. That is part of the incidence of public life, as such, and Dag Hammarskjold took it in that way. All representatives will remember that when last year, while we were at the United Nations, there were demands for his resignation he said, very courageously, that it was very easy to resign but much more difficult to stay on. He said that if it was the desire of the smaller nations in the Assembly that he should resign he would do so; but that, on the contrary, if it was not their desire that he should resign, he would stay.[12]

---

[11] Count Folke Bernadotte of Sweden (1895-1948), United Nations Mediator in Palestine, was assassinated in Jerusalem on September 17, 1948.

[12] The Soviet Union condemned Mr. Hammarskjold for the actions of the United Nations in the

Mr. Hammarskjold brought the importance of the United Nations to bear in Africa more than in any other part of the world. Perhaps those who have been here for six or seven years will realise that until about three years ago Africa was spoken of only in passing. It was only in 1957-1958, I believe, that in the Secretary-General's report, Africa was fully projected as an important part of United Nations activities - not merely in the sense of receiving milk from UNICEF or antibiotics from WHO, but as part of the problem of restoring the imbalance of the world in which the present African position emerged. To Africa, more than anything else, his later years were devoted, and to Africa we look for the correction of these imbalances which will help to restore peace and harmony in the world.

To the late Secretary-General, therefore, we pay our tribute, and as far as we are concerned we should like to assure this Assembly that, to the best of our ability and to the best of the ability of our Government and our people, we shall devote ourselves to the fulfilment of the purposes of the Charter and the resolutions passed by the United Nations - more particularly with regard to the Congo, to Africa and to other matters.

WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

[Admission of new members to the United Nations was blocked from 1950 as the Western countries vetoed eastern European States and the USSR countered by vetoing all other applicants, including several Asian States. India, and Krishna Menon in particular, tried hard to break the deadlock. Some sixteen new members were admitted in a "package deal" in 1955 when a compromise was reached. The following are speeches by Mr. Menon on the admission of some of the new members since that time.]

MALAYA

Speech at the Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly on September 17, 1957[13]

With Malaya my country has very ancient and historic connections. In the third century before Christian era, before the emissaries of the Emperor Asoka of that

---

Congo.

[13] Source: *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twelfth Session, Plenary Meetings,* pages 8-9

time went to preach peace and co-operation in this land - long before that - geologists have it that, by overland route on the continent that is now submerged, trade was carried on between India and Malaya of that day. Later on, through the Straits of Malacca we traded with China, and this connection between the two territories was later cemented by the movement of populations. So today in this vast land there are some 700,000 people of Indian origin who are either citizens of or domiciled in the Federation of Malaya.

In welcoming the Federation of Malaya to membership in the United Nations, we are happy to recall the fact that once again the United Kingdom, in the exercise of its sovereignty and by the process of co-operation, has enabled one of its former colonial territories to become an independent nation.

On this occasion, the names of two men, who are not present in the Assembly, come foremost to mind. One is the present Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya, Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra, whose statesmanship and patience has enabled both the United Kingdom and the several States that compose the Federation, to overcome the difficulties that made the achievement of independence a very long process extending over several years of negotiation.

The other name that comes to one's mind is that of another statesman, a Scotsman, the High Commissioner for the United Kingdom in India, Mr. Malcolm Macdonald, who a few years ago started what then seemed the impossible task of welding the various communities and territories of Malaya in preparation for independence.

It would not perhaps be inappropriate at this moment to say that, irrespective of the different racial stocks that exist in the territory, it is possible, given the will and the desire to co-operate, for them to be united in a form of independence within the aegis of the Commonwealth of Nations. This may be an instance which has lessons for all of us. We in India are happy to feel that the process that we began as an act of faith in the United Kingdom and in ourselves and other members of the Commonwealth eight or nine years ago, when the territories that became independent decided, upon their own free will and with no pressure from the older members of the Commonwealth, to remain in the fraternity - that act of faith stands justified today. Now the tenth member of the Commonwealth has been admitted as a Member of the United Nations at the dawn of its independence and welcomed by the other States in the same way as its predecessors.

