

CONSEIL DE L'ATLANTIQUE NORD
NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL

EXEMPLAIRE
COPY N° 222

M.F.

ENGLISH ONLY
2nd November, 1961

NATO RESTRICTED
WORKING PAPER
AC/52-WP(61)60

COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION AND CULTURAL RELATIONS

STATEMENTS ON GERMANY AND BERLIN IN THE GENERAL DEBATE
OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Note by the United States Delegation

The attached paper is provided as a contribution to the process of exchanging material and information connected with public relations work on Germany and Berlin.

2. The paper contains analyses of statements made on Germany and Berlin in the general debate of the United Nations and extracts from some of the speeches are attached at Annexes A and C.

3. In its original form the paper was classified "Official Use Only".

NOTE: Throughout this document please replace the expression GDR by "the Soviet occupied zone of Germany".

OTAN/NATO,
Paris XVIIe.

NATO RESTRICTED

STATEMENTS ON BERLIN AND GERMANY IN UNGA GENERAL DEBATE

PART I: 22nd September to 4th October, 1961

1. Of the first 39 speeches in the General Debate (as of 4th October) all but five (Ghana, Argentina, Chile, Uruguay and the Dominican Republic) made some reference to the Berlin and German problem. A number of countries mentioned Berlin only in passing, merely pointing out that Berlin and Germany constituted a serious problem for world attention. Included in this category are Iran, Liberia, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Turkey and Saudi Arabia. Most of the speeches made no clear-cut distinction between the narrower question of the Berlin dispute and the broader problem of the way in which the future of Germany and the security of Central Europe affected the East-West conflict. Guinea, Lebanon and Liberia, for example, asserted that the Berlin problem was properly to be regarded as one aspect of the more general East-West dispute. Guinea expressed some concern that the problem of Berlin might cause the United Nations to lose sight of the more important problem of "colonial oppression".

2. For India, Menon at first stated his government did not want to make any remark about the Berlin crisis lest it "came in the way of some agreement". But later he declared that India was in favor of any country that "wants to make peace", and wondered "if the Americans want to make peace with East Germany".

3. Annex A lists delegations that have spoken and contains excerpts of significant references to the Berlin issue during the period covered in this Part.

Self-Determination

4. The central theme of most statements on Berlin, particularly those which favored the West, was self-determination. This was cast in a great variety of formulations. Indeed, a number of the bloc countries and neutralists picked up the theme maintaining that the régimes in both Germanies could be regarded as instances of self-determination. There was, however, a certain amount of defensiveness on the part of pro-bloc speakers in their references to self-determination. The basic argument on the pro-Western side (notably put forward by Latin American delegations) was that the problem of Berlin could not be separated from that of self-determination for East Germany and called attention to the flow of refugees and the lack of free elections. The stronger statements suggested that only free elections would assure stability and a system of justice and freedom in Central Europe (Brazil) and that the right of self-determination has been "contemptuously denied to the inhabitants of East Berlin" (Netherlands). Tied in with the theme of self-determination were frequent references to unification through

democratic means. Notable was the statement by the Japanese speaker which called for a lasting settlement which would reflect the "freely expressed will" of the city of Berlin and the people of Germany. Bloc statements either suggested that the cry for self-determination masked an intent by the Federal Republic to absorb the GDR or contended that the actual existence of two Germanies constituted self-determination.

Negotiation

5. Almost all of the speakers who mentioned Berlin called for negotiation as the road to settlement. Most of the references were vague and did not suggest either the forum or the content of negotiations. Normally the plea for negotiation was made in the context of fear of war and the need to reconcile the two sides. Only Libya suggested that the UN itself should participate in the process of negotiation, but there were a number of references to a possible UN rôle in Berlin.

Right of Access

6. Surprisingly few speakers made explicit references to right of access to West Berlin, although this appeared to be implicit in arguments for a settlement based on existing rights or new arrangements. Specific references to access were made by Canada, New Zealand, Senegal and Yugoslavia. Notable was the statement by Yugoslavia that "within the framework of an agreement the free access of the Western powers to West Berlin should be guaranteed as well as the right of the population of West Berlin to determine its own political and social order". Variations on this theme were also advanced by a number of bloc delegations, although the USSR formulation, while "solemnly" declaring that West Berlin's population would be guaranteed the right to live under its own social system, emphasized that lines of communication to the "free city of West Berlin" would run through the GDR, and that "appropriate agreement" on the use of such communications would have to be concluded with the "sovereignty" of the German Democratic Republic.

