

Dag Hammarskjöld: Svarstal till Nikita Chrusjtjov

Talare

Datum

Dag Hammarskjöld FN:s generalsekreterare 3 oktober 1960

Omständigheter

Under Kongokrisen, som inleddes 1960, intog FN och Dag Hammarskjo\(\text{NId}\) den motsatssta\(\text{MIlning}\) till Sovjet, som st\(\text{odde}\) den nyss tillkomna Kongoregeringen mot utbrytarregimen i Katanga. Hammarskjo\(\text{MId}\) ld fo\(\text{Vrso}\) rso\(\text{Mte}\) te medla med hja\(\text{Mlp}\) pav FN-trupper, men fra\(\text{Mgan}\) var infekterad och en lo\(\text{Msning}\) sva\(\text{Mr}\) att na\(\text{M}\). Generalsekreteraren fick tidigt kritik fra\(\text{M}\)n sovjetiskt ha\(\text{MII}\) fo\(\text{M}\) att vara partisk till fo\(\text{M}\)rma\(\text{M}\)n fo\(\text{M}\)r va\(\text{M}\)stidan.

Pall morgonen den 3 oktober 1960 holl Sovjetledaren Nikita Chrusjtjov ett tal i FN:s generalfollrsamling som var mycket kritiskt mot Hammarskjolld. Chrusjtjov follrklarade att hans land inte lallingre hade follrtoende follr generalsekreteraren utan ville se honom ersatt av en trojka med representanter frann ollst, vallst och de neutrala staterna. Chrusjtjov tillade: "Om han sjallv [Hammarskjolld] inte kan uppbringa tillrallickligt kurage follr att avgall sall att sallga i hollviska former, kommer vi att dra de nolldvallindiga slutsatserna av den ralldande situationen."

Redan samma eftermiddag bemo\text{\text{Mtte} Hammarskjo\text{\text{Mld} Chrusjtjovs} anklagelser info\text{\text{Mr} rett fo\text{\text{Mrva}\text{Mntansfullt}} auditorium. Han fo\text{\text{Mrklarade}} i ett kort, dramatiskt tal att han inte a\text{\text{Mnnade}} avga\text{\text{M}} och mo\text{\text{Mttes}} ttest med ovationer.

Hammarskjo\(\text{MId}\) gjorde bara ett f\(^a\text{tal}\) framtra\(\text{M}\) danden varje a\(\text{M}\)r. Enligt presstalesmannen Wilder Foote var Hammarskjo\(\text{M}\)ld inte fo\(\text{M}\)rtjust i flo\(\text{M}\)dande retoriska tal; anfo\(\text{M}\)randena skrevs snarare fo\(\text{M}\)r att l\(^a\)sas. I denna mening a\(\text{M}\)r Hammarskjo\(\text{M}\)lds svarstal till Chrusjtjov otypiskt. Det har visserligen betecknats som en retorisk ho\(\text{M}\)jdpunkt under hans tid som FN-chef, men redan samtida bedo\(\text{M}\)mare noterade att det a\(\text{M}\)r ha\(\text{M}\)llet i en stil som man inte fo\(\text{M}\)rknippar med Hammarskjo\(\text{M}\)ld: korta, skarpa formuleringar i sta\(\text{M}\)llet fo\(\text{M}\)r vagt diplomatspra\(\text{M}\)k och dessutom "en ton som inte la\(\text{M}\)mnade tvivel vare sig om hans indignation eller hans engagemang" (\text{Dagens Nyheter, 4 oktober 1960).

Till formen handlar det om ett klassiskt foll rsvarstal, genus judiciale. Det inleds med utfoll rliga citat fra In anklagaren, innan det ga Ir o Iver i en argumentation foll r den egna saken. Ett annat typiskt inslag a Ir meningen om att ett foll rsvar egentligen inte behövs: "I have no reason to defend myself or my colleagues against the accusations and judgments to which you have listened." Hammarskjo Ild understryker FNa Imbetets ho Ilghet genom anva Indande av antiteser, a Ilberopande av historien och omna Imnande av sig sja Ilv i tredje person. Talet handlar om att det viktiga är a Imbetet, inte individen som innehar det.

Vi allterger talet i dess ursprungliga engelska version sallsom det kunde hollras och ses i etermedierna hollsten 1960.