This is a further step in the Asian revolution and the liberation of colonial peoples. Now two or three small pieces of territory have yet to take this course, and we hope that the United Kingdom and others that have assisted in the process of the liberation of Malaya will not be found wanting in the processes which will accomplish the same thing in regard to other territories...

That chapter of history which began 171 years ago, when the British went to this

place and established a colony, and which has passed through various vicissitudes, is now completed. We have no doubt that the attainment of independence by the Federation of Malaya is not merely the achievement of that country and the United Kingdom, but is also one of great credit to the world, and its admission to the United Nations is a gain to us as it is to that country.

GUINEA

Speech at the Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly on December 12, 1958[14]

We join in congratulating the two main parties who made this event possible, namely, the new Republic of Guinea and the Republic of France.

While countries have won freedom before, the modern age has seen imperialisms abdicating their power and, at least in the last stage, in an atmosphere of friendship and co-operation or at least in the acceptance of the inevitability of freedom. We are also glad to feel that in the rise of the Republic of Guinea there has been an expansion of the arena of freedom in West Africa, opened in recent times by the action of the United Kingdom in welcoming what was the former Gold Coast to the sisterhood of the nations of the Commonwealth.

We have no doubt at all that this event has had an impact on the awakening and the fruition of the efforts of the people of West Africa, and I hope that the whole of Africa will continue to have it in the same way.

In the case of Guinea there is one other factor which we must not lose sight of, and that is the great national movement which has enabled Guinea to become independent today - and the full participation in it of the great trade union organisations - which gives us the hope or the insurance of social equity and social progress in this new republic of Africa. We welcome this eighty-second member, therefore, not merely as an addition to our large number, but as one which will bring to this Assembly new ideas and which will contribute generally to the lessening of tensions and to the richness which so-called small nations have contributed to the work of this Organisation...

We hope that the admission of Guinea will be followed by the admission of other countries with which it was linked until a few days ago. Since 1946, Guinea has been a part of the French West African Federation. Only two days ago we read that Dahomey, the Ivory Coast and other parts of that French federation had become republics. We hope that the republican form of government, the content of it, will justify their application for admission and our welcoming them here...

---

[14] Source: *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirteenth Session, Plenary Meetings*, pages 571-572

I believe that Guinea is the first element in the French colonial empire proper - that is, excluding Cambodia, Laos, Tunisia and Morocco, which were protectorates whose sovereignties were, theoretically, only mothered by the presence of an empire on top of them. This is the first part of 4.5 million square miles of colonial territory of the French empire in Africa which, by dint of its own efforts and by the co-operation of the leadership of the French Government, has been able to come into the United Nations...

My Government, which recognised the Government of the Republic of Guinea as soon as it was born, joins with all of you not only in congratulating this new republic, but in hoping that its admission to the United Nations will rapidly lead to the expansion of freedom in West Africa, in the rest of Equatorial Africa - not only in French Equatorial Africa - but in the rest of the former mandated and trust territories such as Tanganyika, and, as a previous speaker has said, in two or three years` time when the neighbouring territories come into the Organisation, we would have altered the composition of this body sufficiently to make it more representative of the world as it is.

THIRTEEN AFRICAN STATES AND CYPRUS

Statement in the Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly, on September 20, 1960[15]

... today we think of these fourteen new nations which have joined us - some of them on the continent of Africa, others like Cyprus, populated by people who have inherited an ancient civilisation. I think it is also right to say that, in some of these cases, as in Somali land and Cyprus, for example, the United Nations has taken a direct part, if I may say so, in that liberation. Not only those who have gained liberty but also those who denied them liberty have learned the lesson of liberty because the burden of empire is not always on those over whom the empire rules, but on the people of the empire itself. They may also rest content in thinking that, with the expansion of the political dimensions of humanity, they have contributed to this vast Organisation greater and greater power towards peace because empire and peace do not live together. The greater the inroads we make into the negation of freedom which empire represents, the greater the hope and the prospect of peace in this world.