No Unilateral Change

7. The strongest statement (also advanced by the British, the Pakistanis and the Guatemalans) against unilateral changes in the present arrangement was that of Japan, which declared that "a four-power agreement continues to be in effect. There can be no lasting settlement of the Berlin situation by unilateral denunciation of valid international agreements or by threatening gestures".

Two Germanies

8. In addition to emphatic bloc and Yugoslav statements that the major premise of a settlement is the recognition of two

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DECLASSIFIE - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

Germanies, there were three references to the "reality" of two Germanies by Asian and African countries (Ceylon, Senegal, and Cambodia). Perhaps one of the most significant of these was that of Senegal, which noted that while "the ideal solution would have been to permit the whole of the German people to express its will in the form of self-determination, the splitting of Germany is today a reality". One expression of this recognition of two Germanies was the suggestion by a number of delegations that both Germanies be welcomed as separate entities into the United Nations. The Cambodians noted that an ideal solution would have been unification by referendum and big-power agreement to neutralization, but since this is out of the question they suggested recognition by the United Nations of both Germanies.

Abnormality of Berlin's Status

9. Only Yugoslavia and a number of bloc delegations used the term "abnormal" in describing the status of Berlin and the situation of Germany in Europe.

United Nations Role

10. Apart from bloc proposals, Denmark and Canada were the only delegations to suggest a UN rôle in the Berlin settlement. The Danes proposed moving some UN organs to Berlin. The Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, carefully predicating his statement on the existence of a prior four-power agreement, suggested that the UN could serve in an observer capacity in the "whole city" and some access routes, that the UN might assume responsibility for operating an "international régime" in the city, and that international influence would be strengthened by locating some UN agency in the city.

Soviet Bloc Position

11. The Soviet bloc speakers, in addition to using the UNGA as a major propoganda forum for reiteration of the themes they have been espousing for the past three years, have been more precise about the kind of Berlin settlement they favor than have the Western speakers. Major points made by the Soviets and reiterated in various forms by the Czechs (and largely supported by the Yugoslavs) were: the need for a peace treaty and convening of a peace conference, reaffirmation of the future of West Berlin as a "free city" based on the peace treaty, restatement of the right of the citizens of West Berlin to be safe-guarded in their right to "live and work under the social system which suits them", unqualified respect for the sovereignty of the GDR, readiness to accept any proposals for the most effective guarantees for that city "than can be found in present-day international practices", and guarantees of access through appropriate agreement on communications with the GDR. In addition the Soviets propose that the status of the

free city would be "officially registered with the United Nations" and that other forms of United Nations participation in the guarantees of the freedom and independence of the free city could also be envisaged. The bloc repeatedly stated (Rumania, Czechoslovakia, USSR and Yugoslavia) that a peace treaty was needed to prevent a resurgence of German militarism.

PART II: 5th October to 11th October, 1961

12. Of the twenty-seven speeches⁽¹⁾ made in the general debate during this period, all but three (Malagasy, South Africa and Israel) made some reference to Berlin. The speakers generally followed the same line as the thirty-nine delegations that spoke before 4th October, as reported in Part I.

13. Statements contained little that was unusual. A number of delegations took refuge in vagueness, along the lines of Morocco's statement of hope that a "peaceful and equitable settlement of this grave problem" would be found. Self-determination continued to be the dominant theme, and was particularly emphasized in pro-Western statements by the Latin American group. Two delegations (Greece and Malaya) made unusually forthright statements which put the blame for the crisis on Soviet unilateral repudiation of agreements and the creation of accomplished facts which prejudiced a solution.

14. Four countries (Tunisia, Thailand, Gabon and Nigeria) called for some degree of UN participation. Nigeria and Gabon espoused the idea of a free Greater Berlin organized under UN auspices. Nigeria suggested that when UN forces are withdrawn from the Congo, the small powers should contribute troops and police to occupy and maintain the peace of the city.

Bloc Emphasizes German Militarism

15. The Bloc countries reiterated the Soviet position, each ringing the alarm bell on West German militarism. Hungary, perhaps running out of new material, quoted paragraphs from the earlier Gromyko speech.

Latins, Greeks, Malaysians Support the Western Position

16. The Latin American group, except for Cuba, whose spokesman toed the Bloc line, came out repeatedly for self-determination for Berlin and Germany, East and West. Costa Rica supported "the cause of the refugees from communism in East Germany," and Colombia blamed the crisis on Soviet "unwillingness to allow self-determination among a people divided against its will."

