

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



## 940th PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 8 December 1960,  
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Address by Mr. Mamadou Dia, Prime Minister of the Republic of Senegal . . . . .</i>	1201

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

Address by Mr. Mamadou Dia, Prime Minister of the Republic of Senegal

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly meets this morning to hear an address by Mr. Mamadou Dia, the Prime Minister of Senegal, to whom I now give the floor.
2. Mr. MAMADOU DIA (Prime Minister of the Republic of Senegal) (translated from French): The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Senegal has already had the honour of informing this Assembly of my country's joy at being able to achieve full membership in this family of nations and to take its share of responsibility in the gigantic common task of constructing a new world, which is the fundamental task of the United Nations and one on which the hopes of all mankind are based. Our joy was all the greater inasmuch as there were two factors which gave it special significance.
3. In the first place, decolonization in our country was brought about peacefully and without bloodshed. Unlike a number of other instances of national liberation, this peaceful process made it possible for us to retain intact the friendship between our people and those of the former colonizing nation.
4. Some people have been astonished at this but nothing could be more logical. Friendship between two peoples does not mean that there is domination by the stronger over the weaker; as a matter of fact, it always implies the opposite. We say this in full freedom. We shall continue, with the same intellectual honesty, freely to distinguish our friends and to be wary of the intrigues of those who would wish to impose on us anew any form of trusteeship, which our new circumstances have convinced us we can no longer tolerate.
5. In addition to our freedom, attained in peace and friendship, we had a further cause for profound satisfaction in the warm and unanimous welcome we received from this Assembly, which showed the same enthusiasm in admitting all the new African nations of our "age group", with which we have so many common ties, thereby showing that the African continent has come of age and will soon be of age in its entirety, we hope. Indeed, it will be one of our most sacred duties to ensure that all our brothers join us here in this Assembly and that the presence of Africa in the world makes itself fully felt through the voice of a completely liberated Africa responsible for its own destiny.
6. It is true that there are one or two divergent notes in the policy of the new African nations, but we are

convinced that as the days go by they will dwindle into little family disputes which we have already begun to settle between ourselves and at home, by means of stressing, not only our common interests, but also the great fact of our brotherhood.

7. I do not wish only to talk to you about our own feelings. We know that we have come to join you in a world filled with problems and anguish and that it is our duty to share all those problems with you, without shirking. Our boldness in wishing to contribute with all our might to their solution will, I am sure, meet with complete understanding and considerate forbearance on your part.

8. For a long time—and long before we were able to express ourselves—we have endeavoured to ponder the great international happenings; we have felt ourselves at one with a world that is seeking to achieve equilibrium, beyond the tensions and clashes of a phrenetic history.

9. We have become convinced that the protagonists, who are engaged up to the hilt in the struggles through which this history is coming about, are so hard pressed by the events that they have scant opportunity to weigh the human side of the problems. Yet, if the human aspect is ignored, it becomes impossible to break through this battle of dialectics, which must be won at all costs, for failure will mean not only defeat but the complete overthrow of our way of life. We have therefore tried to reflect first of all upon the fundamental doctrine which must be accepted by all peoples and without which no form of international community is possible.

10. I shall endeavour to explain to you our impression of the world as we see it from the African continent. I shall then be on much firmer ground and better able to appraise the objectives of our common action and so to judge what means are open to us for achieving them in a worthy manner.

11. I do not think a single one of the great problems at present dividing the world can be solved without a universal effort, and consequently without a universal conception. We must therefore begin by trying to define what that conception is.

12. In the remarkable speech which he made before this Assembly on 22 September last, President Eisenhower said:

"The generating force behind a successful United Nations must be the noble idea that a true international community can build a peace with justice if only people will work together patiently in an atmosphere of open trust." [868th meeting, para. 82.]