My delegation would also like to recall on this occasion the great numbers of men, women and statesmen who have contributed much both in the ruling countries and in the ruled or oppressed countries in order to bring about this consummation. I think it is only right that we should also remember those men and women who made the supreme sacrifice in order that those who came after them might become citizens of a free country.

---

[15] Source: *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Plenary Meetings*, pages 26-27

The United Nations can congratulate itself that it is receiving into its fold millions of human beings who, perhaps a generation ago, would not have been thought of in this context, but who today represent in their own persons and presence here as independent nations the triumph of the principles of the Charter. But that triumph would have been short-lived unless the imbalances that exist in the world, largely as the result of previous conditions, are not redressed both by the efforts of the people who are liberated and by those who are in more privileged positions.

I conclude by saying that, even before this Assembly rises, we hope to welcome into this fold newer elements who represent this freedom and that the whole continent of Africa, the rest of Asia, the remnants of the colonial empires will also see either the light of day or the curtain which keeps them away from it will be ripped open by the force and energy of peoples. Once again, I wish to congratulate all these new countries that have come into the United Nations...

SENEGAL AND MALI

Statement in the Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly, September 28, 1960[16]

It is with a sense of privileged duty that my delegation appears on this rostrum, on its own behalf and also on behalf of the delegation of Pakistan to convey our congratulations to the two young Republics - Senegal and Mali - which have now joined us as States members of the United Nations.

We have reason to congratulate ourselves on more than one count. First of all, the wisdom and statesmanship of the leaders of these countries have saved us from the fear of another crisis and another seat of confusion on the African continent. The Assembly owes them a debt of gratitude for having been able to resolve their disputes in this way and for having given a demonstration of the implementation of the principles of the Charter which calls upon people to resolve their disputes by peaceful means...[17]

My country is very happy to feel that on this continent of Africa where in 1950 there were four independent countries - that is, if you include South Africa as an independent country, large numbers of its people not being independent - there are now some twenty-six independent countries, covering a population of 178 million out of a total estimated population of 222 million. The great French empire with its area of 4.5 million square miles has now only three-quarters of a million square miles under its tutelage. It is our hope that with the victory of

---

16 Source: *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Plenary Meetings*, pages 209-10

17 The Federation of Mali, encompassing Senegal and Mali, established in 1958, was granted independence in June 1960. But Senegal and Mali separated soon and the two States applied for membership in the United Nations.

freedom in Algeria, the greater part of that area also will come within the ambit of freedom. The remainder of what is truly dark Africa is South West Africa - I use the language of the present rulers - and Portugal in Africa. We have no doubt that the vigour and the determination of the African peoples, backed by enlightened public opinion and the conscience of humanity, will see the dismemberment of the Portuguese empire and the liberation of the African peoples and others subject to Portuguese colonialism...

NIGERIA

Statement in the Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly, October 7, 1960[18]

My delegation is privileged to be associated with other Commonwealth countries and to be associated on behalf of the Government and people of India in the good wishes expressed from this rostrum both to the people and Government of Nigeria and the people and Government of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the present occasion when Nigeria has become an independent country. I have also the great privilege of speaking on behalf of our neighbour countries of Burma and Nepal, who asked me to do so.

We from India have special reason to feel gratified on this occasion, because the current of political evolution which was released by the emancipation of India... that process, though sometimes obstructed by the smaller-minded administrators, has progressed, and today we have large numbers of these territories which were formerly colonial countries that have become independent. Not only have they become independent, but they have become independent on the one hand, by the process of resistance, and, at the same time, by following that resistance along routes that are not violent.

In Africa, this current manifested itself in the liberation of the colony of the Gold Coast, now the great Republic of Ghana, which regained its territories that it had a thousand years ago in the great Empire of Ghana.