17. Greece and Malaya, by implication, put the blame of the crisis on the USSR. Greece felt that the crisis was caused by

(1) See list at Annex B.

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DECLASSIFIE - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

"the breaking of contracts, to the repudiation of clauses of treaties of peace and to the creation of de facto situations prejudicial to the solution of problems." Malaya claimed that any unilateral act would "produce reactions with harmful consequences."

Neutrals on the Fence

18. The orthodox neutrals (U.R., Indonesia and Iraq) attempted not to choose sides. The UAR merely quoted from the Belgrade resolutions asking that the Berlin crisis be settled without force. Iraq felt that an "agreement to neutralize Germany" would "greatly facilitate" a settlement. Indonesia talked of the "existing realities" of two Germanies, two Berlins, and "acceptance of free passage from and to West Berlin." It urged the Great Powers to "stop treating these nations which are divided against themselves as an ideological battleground."

19. Nepal rode two horses, simultaneously claiming that "the first essential of the German question is that existing agreements must be scrupulously honored and any modification thereof must be sought through negotiations, consent and agreement" and asserting that "in a dynamic world the maintenance of strict positions sometimes tends to hold up progress, and becomes a source of friction and conflict." Nepal did state unambiguously that "the solution of this (Berlin) crisis is completely in the hands of the Big Powers, and it appears to us that the United Nations has almost no practical means of intervening in it."

African Views

20. Niger and Somalia felt the basis solution would revolve around "self-determination." There was no explicit explanation of what self-determination meant. Togo felt that one would have to deal with "valid spokesmen of the Germans" which could be interpreted as one more variation of the self-determination theme. The same vagueness characterized the Moroccan hope that through negotiation a "peaceful and equitable settlement of this grave problem" could be reached.

For United Nations Participation

21. Tunisia, Thailand, Gabon and Nigeria called for varying degrees of UN participation. Tunisia felt that "our organization, in keeping with its mission, should assist the two great rivals in leaving aside their distrust and in reshaping their ideological framework so as to allow a constructive and calm approach to the problem, particularly so as to allow them some type of stable settlement that would take into account all the legitimate interests, first of which is the safeguarding of

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DECLASSIFIE - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

peace in that critical region of Europe." Thailand upheld "the principle and practice of self-government" and believed "the problem may be brought from the narrow and unmanoeuvrable area into a wider forum where perhaps the UN may be able to play a helpful and beneficial rôle in preventing that grave situation from deteriorating still further."

22. Gabon and Nigeria called for direct UN intervention. Gabon asked if it could "not be conceived that, under the flag of the UN, there might be a free zone which would encompass not only West Berlin but all of the city, and from which the troops of the parties would be evacuated." The Nigerian proposal, though also phrased in questions, had more detailed suggestions.

"It seems to me that they (the big Powers) are not prepared to (discuss the German problem) because, again, we find all sorts of problems involved. There is fear about rearming Germany, reuniting Germany, and starting off a third war in that area... On the question of Berlin, so many people have suggested here that it is necessary to have an international police force ... Is it possible to persuade the Eastern section to find a new capital for its own area, just as Bonn is the capital for the exercise of political power by the West, and to surrender Berlin to the UN, so that neither of the great Powers holds sway there and so that the Berliners, at least, can have peace and tranquility under the auspices of the UN until such a time as the big Powers begin to think realistically and reasonably in terms of the yearnings of mankind to be free from the fear of destruction? I pose the question only so that, when we withdraw the troops and the police from the Congo, each Member State of the UN may contribute troops and police occupying Berlin and maintaining the peace of Berlin in the interests of mankind. Preferably, none of the big Powers should have any say there, and those who control the area should be drawn from the smaller Powers. Is that possible, in order to save mankind from destruction because of Berlin?"

PART III: 12th October to 19th October, 1961

23. Of the final twelve speeches in the General Debate, all but two (Yemen and Laos) made some reference to Berlin. (Finland and Syria did not speak in the debate but made general statements, neither of which mentioned Berlin). The themes touched on included unification, sanctity of treaties, self-determination, and Berlin as a Soviet-manufactured crisis(1).

(1) For excerpts from these speeches see Annex C.

Australia: The Soviet-Created Crisis

24. Australia claimed that it is only because the Soviet Union has been "waving threats, forcing questions forward, demanding decisions, demanding action that is not acceptable to key parties" that this session of the General Assembly meets "in an atmosphere of possible war". Australia denied the persistent bloc charge of German militarism. Its speaker said that "there is no intention to use Germany as a spearhead that will threaten the security of any of the countries of Europe".