- The head of the Soviet Delegation to the General Assembly, this morning, in exercising his right of reply, said, among many other things, that the present Secretary-General has always been biased against the socialist countries, that he has used the United Nations in support of the colonial Powers fighting the
- Congolese Government and Parliament in order to impose 'a new yoke on the Congo', and finally, that if I, myself, and I quote, 'do not muster up enough courage to resign, so to say in a chivalrous manner, then the Soviet Union will draw the necessary conclusions from the obtained situation.' In support of this challenge the representative of the Soviet Union said that it is not proper for a man who has 'flouted elementary justice to hold such an important post as that of the Secretary-General'. And later on he found reason to say to the delegates

of this session that they should not 'submit to the clamorous phrases pronounced here' by me 'in attempts to justify the bloody crimes perpetrated against the Congolese people'.

The General Assembly can rightly expect an immediate reply from my side to a statement so directly addressed to me and regarding a matter of such potential significance.

20

The Assembly has witnessed over the last weeks how historical truth is established; once an allegation has been repeated a few times, it is no longer an allegation, it is an established fact, even if no evidence has been brought out in order to support it. However, facts are facts, and the true facts are there for whosoever cares for truth. Those who invoke history will certainly be heard by history. And they will have to accept its verdict as it will be pronounced on the basis of the facts by men free of mind and firm in their conviction that only on a scrutiny of truth can a future of peace be built.

I have no reason to defend myself or my colleagues against the accusations and judgments to which you have listened. Let me say only this, that *you*, all of you, are the judges. No single party can claim that authority. I am sure you will be guided by truth and justice. In particular, let those who know what the United Nations has done and is doing in the Congo, and those who are not pursuing aims proper only to themselves, pass judgment on our actions there. Let the countries who have liberated themselves in the last fifteen years speak for themselves.

I regret that the intervention to which I have found it necessary to reply has again tended to personalize an issue which, as I have said, in my view is not a question of a man but of an institution. The man does not count, the institution does. A weak or nonexistent executive would mean that the United Nations would no longer be able to serve as an effective instrument for active protection of the interests of those many Members who need such protection. The man holding the responsibility as chief executive should leave if he weakens the executive; he should stay if this is necessary for its maintenance. This, and only this, seems to me to be the substantive criterion that has to be applied.

I said the other day that I would not wish to continue to serve as Secretary-General one day longer than such continued service was, and was considered to be, in the best interest of the Organization*. The statement this morning seems to indicate that rhe Soviet Union finds it impossible to work with the present Secretary-General. This may seem to provide a strong reason why I should resign. However, the Soviet Union has also made it clear that, if the present Secretary-General were to resign now, they would not wish to elect a new incumbent but insist on an arrangement which – and this is my forn conviction based on broad experience – would make it impossible to maintain an effective executive. By resigning, I would, therefore, at the present difficult and dangerous juncture throw the Organization to the winds. I have no right to do so because I have a responsibility to all those States Members for which the Organization is of decisive importance, a responsibility which overrides all other considerations.

It is not the Soviet Union or, indeed, any other big Power who need the United Nations for their protection; it is all the others. In this sense the Organization is first of all *their* Organization, and I deeply believe in the wisdom with which they will be able to use it and guide it. I shall remain in my post during the term of my office as a servant of the Organization in the interests of all those other nations, as long as *they* wish me to do so.

In this context the representative of the Soviet Union spoke of courage. It is very easy to resign; it is not so easy to stay on. It is very easy to bow to the wish of a big Power. It is another matter to resist. As is well known to all members of this Assembly, I have done so before on many occasions and in many directions. If it is the wish of those nations who see in the Organization their best protection in the present world, I shall now do so again.

Källa

<div>*Hänvisar till ett kort uttalande 18 september 1960, där Hammarskjöld ber att få återkomma till ärendet senare i debatten.
br>Vår omständighetsbeskrivning är en omarbetad version av beskrivningen av talet i Ordet är en makt: svenska tal från Torgny lagman till Carl Bildt och Mona Sahlin: en antologi (1998) sammanställd av Kurt Johannesson, Olle Josephson, Erik Åsard.</div>

Taggar

1960, 1960-tal, Förenta nationerna, Försvarstal, Kongokrisen, Man, Politiska tal

URI

https://www.svenskatal.se/tale/dag-hammarskjold