Now, Nigeria, though its name and its present geographical boundaries are the result of those pages of history which we desire to forget for the four hundred years that preceded British settlement, and though its territorial boundaries are the result of imperial occupation and conquest, that land and its peoples who were then resident there came into the context of international relations in the first millennium before the birth of Christ. From the ports of Egypt and India sailed the ships of the Phoenician Empire into Nigeria in order to conduct trade, and so did the Carthaginians. So from all times there have been relations...

There is at the present moment a comparatively unknown period between the

---

[18] Source: *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Plenary Meetings*, pages 525-26

Phoenician traders and, so far as I know, the later period when the French made an incursion into these territories, only halted by internal troubles in France itself. I would like to draw the curtain over the period that follows, because this is not the occasion for it. Then comes the challenge to the Portuguese monopoly, when the Portuguese protested to King Edward IV of England because some of his men had gone on to the coast of Guinea and they said they had a Portuguese monopoly in this area and no one should go there. So began the conflict between empires, which is always the hope of dependent peoples.

Then came the great liberal movements in England which were responsible - and I say this deliberately - which were responsible for the overthrow of slavery and the liberation of a large number of African peoples from the status they then had either in their own homeland or in other parts of the world.

The British Empire settled Nigeria; the present boundaries began gradually to emerge. It is a matter for congratulation to the British people and a matter of satisfaction to the Nigerian people that, unlike some other parts of the world, their many institutions, tribal systems, and so on, for various reasons which we need not go into now, were left comparatively free and intact. The liberal administration of West Africa enabled the emergence of the present Federation with its territorial particularity and, at the same time, a great sense of unity. I think, if the United Kingdom will forgive me, it is occasion not only to pay tribute to the British Government and British State as such, and to the Nigerian people but also to the large number of liberal administrators of West Africa - who are different from the administrators in some other parts of the Empire, who advocated the policy, though perhaps paternalistically, of the participation of the peoples themselves...

The relations of our own country with Nigeria have been of an economic character. It is singular that that area, like the rest of West Africa, is surprisingly free from any trace of racial discrimination. It is a happy thing that in those countries of the former British Empire which are now independent, and entirely independent members of an association which we call the Commonwealth, where all power and authority derives solely from their own people, there is no racial discrimination in reverse. My own country would dislike to see, either on account of past history or on account of a newer form of colonialism, the emergence in any of these territories of a practice against a non-indigenous minority which recalls the "apartheid" practice in the Union of South Africa. Discrimination in one direction or another is against the principles of the Charter and all elementary conceptions of human relationships.

Together, therefore, we welcome into this community of nations another great African territory, its boundaries shaped perhaps by pages of history of which everybody need not necessarily be proud - but progress always has diverse elements in it - and they come here through progress made by their own efforts very largely, responded to, as their leaders said in the Conference in London, by

the peoples and the Government of the metropolitan country in various degrees.

The number of the population liberated in Africa reached a total of 178 million in the past twenty years...

Over a hundred years of peaceful administration have brought into existence a federation - and a federation is a far more difficult political structure to work than a unitary government - which is today functioning. In the continent of Africa the struggle for that independence has been carried on comparatively peacefully. What justification on earth can exist for the continued domination and suppression of vast territories either by one country or another?

The United Nations, therefore, can point to all these territories as witness of the success of its gospel and also as justification for the demand that it must make upon other colonial countries.

At the end of the year perhaps others also will join until on that great continent which has now become so significant in the history of the development of peoples there alone will remain the empires of Portugal and of South Africa dominating other peoples. We have not the slightest doubt that the sense of liberty and the passion for freedom that rests in the minds of peoples, the example of the greatness of these nations, their proximity, and the development - economic, social and spiritual - they will make will be a force which no empire in the world can resist. This is the hope that we must have today, and I, on behalf of my Government and the people of India and of my colleagues of Nepal and Burma, tender congratulations to Nigeria and to the Government of the United Kingdom, and to the United Nations itself, for being able to welcome to our ranks a new nation with new contributions to make.