The Wall

25. Cyprus and Congo (B) spoke up against the "wall". Congo (B) asked if "as a sign of obvious goodwill and of respect for the status quo ante. . . those hateful walls which give to Berliners on either side the impression of living in a despicable ghetto" could be destroyed. The Cyprian speaker claimed that "we cannot refrain from expressing our profound regret and disappointment in witnessing barbed wires placed and high walls erected in Berlin in order to render more effective and more pronounced the breaking up and division of a great city".

Self-Determination

26. Self-determination, that is letting the Germans decide if they should be reunited, was suggested by Cameroun, Spain, Congo (B), and Cyprus. Congo (B) challenged the Soviet attitude to self-determination: "Some speakers have gone so far in this Assembly as to say that the German people decided their future in 1949 and to speak of self-determination today is but a mockery." But, the speaker claimed, "why not admit simply that the German people exist? This is a reality. Why do the advocates of the division of Germany not agree to let the entire German people speak out".

27. Both Congo (L) and Sudan stated that the Berlin crisis was caused by both East and West, but both nevertheless suggested self-determination. Congo (L) stated "in order to show that they stand firm, each bloc of antagonists risk involving the world in an atomic conflict," but self-determination "might be the key to the solution of the Berlin problem just as it should be the key to all problems which threaten world peace". Sudan claimed that "the crisis in its essence is a crisis caused by mistrust, fear and lack of confidence", and the solution depended on "the legitimate aspirations of the German people".

Small-Nation Fear of War

28. Sierra Leone's statement calling for negotiation and suggesting that the small nations offer their "good offices" to

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DECLASSIFIE - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

aid in finding a peaceful solution in essence seems to be representative of the small-nation position. "My delegation, alongside the delegations of many small countries in this Assembly, is most anxious to see the solution of the Berlin question and the ultimate removal of this potential source of war. The great powers involved with the situation there have spent such a long time talking without apparently reaching any solution -- is it not time that the smaller nations not directly involved with the passions and emotions of the political situation in Berlin be brought into their councils to inject sanity into their deliberations and help achieve a solution? Who knows whether the small nations of Africa and Asia have not been called into the councils of the world for such a time as this, when men of the older nations seem to be at their wits' end and appear determined to destroy themselves and the world around them?"

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DECLASSIFIE - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENTS ON BERLIN IN UNGA DEBATE
22nd September - 4th October, 1961

(A) Latin America

BRIZIL (Arimos de Melo Franco 9/22/61): "The problem of Berlin cannot be separated from that of the self-determination of Eastern Germany. . . The flow of refugees is proof of this type of neo-colonialism. . . The German nation has the right to be a single State that may, through democratic means, guarantee the free expression of the will of its people."

URUGUAY (Nardone 9/22/61): No mention of Berlin

VENEZUELA (Falcon Briceno 9/25/61): "I am referring to the problem of Berlin, which is really only part of the more general problem of Germany's reunification. My delegation believes that this question must be solved by negotiation."

PERU (Prado 9/25/61): ". . . periodic free election which would assure a system of justice and freedom as well as respect for human rights. By this means more than one serious problem now pending -- such as, for example, that of reunification of Germany -- could be settled with the support of world public opinion."

ECUADOR (Vela-Hervés 9/26/61): ". . . the difficult and tragic situation of sixteen million people subjugated in East Germany to a special status."

ARGENTINA (Frondizi 9/27/61): No mention of Berlin

GUATEMALA (Unda Murillo 9/28/61): "The problem of Berlin is an integral part of the problem of German reunification. We have heard on various occasions Soviet representatives . . . pronounce themselves . . . in favour of the self-determination of peoples; and yet they categorically refuse to permit artificially divided peoples from exercising this right of self-determination with regard to their future."

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (Balaguer 10/2/61): No mention of Berlin

PARAGUAY (Godinot de Vilaire 10/3/61): (Transcript not yet available.) Speaker stated that people of Germany had right to determine their own future.

HONDURAS (Milla-Bermudes 10/4/61): (Transcript not yet available) Speaker stated that if principle of self determination were applied in Germany, there would be no Berlin problem.

(B) Asia (except SEATO)

CAMBODIA (Sihanouk 9/22/61): "To give a seat to each Government of the divided countries would in no way disturb the balance because we know that each of them would follow faithfully the leader of the bloc to which it has given allegiance . . . The ideal solution is surely the reunification of these countries by a general referendum organized and controlled by the United Nations, without intervention from the two Governments which are aligned with the blocs responsible for the division. But in the present state of the world this reunification can only be obtained if the two blocs recognize and guarantee a military neutralization of these reunified countries. And this seems out of the question for the moment."