13. On the following day, 23 September, in a speech which was also most remarkable, Premier Khrushchev declared in turn:

"The United Nations was established in the name of the victory of peace and tranquillity, in the service

of peace and the security of nations. We trust that the decisions reached by the present session of the General Assembly will bring us closer to the realization of peace and justice—the goal of all mankind.” [869th meeting, para. 110]

14. That, then, is how the most prominent leaders of the two great world coalitions stated, in curiously similar terms, the great objectives of their international action: namely, to build peace with justice. Unfortunately, we have to realize that, in this verbal paradox, we are at the heart of a gigantic conflict which would be absurdly lacking in purpose if those words meant the same thing to both sides. Why? Because peace is not simply a good thing in itself; it is secondary to justice, and justice for East and for West does not correspond to the same order of things in the world. It is this hard truth that we must agree to face if we wish to make progress and to try to resolve the great contradiction.

15. First and foremost, at the very heart of that contradiction, there is the United Nations, the Assembly which we are now attending.

16. An analysis of the important discussions of which the United Nations has been the scene—and sometimes even the cause—in recent years seems to reveal a profound evolution in all the conditions governing the vital problems which confront us and which tend to become issues of life and death, not only for one civilization but for all civilizations, not only for one group of human beings but for all men.

17. That explains why, as the representative of India in the First Committee [1094th meeting] recently put it, the smaller nations, like ourselves, may feel as much concern as the great nations about this alarming situation.

18. In trying to discover the meaning of the recent history of the United Nations, one comes to the conclusion that this supreme body, built above the nations and with the help of all the nations, is, alas, no longer essentially the meeting place where problems are discussed and disputes settled in order to achieve that co-operation which is becoming more and more necessary, which everyone is talking about, but which is practised only to a very limited extent outside the field of armaments and the machinery of war.

19. The United Nations has become a theatre of the cold war. There two great blocs confront one another daily, sometimes with sound and fury—so much so that one begins to wonder whether the building which still plays the part of a shield will not burst asunder—while at other times the competition, which is no less bitter, takes the form of procedural and tactical outmanoeuvring and outbidding, a veritable war of movement following—or sometimes accompanying—the war of positions.

20. The objectives of the two blocs seem quite clear to us who, not being totally crushed in their global dialectics and often appearing in the role of pawns, are in a better position to discern them.

21. The objectives and the strategy are for the most part strangely similar. Each bloc is convinced that its system of reasoning is leading it along the highway of history, that it alone is in possession of the truth. Strong in the possession of this exclusive truth, it feels in duty bound to conduct a crusade. Thus for each of the protagonists the avowed object is the defeat of the

other. There is no intermediate solution on a long-term or short-term basis.

22. Thus there has never been any genuine peaceful coexistence, since that would have meant each side tolerating the differences in the rival system and respecting the choice made by the other. Consequently, this coexistence that is continually being talked about is for the time being nothing but a myth. Furthermore, we think that peaceful coexistence in the sense of the passive juxtaposition of two blocs is a purely abstract conception, which is quite ineffectual for the solution of problems.

23. Between the two blocs an intense competition has arisen which, on the theory and practice of calculated risks—for the weapons on either side are becoming more and more formidable in size and power of destruction—is in danger of bringing about a cataclysm and complete destruction. But the two blocs do not yet control the whole world. Strangely enough, the young nations are still a choice prize and are subjected to every possible kind of enticement and veiled blackmail. In fact, it is now being said that the bloc which is able to lure the countries of the third sector of the world into its camp will probably have won the decisive phase of the struggle.

24. Such, then, is the crossroads at which we find ourselves, we, the nations of the third sector of the world, forced to define our position in relation to that situation, torn between the vital need to find the necessary resources for our development, that is to say for our survival as nations, and our personal dignity and the safeguarding of our own standards of civilization, which command us not to allow ourselves to be swallowed up in a struggle which is beyond us and which is crushing us.

25. I know that the temptation before us is to maintain ourselves in a state of balance between the two opposing blocs which want to lure us into their orbit and to try to keep up a semblance of independence. But that path, which may seem practicable for big nations—although I am not at all sure of that—seems to us to be more than hazardous for small countries, which would be hard put to it to resist the pressure of the rival bids. In such a highly competitive world, to be perpetually walking on the razor's edge seems to us to be extremely dangerous.

26. What, then, can we do? Is there any solution? That is what we have to devise very quickly. We must work out our strategy in terms of what we want to be. However difficult and ambitious such a course may seem, I do not think it is necessarily bound to fail. In any event, we cannot avoid this problem. I even think that, basing themselves on such reflections as these, the two blocs may deem it opportune to reconsider their arguments completely, giving them that human dimension without which we feel that mankind cannot survive.

27. Indeed, we think that despite the exaltation of man that is paraded in both camps, their propaganda machines mask a certain failure and conceal the same danger of not rising to the level of the age in which we are living.

28. In our countries where, despite our lack of material resources and in some cases our extreme poverty, man has remained more conscious of his communal and spiritual potentialities, we are better able to perceive what is somewhat unnatural in the solutions

put forward by either side, which are primarily technical.

29. We do not think it possible for an international exchange of ideas to be carried on successfully unless everyone tries, with the same good will, to discern the broad lines along which our world is developing, an evolution which is not being brought about entirely by the will of man. Common sense indicates that nothing will ever be settled unless we seek, first and foremost, to determine what tomorrow's world is going to be like—the world that will come after the two blocs.

30. If that world of tomorrow ever comes into existence, if destruction does not come to sweep everything away, it seems to us that it will have to come about through something corresponding to the basic view of Teilhard de Chardin, in the sense of a totalization of the organic structures of the nations and a consequent raising of human values. This cannot be done by following a static middle course between the present systems, but rather by going beyond present-day Marxism and beyond present-day liberalism, which sometimes calls itself individualistic, in a new and dynamic conception, striking a balance between whatever is best in those two basic currents which together embody the essence of the forces at work in the world today, namely socialism and individualism.

31. In practical terms, this implies that, for the world to progress in a balanced way, each of the two blocs would accept the existence of the other and an exchange of positive ideas in the matter of values, thus accepting a certain degree of influence from the other, and would agree to put a stop to unhealthy reactions in the name of conformity, which are reflected as much in the witch-hunting of McCarthyism as in the liquidation of so-called 'deviationists'.

32. We must do our utmost to make the Eastern bloc agree to restore those fundamental spiritual values which must find a place in all true socialism.

33. We shall strive equally hard to make the Western bloc recognize that it must not persist in rejecting the socialist form of society, in the most noble sense of the term—that concerned with the relationship between men and between peoples.

34. I know that it would be naïve to imagine that this "rapprochement" can be brought about without enormous difficulties, but I also think that until we have all of us, together, approached the problem at that level, we shall have settled only secondary aspects of all these questions and shall continue to run the risk of a global conflict. Permanent peace can be based only on this "rapprochement" of peoples.

35. Africa, which has not yet been completely caught in the coils of the cold war—though how long will that hold good?—has perhaps the mission in the United Nations of trying to offer a sincere testimony of what a continent can become when it determines to organize itself and to promote increasing co-operation within its own borders on the basis of a socialism which respects man's spiritual values. Africa must therefore be resolved to remain truly African, in the midst of the rival bids for it, by working out its own strategy, mapping out its own path and drawing up its own international doctrine, which can only be that of open co-operation and free exchange of views, without any limitations.

36. For us African socialists, this doctrine that I have tried to define, and that is designed to resolve the

fundamental contradiction in the world of today by combining socialism and individualism, offers a number of solutions to present-day problems. I shall not try to expound them to you, for I do not wish to overtax the kindly attention which this distinguished Assembly is good enough to accord me. With your permission, however, I shall draw attention to a few general principles relating to the main questions on the agenda of the present session.

37. First of all, it is not enough simply to proclaim coexistence; it has to be organized and, if possible, established by a series of reforms which will ensure the operation of democracy at the international level.

38. Our role at the United Nations should be to help to define the objectives and the means for fresh international action which would open the way to the construction of a true world democracy.

39. We for our part are ready to show that we believe in democracy by signing the convention on human rights drawn up by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. We feel that the Charter should not remain in this respect a purely declaratory document but that the States should comply with it in their respective domestic systems. For decolonization will not cease to be a principle for external use until there is complete democratization of national and governmental systems and of internal economic and social structures. Furthermore, in the century of the advance of the masses and of socialization, no declaration of human rights can assume full significance unless it is supplemented by a declaration of the rights of peoples, proclaiming among others the right, which is becoming more and more urgent, to economic and social development.

40. Indeed, world democracy will be economic and social democracy or it will not exist at all. Hence we welcome every effort, however modest, to solve the problem of under-development. We welcomed the setting up of the International Development Association. We think that the efforts of the United Nations must be co-ordinated and expanded by setting as the most immediate objective the establishment of The Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED), which the historic Bandung Conference in 1955 placed at the centre of its economic demands, and of a stabilization fund for raw materials.

41. There is no doubt that a problem of such concern as that of disarmament cannot be positively and realistically solved unless it is linked organically with economic and social co-operation which will ensure the reinvestment of the resources thus released step by step.

42. As is natural for a country which has been through all the stages of decolonization, Senegal fully endorsed the General Assembly resolution on putting an end to the colonial system [1514 (XV)]. It is hardly necessary to specify that we are not endeavouring to put an end to the old colonialism and its after-effects simply in order to fall under new forms of political, economic or strategic domination. Our anti-colonialism is not confined to one type; it is inspired by the universalist spirit of the pioneers of democracy, whether French or American. Need I add that the United Nations itself should set an example in all fields, first and foremost by democratizing the structure of its own organs, and that it should hasten to meet the claims of the African nations regarding an increase in the number of seats on the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council?

43. With regard to the admission of new States, a discriminatory policy seems to us to be completely contrary to the spirit of the Charter and to the jurisprudence of the General Assembly. That is why we support the admission of Communist China. Similarly, we strongly deplore the fact that the admission of Mauritania was made into a question of bargaining and of interference of bloc politics into our decisions. It must be understood once and for all that every young State, whatever its ideology, has a right to be seated among us. It is our duty to help it to find in the United Nations the protection and the guarantees which small nations have the right to expect from us in a harsh world, dominated by the powerful. I wish to take this occasion to reaffirm our solidarity with the young State of Mauritania and to express the firm hope that the injustice of which it has been the victim will soon be redressed.
44. I also think that the United Nations would do well to take an interest in the fate of those small nations which have been temporarily divided and mutilated as a result of artificial partitioning and are legitimately seeking to recover their unity. We think in this case that the simultaneous admission to the United Nations of the separated parts of one and the same nation can be a step towards a return to negotiation and efforts to obtain co-operation.
45. But the supreme test of the United Nations, which will measure its efficiency and the greatness of its mission, will lie in our capacity to help to settle the conflicts which are particularly painful for all the peoples, especially those of Africa, and whose threat to international peace needs no demonstration: I am referring to the Congo and Algeria.
46. When the debate on Algeria opens, we shall give our views on that question in greater detail. For the moment I shall confine myself to expressing a few general principles which, in my Government's view, constitute the basis for a peaceful, democratic and just solution of these conflicts.
47. First of all, as regards the principle of intervention by the United Nations, I consider it to be perfectly legitimate and necessary, but on one condition: namely, that it is guided by the democratic principles of the Charter and that it assists in finding a way to settle the difficulties instead of exacerbating them by introducing certain factors which are irrelevant both to the problem and to the interests of the peoples concerned. Hence it is not so much a question of saying that the United Nations should intervene as of defining the conditions, modalities and scope of its intervention, so that such intervention may be fully effective and may contribute to peace and the building of international democracy.
48. We think that the United Nations was quite right to intervene in the Congo in order to try to restore peace and put an end to chaos. The action of the Secretary-General was decisive in that respect and I wish to associate myself and Senegal with the just tribute that has been paid to him. But, while it is the business of the United Nations to create a climate of "rapprochement" and to help to restore to normal a situation which has deteriorated, we do not think it has any right to decide on the future régime of the Congo. It can only express the hope that the system will be one best adapted to the country, that it will not evade the problem of minorities and ethnic groups which a flexible internal federal system could solve without insuperable difficulties. It behoves us to leave it to the Congolese to determine their own future, which, it must be said, was sketched out only hastily and incompletely at the Brussels Round Table Conference in 1960.
49. In the present circumstances the exercise of that self-determination seems to be practically impossible. The Congo is exposed to all the winds of the cold war and to the unceasing play of intervention by the strategic blocs. Moreover, the most vociferous extremists on all sides are giving themselves free rein and making any constructive solution virtually impossible. We think it is for the brother African nations, acting under the guidance and in the spirit of the United Nations, to bring about a round table meeting of all the Congolese movements, not at Brussels this time but in Africa. No economic assistance plan for the Congo can be established until the institutions that will receive such assistance have been organized as a result of that round table meeting. The United Nations can only provide first aid to cope with humanitarian problems. It can begin to gather together the means for providing economic and technical assistance, but the Congo must be in a position to accept that assistance and to make use of it freely.
50. Our stand on the Algerian question will not surprise anyone. As old fighters for decolonization, we are in favour of self-determination for the Algerian people and we welcomed the formal recognition given to it, for the first time in Algerian history, by General de Gaulle. Furthermore, we have no hesitation in stating here that we are in favour of an independent Algerian Republic accepting majority rule and respecting minority rights, those being principles recognized by all modern democratic nations. It is only fair to recognize that, in this fundamental aim of the Algerian revolution, the speech of General de Gaulle on 4 November 1960 marks a new stage on the path of decolonization and makes a positive contribution to peace. The fact cannot be ignored that one of the main difficulties will lie in translating these principles into reality, a reality which is, alas, overshadowed by war with its train of horrors. Nevertheless, we think that, apart from the initiatives taken at various times not to hinder, as some have insinuated, but to prepare or extend United Nations action, the United Nations can and must assist in surmounting the obstacles, provided it has a sound notion of the nature and limits of its intervention. Realism and honesty towards our Algerian brothers force us to say that the role of the United Nations cannot be to impose a solution or even a procedure, but to establish the necessary climate for the resumption of negotiations between Frenchmen and Algerians.
51. We shall endorse any resolution which, imbued with that spirit, opens the way to negotiations instead of postponing them and which will promote peace, instead of compromising it. We are firmly in favour of a negotiated peace; we are firmly in favour of an Algerian Republic which is truly Algerian, made by and for the Algerian people. We distrust solutions which the authors know to run counter to those essential aims, for they maintain the breach instead of healing it and they prolong the state of war, with the risk of further deterioration, instead of leading to pacification.
52. Far be it from us, however, to discount any idea of reciprocal guarantees applying both to the ceasefire and to the implementation of a true self-determination. But we think that, whatever may be the difficulties to overcome, whatever the disappointments to

be borne, these guarantees can only result from direct negotiations which the United Nations has the right and the duty to demand in a unanimously supported recommendation.

53. That, in our opinion, is the proper course of action for the United Nations if it is to be efficient, constructive and true to the spirit of this body in a matter too serious to be the subject of bargaining.

54. Forgive me for having taxed your indulgence. I did not think I was entitled to fail to make use of a healthy tradition which is, indeed, a permanent tribute

to your Assembly, that is the tradition of free discussion, that supreme resource which nations sometimes tend to despise, but always to their detriment. It is not the least of my reasons for gratitude to the Assembly that it gave me the opportunity, in continuing that tradition, to associate myself with the tribute which we all owe to free discussion between peoples, of which the United Nations must be not only the symbol but a living image. The survival of nations, large or small, depends on that.

*The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.*