IRAN (Nakhai 9/22/61): "It is our earnest belief that there are two major factors to be considered in solving the problem: that force, and threats to use force, must be abandoned; and that the rule of international law with respect to the right of peoples to self-determination must be observed."

JAPAN (Kosaka 9/22/61): "On the status of Berlin, a Four-Power agreement continues to be in effect. There can be no lasting settlement of the Berlin question by unilateral denunciation of valid international agreements or by threatening gestures. There is no question but that its settlement should be reached by mutual agreement through negotiations and that such settlement should be in accord with the United Nations Charter."

LEBANON (Ammoun 10/2/61): "The resurgent crisis of Berlin, together with that of Germany, brings mankind to the very brink of the abyss. It cannot be viewed in isolation from the competition which, since the end of 1945, has cast its sinister shadow on our whole planet."

SAUDI ARABIA (Shukairy 10/3/61): (Transcript not yet available) Speaker stated that if General Assembly could create "necessary atmosphere for two Germanies and two Berlins to be united under one system or another" German people would know how to do it. Neither West nor East had any legitimate rights to "one single inch of Germany."

CHINA (Shen 10/4/61): (Transcript not yet available) Speaker stated that "deliberate Soviet creation designed to bring West Berlin under communist domination" is causing the crisis.

INDIA (Monon 10/4/61): (Transcript not yet available) Speaker declared his government did not want to make any remark about the Berlin crisis -- lest it "come in the way of some agreement." But a bit later he declared that India was in favour of any country which "wants to make peace," and wondered "if the Americans want to make peace with East Germany."

CEYLON (Bandaranaike 9/2/61): "It was not intended that a peace treaty should be signed until a reunified, demilitarized Germany could be established . . . Supposing it never happens, the contract will never run out . . . if we start on that kind of assumption we shall get into extremely deep water . . . When one makes an assessment of Berlin, it is not sufficient to think only in terms of legal rights and technicalities arising from agreements concluded among the victorious Powers at the end of the last war . . . One of these realities happens to be the existence of two Germanies today, whether we like it or not. Equally we have to bear in mind that no solution in regard to Berlin can be accepted which does not accord with the wishes of the people of West Berlin to retain their way of life."

AFGHANISTAN (Pazhwak 9/27/61): "In our view, the major problems confronting the world are the following: . . . the settlement of the situation in Berlin -- although this last point is not yet on the agenda of this session."

(C) Africa

SENEGAL (Thiam 9/22/61): "The ideal solution would have been to permit the whole of the German people to express its will in the form of self-determination. Perhaps it will have the opportunity, one day, of so doing. However, the splitting of Germany is today a reality. We can deplore it, but unfortunately that will not change anything . . . and we must consecrate the existence of these two States and find, for the specific problems of Berlin, a solution guaranteeing to that city a status which would make it possible for the Western forces to have free access to it, in particular West Germans having free access to it. That is one way in which this matter should be dealt with in the interests of peace."

GHANA (Adjei 9/26/61): No mention of Berlin

LIBERIA (Grimes 9/27/61): "A serious situation exists in Berlin . . . the peoples of the world are demanding that such negotiations begin at once to ease the tensions and remove the threat of war."

GUINEA (Beavogui 10/2/61): One simple remark: If the Soviet Union and the United States really desired it, there would no longer be any problem of Berlin today . . . We should also like to appeal to our Organization to see to it that the problem of Berlin, important as it may be, does not cause it to lose sight of the terrible colonial oppression."

ETHIOPIA (Yifru 10/2/61): "The Berlin crisis has developed because of the absence of agreement among the Four Powers concerning the future of Germany and, in particular, the status of Berlin."

LIBYA (Fekini 10/4/61): (Transcript not yet available)
Speaker stressed danger of any unilateral attempt to alter present position in Berlin. The UN should offer to help reconcile opposing points of view. However, self-determination and territorial integrity should in all circumstances be upheld.

(D) NATO and SEATO

NETHERLANDS (Luns 9/26/61): "It is our profound conviction that the way of life which the people of West Berlin have freely chosen must be respected and not obliterated by the system that surrounds them, which is unacceptable to them. In East Berlin the right of self-determination has lately been contemptuously denied to the inhabitants of that part of the city."

UNITED KINGDOM (Home 9/26/61): "But when the contract has not run out — and this contract between us has not run out — then the change must be by consent . . . I thought that Mr. Gromyko said yesterday . . . that the principle of self-determination should not apply in this case, in the case of East Germany."

ITALY (Martino 9/27/61): "Reunification by means of free elections, which was also reaffirmed in principle at the Geneva Conference of 1955, was never permitted precisely by the Soviet Union."

DENMARK (Krag 9/28/61): "Fortunately, there are now signs that the way is opening up for new negotiations among the Powers directly responsible . . . If negotiations between the Four Powers are successful, we would welcome arrangements placing the resulting agreement under the auspices of the United Nations. Thought should also be given to the possibility of moving the seat of one of the United Nations bodies to Berlin."

TURKEY (10/2/61): "All the nations should do their utmost to spare humanity the agony of a tragedy which can and should be avoided."

CANADA (Green 10/3/61): (Transcript not yet available)
Speaker suggested that the United Nations might assist by:
(1) focusing world attention on problem and leaving big Four in no doubt as to their obligation to seek negotiated settlement;
(2) serving in observer capacity in whole city and on access routes;
(3) assuming some responsibility for operating international regime for whole city. Influence of international regime could be seen through the United Nations' European office, or other United Nations agencies, in Berlin.

PAKISTAN (Zaflullah 10/3/61): (Transcript not yet available)
Speaker stressed existing agreements must be "scrupulously honored" . . . Insistence on the maintenance of static positions ties down progress and becomes source of friction and conflict." However, machinery for change must be "negotiation rather than ultimatums and fait accompli."

NEW ZEALAND (McIntosh 10/4/61): (Transcript not yet available) Speaker stressed necessity safeguarding freedom of people of West Berlin. Free access must also be protected "if freedom is not to prove a sham." Negotiations, which should begin, immediately, must take into account the wishes of the people of Berlin and Germany.

(E) Yugoslavia

YUGOSLAVIA (Popovic 9/26/61): "There are two German States included in different alliances. The Oder-Neisse frontier is a final one. We recognize, however, that, within the framework of an agreement, the free access of the Western Powers to West Berlin should be guaranteed, as well as the right of the population of West Berlin to determine its own political and social order. We also consider abnormal the fact that a treaty of peace has not yet been signed with Germany. The fact that we are led to wonder who we can get out of the present situation in Berlin indicates that the problem does exist.

. . . we are, of course, in favour of a prompt solution to the Berlin problem by means of negotiations and on the basis of existing realities . . .

As for the right of self-determination for the German people -- a matter which has been raised by some and is considered essential by some -- I can say without any hesitation that we are in favour of self-determination for all peoples; and this, of course, includes the German people . . . When Germany is involved, however, and if what is in mind is primarily the reunification of Germany, we cannot and must not overlook certain facts.

The fact that there are two German states is a result of World War II . . . The question of self-determination for the German people, however, cannot be raised separately from the whole question of European security. Germany was the aggressor in two World Wars. At the end of the second one the members of the anti-Hitler coalition expressly reached agreement to prevent any revival of revanchism or militarism or any policy of aggression on the part of Germany. For well-known reasons this objective was not achieved. On the contrary, we are witnesses today of a remilitarization of Germany. It is only with German demilitarization that it is possible to conceive of the right of self-determination. It is only, as a matter of fact, in the same framework that we can expect to find any enduring solution to the Berlin problem."

(F) BLOC

USSR (Gromyko 9/26/61): "The States whose territories it is claiming will never agree to changes in their borders in favour of the German revenge-seekers, and will not allow themselves to be drawn into bargaining on that question . . . The wider the international recognition given to the two German States, and the

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DECLASSIFIE - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

sooner they are admitted to United Nations membership, the stronger will be the foundations of post-war peace in Europe and the less will be the freedom of action of the West German militarists and revenge-seekers.

We are ready to sign a single treaty with the two German States or else separate treaties . . .

No one is encroaching on the social order existing in West Berlin . . . we reaffirm now, that we are firm advocates of guaranteeing to the West Berlin population the right to live and work under the social system which suits them. We are proposing that this right of the citizens should be reliably safeguarded against anyone's encroachment . . .

In this, one thing alone is required, and that is unqualified respect for the sovereignty of the State through whose territory run the land, air and water communications linking West Berlin with the outside world, the sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic with which the appropriate agreements on the use of such communications must be concluded. . . .

To that end the status of the free city could be officially registered with the United Nations, and other forms of United Nations participation in the guarantees of the freedom and independence of the free city could also be envisaged.

The Soviet Government is ready to agree to the use of troop contingents of neutral States or United Nations troops. In brief, we say: Accept the proposal to sign a peace treaty and to turn West Berlin into a free city on this basis and we will accept any proposals on the most effective guarantees for that city that can be found in present-day international practice. . . .

We should not like to deal with them as they dealt with the Soviet Union when they concluded a peace treaty with Japan without the participation of the Soviet Union . . . Our draft of a German peace treaty was delivered to the Governments concerned and published as far back as two years ago."

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (David 10/2/61): It is imperative to defeat the plans of the German militarists by concluding a peace treaty with the two German States . . . The treaty would legally affirm the existing German borders, established in conformity with the outcome of the Second World War, would create favourable conditions for the improvement of the relations between States, and would strengthen the security conditions for the peaceful developments of the two German States and for their progressive rapprochement.

"We favour the idea that all the States whose armed forces participated in the fight against Hitlerite Germany should take part in the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany."

ALBANIA (Shytilla 10/3/61): (Transcript not yet available)
Speaker supported Soviet proposal to admit both German States to United Nations.

RUMANIA (Manescu 10/4/61): (Transcript not yet available)
Speaker asked if one could reconcile principle of self-determination with the 1954 Big Three agreements with FRG under which Western Germany remain occupied by foreign armies until end of century. As for West Berlin, evident United States, United Kingdom and France meant by "self-determination" maintenance of regime of military occupation.

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DECLASSIFIE - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

LIST OF GENERAL DEBATE SPEECHES ON BERLIN

5th - 14th October

	<u>Country</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Date</u> <u>October</u>
LATIN AMERICA	Bolivia	Morales Guillen	9th
	Colombia	Turbay Ayaia	5th
	Cuba	Roa	10th
	Haiti	Auguste	11th
	Costa Rica	Ortiz Martin	11th
ASIA	Nepal	Shaha	10th
	Iraq	Jawas	6th
	Thailand	Khoman	5th
	Malaya	Dato' Kamil	10th
	Indonesia	Subandrio	9th
	Israel	Meir	9th
BLOC	Poland	Rapacki	9th
	Byelorussia	Kiselev	6th
	Bulgaria	Lukanov	5th
	Ukrania	Palamarchuk	9th
	Hungary	Peter	11th
	Greece	Pipinelis	5th
AFRICA	Gabon	Aubame	9th
	Nigeria	Wachuku	10th
	Tunisia	Mokaddem	6th
	Somalia	Issa	5th
	Togo	Freitas	5th
	Niger	Djenmakoye	10th
	Malagasy	Pakotomalula	10th
	South Africa	Louw	11th
	UAR	Fawzi	11th
Morocco	Benjeloun	10th	

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DECLASSIFIE - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENTS ON BERLIN IN UNGA DEBATE
12th - 19th October 1961

CAMEROON (Muna) - One would have thought that the easiest means of solving the Berlin problem would have been to give the people of Germany the freedom to decide in one way or the other whether they wanted to unify or not. This is the only solution, in the opinion of my delegation. If the great Powers are afraid that by uniting Germany again the Germans would start again the doctrine of Herrenvolk and sing "Deutschland, Deutschland, über alles," let them say so.

PHILIPPINES (Flizalde) - The Charter likewise enjoins the people all over the world to "establish conditions under which justice and respect for obligations arising from treaties and international law can be maintained". Viewing the Berlin question in this context, the Philippines can only reaffirm its conviction of the necessity of traditional respect for international treaties and commitments. We here express the hope that the parties concerned should find their way clear to peaceful negotiations and settlement.

SPAIN (DE Lequerica)

SPAIN (DE Lequerica) - The violations of Moscow have been obvious and outrageous. Let us merely glance at the division of Germany and the problem of access to Berlin . . . Germany is obviously a single country and no one can stop it from becoming a national association freely constituted in the course of time. If we had to test this again, then self-determination must come into play and it would then be the moment to ask -- because so many complicated events have taken place -- the Germans themselves whether they still consider the advantages of standing as a single people and thus continue their international road. . . Spain believes that Germany must be united. A divided Germany is a focus and a hotbed of international tension that may endanger peace itself. The Germans have shown already that they want peaceful means to allow them to unite that divided country. Their spokesmen have stated this and have asked for a decision on the part of that country. All the great peace-loving powers seem unanimous in desiring this and in encouraging it. . .

YEMEN (Zabareh) - No mention of Berlin.

AUSTRALIA (Plimsoll) - The outstanding thing about this crisis is that it is largely a manufactured crisis . . . Does anyone here today seriously think that if the Soviet Union had not been waving threats, forcing questions forward, demanding decisions demanding action that is not acceptable to key parties that this session of the GA would have met in an atmosphere of possible war? . . . There are certain international agreements on Berlin. They provide, among other things, for access rights

and these must be observed. Another principle is that West Berlin cannot be allowed to go under. Now Germany and Berlin is surely a case where we have had some competitive coexistence, and in Germany and in Berlin more than anywhere else in the world we have a certain degree of movement backwards and forwards between the East and the West. . . . There has, of course, been a steady stream of refugees, millions moving from East Germany and East Berlin over to West Germany and West Berlin. . . . East Berlin has built a wall in order to keep its own people in, and that wall is rather symbolic of the situation that exists in Berlin and in Germany today. . . there is no intention to use Germany as a spearhead that will threaten the security of any of the countries of Europe.

CONGO (LEO.) (Bomboko) - We cannot speak of the question of disarmament and the question of colonialism without thinking immediately of the question of Berlin and the reunification of Germany. The threats of war seem to have increased and the thorny question of Berlin seems to have become one of the causes of the aggravation of international tension. In order to show that they stand firm, each bloc of antagonists risks involving the world in an atomic conflict through a miscalculation. . . . If international agreements will be arrived at some day on the question of Berlin they can certainly be revised and brought up to date if different circumstances warrant such a revision. . . . self-determination. . . might be the key to the solution of all problems which threaten world peace. . . .

SUDAN (Abboud) - The present crisis in Germany is closely linked with this aspect (tension) and is one of its regrettable expressions. . . . The crisis in its essence is a crisis caused by mistrust, fear and lack of confidence. . . . The only alternative to negotiations is bloc or unilateral action, which means a war impossible to localize. Negotiations taking into consideration, first and foremost, the preservation of world peace and the legitimate aspirations of the German people, who are directly concerned, conducted in an atmosphere of mutual good will, are the only safeguards for world peace, and peace is the equal concern of us all, without any conceivable exception.

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC (Gallin-Douathe) - It is in the midst of these deafening noises of atomic explosions that the Berlin crisis has now reached its most acute state. From day to day the opponents become more intransigent. . . . Great powers should undertake immediately negotiations on the Berlin problem in order to find a solution acceptable to all. First of all we must take into account the wishes of the inhabitants of Berlin, and their right -- which is not mentioned very often -- to determine their future for themselves.

LAOS (Sisouk Na Champassak) - No mention of Berlin.

CONGO (Brassaville) - Techichelle - The sacred principle of self-determination applies to the German people, who should be able to decide their own future immediately. As to the special problem of Berlin which is a matter of the gravest concern, we are of the impression that everything is being done as if the German people did not exist. Some speakers have gone so far in this Assembly as to say that the German people decided their future in 1949 and to speak of self-determination today is but a mockery.

Why not admit simply that the German people exist? This is a reality. Why do the advocates of the division of Germany not agree to let the entire German people speak out . . .

Why not, as a sign of obvious goodwill and of respect for the status quo ante, destroy those hateful walls which give to Berliners on either side the impression of living in a despicable ghetto?

SIERRA LEONE (Collier) - It is in Berlin where the cinders of the last world war are still smouldering that we have the greatest threat of another world war. My delegation, alongside the delegations of many small countries in this Assembly, is most anxious to see the solution of the Berlin question and the ultimate removal of this potential source of war. The great powers involved with the situation there have spent such a long time talking without apparently reaching any solution -- is it not time that the smaller nations not directly involved with the passions and emotions of the political situation in Berlin be brought into their councils to inject sanity into their deliberations and help achieve a solution. Who knows whether the small nations of Africa and Asia have not been called into the councils of the world for such a time as this, when men of the older nations seem to be at their wits' end and appear determined to destroy themselves and the world around them?

CYPRUS (Rossides) - We cannot refrain from expressing our profound regret and disappointment in witnessing barbed wires placed and high walls erected in Berlin in order to render more effective and more pronounced the breaking up and division of a great city . . . Any solution of the problem of Berlin and Germany could not disregard the basic principles of the Charter of the UN in relation to the right of all peoples to determine freely their status and their future. The concept of peace cannot be divorced from the concept of freedom.

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DECLASSIFIE - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE