

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records



1413th
PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 23 September 1966,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
<i>Speech by Mr. Arenales Catalán (Guatemala)</i>	1
<i>Speech by Mr. Martin (Canada)</i>	6
<i>Speech by Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)</i>	11
<i>Statement by the representative of the United States of America</i>	19

President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHWAK
(Afghanistan).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) (translated from Spanish): Guatemala comes before this august world parliament to explain the position of its new Government, revolutionary in its desire to bring about immediate and radical economic and social reforms for the underprivileged classes, but democratic in the legal basis of its actions and the fact that it was elevated to power, from the opposition benches, through free and direct elections which gave voice to the unlimited support of those same people.

2. As representative of this Government, Mr. President, I wish to repeat the tribute which I had the honour to pay you from this same rostrum three days ago on your election to the Presidency of the General Assembly. Today I should like to add our most sincere wishes and to offer our loyal co-operation in bringing the work of the twenty-first session to a successful conclusion. We are meeting in circumstances which are ominously grave, not only for the existence and fate of the United Nations, but also for life itself in a large part of the world, for they point to the danger of a world-wide holocaust.

3. If participation in the general debate of the United Nations is ever imperative—a debate unjustly criticized as yielding scant results in comparison with the amount of time involved—if, I repeat, participation at this stage of our discussions is ever called for, it is precisely at a time when a new Government must restate or modify its political stand as a Member of the United Nations. This necessity takes on giant proportions in view of the responsibility placed on each and every Member of the United Nations by the two crises facing us as this session begins: the Secretary-General's decision not to continue at the head of the Organization, and the threatening clouds of war in Viet-Nam.

4. Guatemala has clearly defined its position with regard to the Secretary-General's decision. Our Permanent Representative to this Organization supported, within the Latin-American group, the joint appeal of our region asking U Thant to reconsider his decision. I am pleased to say that all the Latin American delegations, sharing the same concern, joined together in this unanimous request on behalf of Latin America, that the Secretary-General agree to remain in his high post.

5. We well understand the intolerable situation in which political and legal circumstances, by setting limits on his sphere of action, have placed U Thant, in the face of grave world events calling for intervention by an Organization which neither acts nor permits him to act. Personal bitterness, intellectual rebellion and moral anguish must weigh heavily upon a man of such intellectual honesty, who so scrupulously upholds his ethical beliefs.

6. But though we understand his distressing personal dilemma, we have to recognize that while his attitude has aroused the attention and conscience of the Member States, adherence to his decision can only make it more difficult to solve those very problems to which he has devoted his whole-hearted efforts. The consensus of the great and small nations of this Organization imposes upon the Secretary-General the clear moral obligation to reconsider his position; but it also imposes upon the Member States, particularly the great Powers, the binding obligation not to oppose, impede or inhibit the political and diplomatic efforts that so wise and impartial a mediator can contribute to the cause of peace. And finally, it imposes upon the United Nations, as an institution, the obligation not to remain indifferent in the face of the very grave crisis now afflicting mankind and facing the United Nations.

7. This crisis in Viet-Nam is perhaps the most serious ever to darken the horizon of the United Nations. We may speak of Hungary or Korea, we may remember Suez or the Congo, we may mention financial difficulties such as those encountered two years ago; but in none of those crises did the United Nations remain inactive. The gravity of the Viet-Nameese war does not lie merely in the fact that human beings are killed every day, or merely in an internal situation producing more than international friction. Nor is it sufficient to point to the conflict between two great world Powers, to rival or aggressive ideologies, or to geopolitical theories. The full scope of this crisis cannot be comprehended even when we rightly point out that it continuously threatens to become a world holocaust. No. There is still another grave factor implicit in the situation, namely, the stand taken thus far by the United Nations in favour

of non-intervention in the conflict, of non-confrontation, of refusal even to study, analyse, discuss or pass judgement. We know the opinion of the United States on this issue, as well as that of both South Viet-Nam and North Viet-Nam; we know the position of the People's Republic of China, the attitude of the Soviet Union and the statements by General de Gaulle; and we have heard the world-wide debate held by the most outstanding and varied personalities of our time at the national or international level. But we do not know the opinion of the United Nations. Whether we call it prudence or indolence, powerlessness or indifference, fear, realism or precaution, the fact still remains that the United Nations is increasingly in danger of becoming a static structure rather than a living organ pulsing with energy, translating the feelings, thoughts, concerns and aspirations of all the peoples of the world.

8. Several reasons have already been suggested to justify or explain this attitude on the part of the United Nations. There are perhaps three main reasons: first, not all the nations involved in the Viet-Nameese conflict are Members of the Organization; secondly, as long as there is no agreement among the great Powers, action by the United Nations would be ineffective; and thirdly, a debate on this issue within the United Nations would widen the gap between some of the great Powers, whereas the vital concern of maintaining peace requires a rapprochement between them.

9. There is a fourth argument, which at once supports and weakens the tireless and disinterested efforts of the Secretary-General in this matter, namely, that the Secretary-General is only the spokesman of the Member States, which are organized and express themselves, naturally, through their statutory organs.

10. There is only one valid argument among these, and even this is not an insurmountable obstacle to some sort of action by the United Nations.

11. The fact that there are nations directly or indirectly involved in the conflict which do not belong to the Organization does not and should not prevent the United Nations from sponsoring or encouraging measures with regard to Viet-Nam. Guatemala firmly supports the principle of universality of the United Nations, including its application to the admission of Members. But Guatemala realizes, as we all must, that, just as an individual may discuss the solution of his problems with people of another nationality or circle, so this Organization may negotiate a settlement of its problems with non-member States. Of course, the possibility of sanctions, particularly those of a moral nature, becomes less effective with non-member nations. But the United Nations does not have to resort to coercive action; in this situation it should act rather as negotiator, initiator and mediator. Furthermore, United Nations sponsorship is not an essential prerequisite to peace initiatives. The United Nations can at least lend its full moral, political and diplomatic support to peace negotiations, or to efforts to get them under way. Peace talks—and I wish to emphasize this point—might even be held in accordance with the Geneva Agreements, should this be desirable in settling the issue.

12. Now let us turn to the second argument—that the action of the United Nations would be ineffective as long as disagreement persists among the great Powers. Does this mean that the United Nations was established only to ensure peace among small or medium-sized nations? Does it mean that the great Powers will act and rejoice only when peace has been made, for example, between India and Pakistan? Does it mean that, like the League of Nations, our Organization must be concerned only with regional conflicts, such as the Chaco War? If such is the case, then the United Nations is doomed to suffer the same sad fate as the League of Nations. No, the United Nations must be able to meet the challenge of the great issues confronting it, and it is the duty of the small- and medium-sized nations to take the initiative when the great Powers are encumbered by their very immensity. On the other hand, when the great Powers are involved in international conflicts, if we wait for them to reach an agreement, the task of the United Nations will in due course become superfluous. But should there be no agreement among the great Powers, then the United Nations always has the obligation, under the Charter, to intervene in the manner most effective for the pursuit of its objectives, always of course endeavouring to avoid any approach which might complicate the problem rather than help to solve it.

13. This brings me to the third argument, which we grant has a certain measure of validity, namely that a debate on Viet-Nam might drive some of the great Powers further apart, whereas a progressive rapprochement is essential to the cause of peace. But this argument can also be set aside if United Nations intervention is planned in such a way as precisely to avoid the negative reaction which such intervention might create. I am referring particularly to a bitter debate on the substance, or the alleged substance, of the question, full of accusations and counter-accusations. While I do not wish to suggest specific solutions, I wonder whether the United Nations could not present a vigorous appeal or judgement in a resolution without debate—deliberately without debate. This, plus a mandate given to the chief official of the Organization, could combine the vehement expression of will, inexorable universal will, with the diplomatic tact of the Secretary-General, to the extent that his personal interventions were considered desirable.

14. I wish to refer to the Secretary-General while just briefly mentioning the fourth argument outlined earlier, namely that his personal intervention in the Viet-Nameese crisis is limited by the expressed will of the Member States—especially of the great Powers—and that as a result the United Nations cannot and must not intervene in this issue. Such views seem to be reflected in repeated public statements by the Secretary-General.

15. I do not wish to enter into a discussion of this issue; I merely wish to express some reflections. First, in addition to the expressed will of the Member States we have this same will codified in the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which include a mandate for the Secretary-General. Secondly, as a consequence of this, it can, of course, be asserted that the United Nations cannot effectively contribute to the solution where there is a particular threat or

breach of the peace, but it can never be said that this Organization must not intervene in the face of a breach of the peace, and even in doubtful cases liable to create friction or threaten international peace. The most that can be said is that United Nations intervention must be cautious, well informed, tactful and prudent.

16. It is no longer merely a matter of safeguarding the prestige of the Organization, or even its existence. The aim is to bring peace to an extensive region of the world and, even more important, perhaps to avoid a war of immeasurable proportions. No statutory limitation can justifiably stand in the way of an act of goodwill. Let us not intervene to widen the gap between the parties involved, nor between these and third Powers; let us avoid at all costs a debate on the substance of the problem; but let us not remain indifferent in the face of a holocaust, when we set up this Organization specifically to eliminate such threats.

17. In this connexion, I should like to repeat that my delegation has unbounded admiration for the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General, the wisdom and devotion he has placed at the service of peace, and the moral stamina which has enabled him to overcome his deep disappointment each time his efforts met not only with no support or understanding, but with actual hostility. These efforts of the Secretary-General, which have upheld the moral responsibility of the United Nations while its principal organs remained silent, today give us cause for a cautious optimism, which my Government is happy to point out. I am referring to the welcome—as I hope it is—given in the United States to the three points proposed by the Secretary-General as conditions for initiating peace negotiations, even though this meant modifying entrenched positions. We hope that the other parties involved in the conflict, particularly the Government of North Viet-Nam and the Viet-Cong National Liberation Front, and the parties to the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962 will be able to accept those three points, along with a time-table for a reduction of the fighting, which might be proposed by the Secretary-General in consultation with the parties directly involved.

18. This session of the General Assembly will not have risen to the needs imposed by the conflict, or the principles of the Charter, the hopes of the peoples that founded the United Nations, or the searching demands of Member States, unless it makes an appeal or formulates a declaration which, in no uncertain terms, will convey to the participants in the conflict what the nations of the world require of them and provide the Secretary-General with the political support which will help him carry out his diplomatic task.

19. I am devoting the greater part of my address to what I feel it should be devoted to: an examination of the two most important issues facing the United Nations. It is unnecessary and, perhaps, inappropriate during the general debate to attempt to define the position of one's Government on each and every item on the Assembly's agenda. This must wait until the debates in the Committees. But it is important, and at times necessary, to explain the general policy

of one's Government towards the United Nations and towards certain general matters for which the Organization and the General Assembly are responsible under the Charter or through the decisions of the principal organs.

20. In this area, the new Government of Guatemala bases its policy towards the United Nations on the principles of legality and universality: on legality, because that promotes the ideal operation of the Organization and defines the authority and sphere of action of its organs; and on universality, because it is the loftiest humanistic principle inspiring the Charter and underlying its aims, and one which must, therefore, serve as an additional criterion in the examination of our problems.

21. The principle of legality, which is the greatest protection for small States, also finds positive, ambitious and very noble expression in the work of the Sixth Committee, the International Law Commission, and other bodies and committees. All are witnesses to the courageous and unrelenting efforts of eminent jurists who, with imagination and patience—although overshadowed at times by the political concerns of Member States—are gradually building the edifice of international law. This structure is already helping to guide our relations—and it will do so even more in the future—to the point when the political settlement of conflicts will be abandoned in favour of a just and correct legal settlement, in keeping with the loftiest values of a humanistic philosophy.

22. The principle of universality casts light particularly on the political issues facing the United Nations. Guatemala supports this principle, which has at least two immediate consequences that should be noted. First, Guatemala maintains relations with all the States Members within the United Nations and its organs and committees. Secondly we feel that all countries should be represented in the Organization, and that there can be no exclusions based on injustice and discrimination contrary to the principles of the Charter.

23. This last point immediately brings to mind the case of the People's Republic of China, a subject on which we shall express our opinion in due course; but it also leads us to rejoice at the admission of Guyana, which we had the occasion to welcome two days ago, and at the return of Indonesia, that great Asian nation with which we once fought side by side as struggling and oppressed peoples and whose prompt return to the Organization Guatemala greets with sincerest good wishes.

24. This question of new Members carries with it a note of sadness and a note of hope: Rhodesia's absence, the refusal of its present government to respect the most elementary principles of racial democracy, its determination not to comply with United Nations decisions—these are distressing matters for the democratic peoples and Governments of the world. We hope that the United Kingdom will be able to solve this problem under the authority of the United Nations, for otherwise we shall have to consider more decisive action by our Organization.

25. The note of hope is contributed by the imminent independence of Botswana, Lesotho and Barbados. Guatemala will be most happy to welcome them to the United Nations.

26. Although I have defined the principles of legality and universality on which the general position of my delegation is based, I still feel that I must mention certain basic political issues which, although not of the same order as the Viet-Nameese crisis, nevertheless exert international pressure fraught with immediate and potential dangers. These are also issues of peace and war, such as disarmament and the related matters of atomic energy and atomic tests. The progress made by the United Nations in these areas does not encourage undue optimism; but we must not give up. The vicious circle of mistrust must be broken little by little, through toilsome discussions at the conference table, with their myriad technical details and through the slow but determined action—or rather, actions—which the great Powers are taking, slowly but surely, in the right direction.

27. At first glance it would seem that in matters of such significance the ability of small States to participate is limited. But the danger of extermination and contamination knows no boundaries, and the waste of enormous financial and technological resources is a source of bitterness to peoples which are still struggling against poverty, disease and ignorance. The role of small nations, therefore—apart from the fact that thinking is not the privilege of the big Powers—will be to urge discussion of the problem, to demand more information from the great Powers and to make use of it, to promote whatever course of thought and action they believe most likely to lead to the slow but sure realization of those goals which help to break the vicious circle of insecurity and the arms race.

28. In this context, my delegation is pleased to express its interest in the masterly address made by the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom at the twentieth session of the General Assembly. The logical structure of his thinking on the items of disarmament, peace-keeping, the peaceful settlement of disputes, and United Nations efforts in the economic and social sphere, was directly related to the sub-items or projects for immediate execution to which he referred. Guatemala is in general agreement with the substance of his thinking and will support any decisions or steps which seem likely to deal with these perennial agenda items.

29. An admirable example of this civilized philosophy and the procedures through which it is applied is the mediation which the Governments of Guatemala and of the United Kingdom have both accepted with regard to their long-standing dispute over the territory of Belize. Such acceptance does not imply a renunciation of our rights, and the primary concern of both Guatemala and the United Kingdom is to further the highest interests and the development of the people of Belize. The equally long-standing reservation of its rights in this matter which Guatemala has always made in the general debate—a reservation which it makes again at this session of the Assembly—does not diminish the profound interest and concern

by the Government of Guatemala for the well-being and the progress of the people of Belize.

30. But, to return to the political items on our agenda, Guatemala will support in principle resolutions designed to prevent the proliferation of atomic weapons and to extend the ban on nuclear tests not only to all countries, but also to underground tests. The 1963 Treaty must be extended to cover underground tests. We are also prepared to support resolutions calling upon those Powers which are not signatories of the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests to sign and ratify it. We are certain that once a Power is assured that tests and production have been suspended, that stock-piles are being reduced and that adequate surveillance or guarantees have been instituted over the remaining supply, it will abandon its plans to procure atomic weapons and will devote those enormous funds and efforts to more constructive ends. Otherwise, whatever United Nations declarations may be made, the only limit to the proliferation of atomic weapons will be financial capacity, for even technology can be bought.

31. For these reasons, Guatemala has viewed with sympathy and admiration the efforts made by the Government of Mexico in favour of a denuclearization treaty for Latin America. We are sure that the differences of opinion over details that have temporarily held up this commendable project will soon be smoothed away.

32. We have also noted with considerable interest the suggestion made by the Secretary-General in the introduction to his annual report [A/6301/Add.1] that an appropriate body of the United Nations should undertake a thorough study of the impact and implications of all aspects relating to the manufacture and development of atomic weapons. Such a study on the manufacture, acquisition, development, demonstration, stockpiling and possible use of these weapons could be a valuable contribution to our understanding of these complex problems and to our search for a suitable solution. We hope that at this session the General Assembly will feel able to authorize this study.

33. I shall not tire my listeners by detailing our position on other question of peace and war, such as the financing of certain United Nations operations, the United Nations Emergency Force and the Special Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations. Statements on these points will be made by our representatives in the First Committee and the Special Political Committee.

34. I therefore turn to the last part of my statement. Thus far I have dealt with the political function of the United Nations. I must also at least mention our concern with colonial problems, with the economic and social functions of the Organization, and with some administrative and budgetary matters.

35. Colonial questions, with which we were so closely concerned a few years ago in the United Nations, have always occupied an important place in the foreign policy of Guatemala. After an eight-year absence, it gives me great pleasure to sit in this forum of international co-operation with nations for whose independence Guatemala struggled so resolutely for more than a decade, always inflexibly anti-colonial, a position which we most vigorously reaffirm

today. The million and a half inhabitants in the Trust Territories and the twenty-six and a half million in forty Non-Self-Governing Territories must, through accelerated political, economic, social and educational development, attain their independence, which will enable them to find a way of controlling their own destinies. However, I should recall a warning which I gave in the last statement I made in this hall several years ago, on leaving the Presidency of the Trusteeship Council: it can be an easy solution to push a Territory into independence before it is ready and, while terminating the obligations of the Administering Authority to the United Nations, still keep the inhabitants in subjection through economic bonds and the handicaps of immaturity and underdevelopment. Fortunately, I do not think that any of the administering Powers would entertain such ideas; but the watchfulness of the Trusteeship Council and the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples can help to avoid illusory independence or the upheavals which occur in nations that are not properly prepared for independence. We must also reaffirm our position that if Chapter XI of the Charter is properly interpreted, the programmes for and the advances in the economic, social and educational development of the Territories must be measured against their political goal, which is self-government.

36. Unfortunately, I must close this portion of my address on a note of discouragement. I am referring to the tragic situation of the people of "unredeemed" South West Africa and their fellow Africans. We must also deplore the inexplicable attitude of the Government of Portugal which, divorcing itself from the present trends towards the liberation of dependent peoples, still refuses to transmit information on the Territories for which it is responsible, Territories whose development should already have been speeded up so as to place them on an equal legal and political footing within the international community. But what is really beyond all comprehension is the callousness shown by the Government of South Africa in maintaining its policy of apartheid in flagrant violation of the principles underlying the United Nations, the resolutions of the General Assembly and the most fundamental human rights.

37. This brings me to the social aspect of the United Nations programme, to which the Government of Guatemala attaches so much importance. Whatever the prevailing systems of government or philosophies of economic development, respect for human rights is a touchstone for judging the moral value of men's acts, of their institutions and of their way of thinking. Guatemala can understand that there may be violations of human rights anywhere in the world at any given moment; but what is reprehensible—more, abominable—is complicity in such violations on the part of a Government—through its actions or its failure to act, through its indifference or negligence, or even through hidden motives. But such monstrous behaviour goes beyond all bounds when it is openly exalted into a policy of defiance, a legal system or a philosophy for action. In this context, Guatemala categorically condemns the policy of racial discrimination, and it will fully support any measures

that will enable the United Nations to achieve its goals and apply its principles in this area.

38. I must now refer to the economic aspect of the work of the United Nations, and I take this opportunity to pledge Guatemala to doing its utmost in the Economic and Social Council if, as we hope, the General Assembly confirms our election at the present session.

39. My Government's interest in the problems of international trade in primary commodities, promoting industrialization and supporting economic development is not unique but is, rather, in keeping with the universal desire to increase productivity in order to bring about social reform and economic justice for the poorest classes of the population. Guatemala wishes to express its gratitude to the United Nations, the specialized agencies and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance—now part of the United Nations Development Programme—for the material and intellectual co-operation extended to it in its efforts towards development. It hopes that this co-operation will be increased in view of the urgency of the reform programmes now being undertaken by the new Government.

40. I cannot neglect to mention the principal contribution for which Guatemala is indebted to the United Nations. I am referring to the economic integration of Central America, whose common market system, integrated industries, investment policies, Clearing House, Central American Bank for Economic Integration and other subsidiary agencies all came into being thanks to the creative impulse of the United Nations. These achievements are a source of pride for a nation which was the first to abolish slavery, for a region which was the first to have an international court and for a group of sister nations which have enjoyed accelerated development and closer ties between their people as a result of economic integration. This stage, now nearing completion, is being followed by efforts to create a customs union and to formulate a common policy with regard to world trade problems.

41. World trade in primary commodities is a subject on which I should like to express some concern and a few ideas. The international agreements on primary commodities reached under the auspices of the United Nations are undoubtedly steps in the right direction. The changing complexity of the problems they are attempting to solve, and any errors or injustices that may arise in their implementation, are not really good enough arguments for adopting a negative attitude to the theoretical basis of such agreements. We all know that there are powerful nations which use their overwhelming voting power to support policies which they back up with reasoned and substantive arguments. All that troubles my delegation in this regard is the want of proportion between the various national economic interests involved and the absolute subjection of nearly all producer nations to the dictates of a single country, no matter how fair and friendly it may be.

42. I think I should point out that agreements on primary commodities should be drawn up bearing in mind not only the particular problems relating to each commodity, but also the effects on the economy

of each participating State. Voting systems—another eternal challenge to man's ingenuity—should be considered bearing in mind the fact that for countries which are always in the minority voting means a renunciation of sovereignty, even when they vote unanimously as a group.

43. In conclusion, I wish to make a few comments on administrative and budgetary matters.

44. First, we are opposed to the proliferation of international agencies. We do not wish to restrict the number of projects unnecessarily, but it is an obvious principle of good administration, and of order and economy that the increase in administrative expenditures and staff required by each new agency should be avoided.

45. With regard to these budgetary matters, and for different reasons, Guatemala feels compelled to recall the very interesting statement made by the Foreign Minister of France during the twentieth session of the General Assembly when he referred to the complexity—if not disorder—of the financial affairs of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. In this connexion, I wish to congratulate the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies on its reports on the finances of the Organization, and to express the hope that Member States, particularly the Soviet Union and France, will now find it possible to make substantial contributions to reduce the deficit of the Organization.

46. As a final word on budgetary matters, I am prompted to emphasize the need to avoid duplication in the tasks and projects of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The primary function of the Organization is political, while that of the agencies is technical.

47. I now come to the end of my address. I do not wish the emphasis I have been obliged to place on the issues discussed during this last part of my statement to divert our attention from what is and should be the central theme of the twenty-first session of the General Assembly. I am referring to the Viet-Nameese crisis and to the weakening of the United Nations.

48. During the years I have been absent from this Organization, I have watched it grow into a more universal body with the addition of so many new Members, each making a different cultural, intellectual and political contribution. I have seen the United Nations overcome new and delicate crises; I have also seen it weakened, for there is no other explanation of its taking a less active role in solving the weighty problems of war and peace which afflict mankind.

49. We may find the explanation of this weakening in these two considerations. First, the very changes in the make-up of the Organization, with so many new and different Members, may have been an unpleasant surprise for the great Powers, which expected to find in the United Nations a more flexible instrument for peace; they expected that the only big disagreements would be between themselves, or if they were with other nations, that the solutions would depend more on the will of these same great Powers. Such a reaction

is understandable, and should perhaps be the object not of criticism, but of constructive thinking aimed both at adjusting solutions to the Organization as it is today, and at preparing the Organization to reach the simplest and fairest solution of the problems with which it is called upon to deal.

50. Secondly, we must also recognize that responsibility for this apparent weakening falls upon all Member States, on our Governments and on our delegations. A sense of responsibility must be allied with tact and discretion when we are dealing with such complex and delicate problems as those which the United Nations must study and solve; but no measure of discretion or tact can excuse indifference, apathy or ineptitude which would relegate our Organization to a secondary role, or give it none at all.

51. If our predecessors had the vision, the ideals and the strength of will to accept the rules laid down in the United Nations Charter, then we of the present generation must have an equally firm determination and lofty outlook in order to bend our minds and wills towards peaceful international co-operation, either within the United Nations or under its auspices.

52. Mr. MARTIN (Canada) (translated from French): Mr. President, I have already had the opportunity to congratulate you upon your election and to welcome Guyana as the newest Member of this Organization, and I have pleasure in repeating this twofold welcome today.

53. I shall now discuss several aspects of the problems facing us which, in the opinion of the Canadian delegation, require special attention if we wish to see the United Nations flourish as an influential force for peace in the world. I propose to discuss the question of the Secretary-General and his office; the problems of safeguarding international peace and security, including peace-keeping; the war in Viet-Nam; disarmament; economic and social progress; and the grave problems of South Africa.

54. I should first like to pay a tribute to the qualities of leadership of the Secretary-General and to the example he sets us. He has done much to inspire our joint efforts during these past five years. He has stated that no one is indispensable in the office which he holds with such distinction. Yet—despite the difficulties he has pointed out—the guidance he has given to our work, the sense of responsibility he has demonstrated, his gifts of compassion and understanding and, above all, his ability to speak and act on behalf of mankind, are all indispensable to the United Nations. And particularly at this time, I do not see how we could possibly get along without him. His departure would be a heavy loss. Let me add that I vigorously support the Secretary-General's determination to strengthen and develop his office into a vital force within the United Nations. In this, he is following the tradition established by Sir Eric Drummond in the days of the League of Nations and by his own predecessors.

55. Let me now turn to those tasks which require our collective understanding and goodwill: first of all the general subject of peace-keeping. A year has passed since the General Assembly set up the Special

Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations [resolution 2006 (XIX)]. A year has passed also since it was decided that the financial difficulties of the Organization should be met by voluntary contributions from all the Members. My Government regrets that the past twelve months have seen so little improvement in either situation.

56. Little progress has been made towards solving the financial problems of the Organization. Perhaps some Governments are awaiting the results of studies by the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies. We now have its report before us [A/6343] and I hope that those countries which have not yet contributed will now do so. But what is perhaps more serious, in the long run, than the need to meet the deficit, is the fact that the Ad Hoc Committee established last year [resolution 2049 (XX)] has not yet succeeded in carrying out a systematic review of the whole issue of peace-keeping operations. It is easy to use the crisis which befell the Assembly at the nineteenth session as a pretext to explain away the lack of success. We have had a year to reflect on the matter, and the time has now come to solve the problem.

57. There are a few Member States which do not share the opinion of the majority as to the nature and value of the contribution which the United Nations has made and can continue to make through its peace-keeping activities. My Government believes that the opinion of this minority must be respected, even if we do not share it. We feel there is no alternative but to accept the limitations imposed on us, particularly in the face of the attitude of certain great Powers towards the principle of financial responsibility. But even if these limitations are acknowledged, much remains to be done. Allow me to present a few examples of what the Canadian delegation believes can be accomplished.

58. First, we believe the time has come to adopt the proposal by the Secretary-General in 1964 for a study of ways and means of improving preparations for peace-keeping operations. Secondly, we believe the time has come for the Security Council and its Military Staff Committee to re-examine the possibility of negotiating agreements with Member States to make available to the Council armed forces, assistance and facilities, as laid down in the Charter. Thirdly, we believe that, without jeopardizing any action the Security Council may undertake, Member States should be asked to inform the Secretary-General of the types of armed forces or facilities they would be prepared to provide for duly authorized peace-keeping operations. Fourthly, this Assembly has already decided, by an impressive majority, that certain principles should govern the sharing of the costs of very costly peace-keeping operations.

59. We believe that measures such as those just mentioned are in accordance with the Charter and could be implemented without prejudice to the views of any Member State. My Government believes that steps designed to maintain and strengthen the ability of the United Nations to keep the peace will be supported by the majority of its Members, and we are prepared, should it seem advisable, to present

specific proposals for the consideration of the Assembly.

60. Experience has shown that the burden of meeting commitments for peace-keeping operations has fallen on a small number of Member States, and that it has tended to be perpetuated. It becomes extremely difficult to terminate these commitments. The costs of maintaining peace are undoubtedly small compared with the costs of war; it thus seems that we should all be willing to pay our share. The risk of allowing existing operations to become ineffectual, or of failing to create the peace-keeping forces required in the future, could well be very serious. If we fully acknowledge this, then it is surely essential that support for, and contributions to, these operations should be more widely shared. For failure to support them may well lead one day to heavier demands and graver dangers for the entire international community. In any case, I do not believe it is fair to expect a minority of countries to continue to bear this burden indefinitely while the majority show no inclination to study the problem of the peaceful settlement of disputes or to share the costs of maintaining peace.

61. The peace-keeping issue is related to the solvency of this Organization. Canada welcomed the proposal submitted by France at the twentieth session that we examine the financial and administrative practices of the Organization.^{1/} We were glad to serve as a member of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts which undertook this study. We regard the report of this Committee as an extremely important document, and we shall press for the implementation of its recommendations both by the Organization itself and by all the States Members of the United Nations. We hope, in particular, that these recommendations will lead us to focus our efforts on the essential issues by adhering strictly to an order of priorities, and enable us to adapt the growth rate of the United Nations and its specialized agencies to the human and financial resources available.

62. In our concern with peace-keeping problems, we must not lose sight of the basic issue of the peaceful settlement of disputes. It is unfortunate that at the very moment that the Security Council was embroiled in a great many disputes—some of them dating back twenty years—the General Assembly was not prepared, at its last session, to examine a proposal to study methods for the "peaceful settlement of disputes" [twentieth session, agenda item 99]. We surely have everything to gain and nothing to lose by a thorough examination of the existing machinery and an impartial evaluation of future possibilities.

[The speaker continued in English.]

63. I listened yesterday with the greatest interest to the statement of Mr. Goldberg [United States of America] [1412th meeting]. At the last General Assembly, my Government took the position that in the General Assembly we could not avoid a discussion of the war in Viet-Nam, and I was heartened yesterday, not only by what Mr. Goldberg himself had to say

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Annexes, agenda item 76, document A/6152.

about Viet-Nam, but by the initiative he took, in discussing this matter in this forum, in inviting our participation in that discussion and in urging all of us, as Members of this Organization, collectively and individually, to do what we could to try to bring an end to this conflict. Our concern with peace-keeping and peaceful settlement seems all the more justified against the background of the conflict in Viet-Nam. This is in the judgement of my Government by far the most dangerous issue now facing the world.

64. Wherever armed conflict breaks out, it involves commitments of power and prestige, and the longer it continues, the more difficult it becomes to reverse the course of events, the more difficult it becomes to bring into play the machinery of peaceful negotiation and settlement. In the face of such a conflict, can the international community really stand by and allow matters to develop to the point where all avenues of peaceful recourse are irrevocably closed?

65. I considered last year and I consider now that this organ, this particular institution in the United Nations, as opposed to the Security Council, has the obligation to contribute to peace in Viet-Nam. I think it is inconceivable that we should proceed with our meeting as if this threat to the safety of mankind did not exist. Even if in present circumstances the Security Council cannot deal effectively with this matter and some other framework may be appropriate, I continue to believe that it is the duty of this body to express its deepest concern over the war in Viet-Nam. We must urge the path of negotiation on all involved. We must persist in this effort until negotiations are begun.

66. I know that there are differences between us about the origins of this conflict and how it can be brought to an end. I know how difficult the issues involved in this conflict are. For twelve years Canada has served, with India and Poland, on the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Viet-Nam. In that time we have witnessed at first-hand the erosion of the Geneva Agreements of 1954. We have known, and we still experience, the frustrations of the observer who is powerless to prevent what is happening before his eyes.

67. The Secretary-General has been untiring in his search for a settlement of the conflict. In doing so he has acted in clear and conscientious recognition of the responsibilities which attach to the world community in this difficult and vital problem.

68. There are those who say that the time for a settlement of this conflict is not ripe. For my part, I cannot accept this judgement. The road to peace in Viet-Nam will not be easy and it may not be quick, but a start on that road must be made.

69. There are different ways in which a start might be made. For our part, we are guided by a number of basic considerations. The Canadian Government has repeatedly emphasized its belief that an exclusively military solution is not possible. We believe that only a political settlement which takes into account the legitimate interests and aspirations of all concerned can restore peace and stability in that country. In the interests of promoting a peaceful settlement, we ourselves have used all the diplomatic channels

available to us to see whether there is any contribution we could make towards resolving the problem.

70. I have mentioned the role of my country as a member of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Viet-Nam. We have attempted to develop our responsibilities into opportunities for constructive action. It still seems to us that the Commission can provide a means of facilitating contacts between the two sides. We have also not excluded the possibility that the Commission might help the parties to scale down hostilities as a means of eventual disengagement.

71. It is discouraging to us that our efforts, like those of others, have not yielded the results intended. None the less, it continues to be the conviction of the Government of Canada that efforts to promote a peaceful settlement of this war should not and must not be abandoned, and, as I said a moment ago, I have carefully noted the statement made yesterday by Mr. Goldberg and, particularly, the significant questions which he addressed to the Government in Hanoi. Against this background, it is all the more essential that channels for contacts between the two sides be developed and maintained to prepare the way for negotiations whenever they are possible. We also believe that such channels are important in circumstances where the risk of misunderstanding and miscalculation is ever present. In my Government's view, it is essential that the attention of the world community should not be diverted from the urgent necessity of a diplomatic solution. For these reasons, we believe that a continuing effort must be made through whatever openings may be available to us, individually or collectively, to explore any possible avenues that may lead to a reversal of the present course of events in Viet-Nam.

72. However, it is a fact that the capacity of this Organization to play a useful role in the Viet-Nam conflict will be called into question as long as certain parties involved in that conflict are not Members of this Organization and are not bound by the terms of the Charter. I am not saying that, if they were Members, the United Nations would be able to settle the conflict. I am saying that the Organization would have a better chance of doing so if those parties were sitting here today. I know that there are fundamental obstacles—great obstacles. Where two Governments claim sovereign, and therefore, exclusive jurisdiction over the same people and territory and, more particularly, where each refuses any rights to the other, then we cannot oblige them to sit down together in these precincts. Nevertheless, I feel bound to say that there is a growing opinion in my country that if this Organization is to realize its potential capacities, all nations, and especially those which, like continental China, represent a significant portion of the world's population, must be represented here.

73. I noted what Mr. Goldberg had to say on this subject yesterday and I would like to think—and I am expressing my personal view—that he advanced the position of his country considerably in his statement [1412th meeting, paras. 43-49].

74. A solution to this problem of representation has eluded us for a long time; in spite of the impelling reasons which favour it, I cannot say whether it will be possible for us to resolve this question within the next few weeks, or within the next few months. However, universality must remain our objective.

75. Peace-keeping and, for that matter, all machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes, is essentially responsive to specific situations. Men have long dreamed of a more positive concept, the development of a world-wide peace and security system in which individual nations would abandon possession of the means of waging war. This is all the more necessary in view of military developments over the past two decades, and especially the acquisition of devastating military nuclear power by a few countries.

76. So it is from this point of view that Canada has approached disarmament negotiations. We share, of course, the common objectives of an agreed system of general and complete disarmament which would give security to all nations and thereby ensure our own. However, in present circumstances, we must pursue partial objectives both for their intrinsic value and as a foundation for future progress. This has been the focus of the negotiations in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament since the last session of the General Assembly. While we are disappointed that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament has had only limited success, we nevertheless consider that it remains the best available forum for the negotiation of arms control agreements.

77. There is no cause more urgent than to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. No single measure, however, will provide a solution. A series of measures directed to various facets of the issue will be required.

78. First, there is widespread agreement that a non-proliferation treaty is imperative. On the central issue of the definition of proliferation, we believe that the formula must prevent nuclear weapons from passing into the control of additional States or groups of countries. This should not be inconsistent with legitimate measures of collective defence. The exhaustive discussion of non-proliferation by the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament at Geneva has made it quite clear what the obstacles to a final agreement are, and it is to be hoped that the great Powers will find it possible to remove these obstacles and to leave the way clear for the agreement which the world so greatly wants and needs.

79. Secondly, as an essential corollary to a non-proliferation agreement, we think that the nuclear Powers and the United Nations should urgently consider ways of extending meaningful guarantees to States which do not possess nuclear weapons and have foregone the right to acquire them. We think that such States should have assurances for their security against nuclear attack or the threat of it.

80. Thirdly, it is in our view essential that if such a treaty is to be effective, and if it is to inspire confidence, some means of verification should be included. We have taken a stand at Geneva for a provision incorporating the mandatory application of International Atomic Energy Agency or equivalent

safeguards to all international transfers of nuclear materials and equipment for peaceful purposes.

81. Fourthly, we must persist in our efforts to devise an acceptable formula for a treaty banning nuclear tests in all environments. To this end, Canada has sought to further the science of teleseismic detection by increasing its capacity to process data from seismic arrays and by supporting increased international exchanges of such data.

82. Fifthly, we support the efforts being made in Latin America and in Africa to establish nuclear-free zones. We hope it may be possible subsequently for such zones to be established elsewhere in the world where conditions are appropriate.

83. Sixthly, we believe that progress towards effective measures of arms control requires the participation of all the principal world Powers in the discussion of these questions. We think that the non-aligned countries have a special role in trying to persuade the People's Republic of China to participate in such discussions.

84. Seventhly, we believe that the idea advanced by the Secretary-General in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization—for a comprehensive study of the consequences of the invention of nuclear weapons—is an interesting suggestion which merits careful consideration.

85. As a member of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, I am conscious of the frustration and discouragement that go with negotiations which seem to be getting nowhere. The fact is that we have no other choice. We must persist in these efforts, for the elusive prize is the peace we all seek, and failure, we know, could have tragic consequences for us all.

86. The maintenance of international peace and security, of which I have been speaking, may be the first of our purposes under the Charter, but it is probably not the purpose which is uppermost in the minds of most of our peoples. They are concerned, above all, by their aspirations for greater well-being and dignity.

87. During the past twenty years an organized assault on the obstacles to economic and social development has steadily gathered momentum under the aegis of this Organization. By contrast with 1945—and Mr. Gromyko, who shares with me, and perhaps with very few others in this forum, direct experience of that period, will recall the time when aid to developing countries was no more than a tentative experiment in international co-operation—in 1965 more than \$10 billion in public and private capital moved to the developing world from the industrialized countries with market economies. A decade ago, the resources administered by this Organization, or by the family of United Nations organs, amounted to \$186 million. Today they approach half a billion dollars annually. Measured by the standards of the past, then, the progress which has been made has been formidable. Confronted by the needs of the future, it is demonstrably not enough.

88. Frankly, I have been appalled at the recent projections of the world food situation. They reveal how drastically world food reserves have fallen in the

course of the last five years, and how grave—grave is the word—is the prospect of an over-all world food deficit no later than 1985.

89. For the immediate future, we must maintain the recent upward thrust in the flow of development assistance. In particular, we must devote much greater attention to short-term and long-term measures designed to cope with the problem of growing food shortages. While I recognize that aid is only one ingredient in the drive to accelerate the development process, particularly in the agricultural sector, I cannot help feeling that it will be a vital one.

90. In my country, we are trying to translate that conviction into action. We have diversified the nature of our assistance and the terms on which it is being given. Last year we supplemented our technical assistance and grant aid with soft loans, extending fifty-year credits at no interest, with a nominal service charge and a ten-year-grace period. This year we have gone further. The service charge has been abolished, our regulations governing the content of grant aid have been relaxed, and we have introduced a new category of loans, mid-way between hard and soft, which will be granted on a thirty-year basis at 3 per cent interest to countries whose economic circumstances so warrant.

91. Total aid resources available from Canada—having increased on the average by \$50 million a year since 1963—will be over \$300 million in the current fiscal year. Subject to economic and other relevant circumstances, the expansion of the Canadian aid programme will continue. We have set our sights on the aid target recommended by the General Assembly of 1 per cent of national income. We will do our utmost to reach it.

92. In the field of human rights, I am pleased to say that Canada has signed the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. We regard this as an important addition to the body of law on human rights, because for the first time implementation measures have been incorporated which we believe may form a pattern for future legislation in this field. It is our hope that the adoption of this Convention will be followed by the completion of the draft International Covenants on Human Rights and by the adoption of the draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance and the creation of the post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. These additional measures would be a worthy accomplishment for 1968, the International Year for Human Rights.

93. We have given much thought to our contribution to the programme for the International Year for Human Rights in 1968, and we have decided that the most useful contribution we could make would be to subject our own record, our own practices, to critical examination, drawing on all the resources of the community for this purpose. Complacency is a disease from which we all suffer. So our objective will be to remove the vestiges of discrimination at home—discrimination involving race, creed or sex—and to strengthen the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms by a continuing process of education and by subjecting violations to exposure

and public attention. I am confident that we shall be able to carry out a programme of this kind successfully because of the enthusiastic support for the cause of human rights which is displayed by voluntary bodies in my own country.

94. A principal area of conflict over racial discrimination and the denial of human rights is unquestionably southern Africa. As signatory to the Charter, we are concerned over the absence of progress towards the acceptance of the principle of self-determination in other Non-Self-Governing Territories in Africa and by the stubborn denial by the South African Government of political and human rights. Non-self-governing peoples should enjoy these basic political, social and economic rights, promised to them under the Charter and also by those who have been given a sacred trust to help them towards self-government.

95. Canada is deeply concerned about the situation in Southern Rhodesia. Since the illegal declaration of independence by the Smith régime, Members of this Organization have acted together with the United Kingdom Government to adopt various measures designed to end the present situation and to make it possible for that Territory to move towards independence on the basis of majority rule. The great majority of Governments at this table have co-operated in these measures. Canada has refused to recognize the régime, has severed economic relations with it, has participated in an oil airlift to Zambia and is providing other economic assistance to the people of Zambia in the difficult situation created for them by the Rhodesian problem.

96. During the past few months, and the past few weeks, the members of the Commonwealth have anxiously and closely followed the developments in Rhodesia. The United Nations, for its part, has taken important, even historic, decisions. The fact is, however, that the actions taken by the international community have so far failed to end the illegal régime. I am well aware that there are many who feel that in these circumstances the best answer is armed force. My Government has deep misgivings, however, about such an answer. Would the use of force achieve the results we desire? If not, might it not hurt those whom it was designed to help? These are the kind of questions we must ask ourselves. We believe that we should concentrate on seeing that the measures now in operation are applied with maximum effectiveness and that they are strengthened and supplemented in areas where this is practical, so that constitutional government can be restored and independence on the basis of majority rule attained.

97. The communiqué of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' meeting^{2/} notes a willingness on the part of the United Kingdom to co-sponsor in the Security Council a resolution for effective and selective mandatory economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia before the end of this year, if the illegal situation has not ended by then, and indicates full Commonwealth support for such a Security Council resolution. We think such a resolution would indeed be desirable, since we have noted that although most

^{2/} Meeting of the Commonwealth Heads of Government, held at Lagos, Nigeria, 11-12 January 1966.

Governments are supporting fully the measures advocated in Security Council resolutions, there have been some instances where this is not the case. My Government is particularly concerned by the fact that some markets are still open to Rhodesian exports, especially minerals and tobacco.

98. At the forefront of the problems before this session is the question of South West Africa. Since the recent Judgment of the International Court of Justice^{3/} was not concerned with the substantive aspects of this question, it does not in any way invalidate previous advisory opinions on the accountability of South Africa to the international community. My delegation is studying the various aspects of the problem with close attention and will indicate its position on whatever proposals are made as the debate on South West Africa progresses. An important concern of my delegation will be the possibility of these proposals achieving their stated objectives.

99. The balance-sheet of our achievements is written each year in this debate. I have tried today—at too great a length, I am afraid, however—to show several areas of endeavour which demand particular attention if the United Nations is to develop into a potent force for peace in the world. But I suggest that our collective experience has revealed a number of useful lessons.

100. In the first place, it is clear that we must not allow great Power differences over certain admittedly very difficult issues to induce a fruitless passivity in the membership. We must continue to search for opportunities for initiatives which are both constructive and realistic.

101. Secondly, there is an evident need for the Assembly to re-establish the free processes of debate and negotiation on draft resolutions. Only in this way can we hope to promote agreements that will attract the meaningful support of Member Governments when it comes to implementation.

102. Thirdly, we need to exercise greater respect for the rights of others under the Charter. This involves restraint by the great Powers in the use of their privileges; restraint by the smaller Powers in the observance of orderly procedures; restraint, above all, in the pursuit of national objectives where these are at variance with the purposes and principles of our constitution.

103. Finally, on the eve of the hundredth birthday of my country, the Government and people of Canada pledge their loyalty and their support to the concept of the United Nations and to the ideals it symbolizes and seeks to attain for the benefit of mankind.

104. I should like briefly to say about the Secretary-General what I said in the other official language of my country. The Secretary-General, the present incumbent, has the confidence of the Government and people of Canada. No man who has ever held this office, no man who has ever aspired to this office, has been so widely endorsed, as we know from events during the past few weeks. We all recognize, as we did three years ago, as the Security Council recognized

three years ago, his great personal qualities. But added to this is the great authority which he has gathered in the last few weeks, an authority that, in the interest of this Organization and in the interest of peace, we cannot dismiss. This commanding authority could be of the greatest value at this critical time in human affairs.

105. I agree with what the Secretary-General said the other day about his concept of the role of the office of Secretary-General. This was the view, I well remember, of Sir Eric Drummond, in the League of Nations, and of Mr. Joseph Avenol, who succeeded him; it was the view of Trygve Lie and of Dag Hammarskjöld; and it is what is implied and implicit in Articles 99 and 100 of the Charter of the United Nations. The Secretary-General—whoever occupies this post—must be one who by personal quality and by capacity and by respect has an authority far beyond his own person, and that exists today, clearly and demonstrably, in the person of U Thant.

106. I have the strong conviction—and I speak in this way only because the foreign policy of my country is so embedded in this Organization, and because I feel that in the immediate period this Organization's future and integrity are involved—that U Thant's personal attributes and his undoubted global moral authority could be a powerful force in helping to end the war in Viet-Nam, moving us on to universality in this Organization and, I think, to sure guarantees for peace in the world.

107. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Mr. President, may I first of all congratulate you on behalf of the USSR delegation on your election to the high post of President of the General Assembly and extend to you our heartfelt wishes for success in discharging your responsible duties.

108. The Charter of the United Nations begins by declaring that the peoples are determined "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind". This lofty aim has united countries situated in different continents and having a different social system. It is the *raison d'être* of the United Nations. It is the true criterion by which to assess the activities of the United Nations at any given period.

109. Even when the United Nations Charter was being drawn up, when the curtain on the final act of the heroic struggle of peoples against the fascist aggressors, to be succeeded by life in peace had not yet fallen—even at that time no one is likely to have imagined that all that was needed to eliminate the lurking dangers to peace was for the just principles of good neighbourliness, peaceful co-operation and the equality of all peoples to be endorsed by the signatures of a majority of States.

110. If the ideals of peace, freedom and national independence are to prevail in international relations, timely and purposeful action must be taken by the peace-loving elements. That was true in the past and is still true. But the opportunities for such action are now immeasurably greater. The fatalistic assumption that the forces of aggression cannot be halted

^{3/} South West Africa, Second Phase, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1966, p. 6.

in our time is as unfounded as the illusory hope that the international outlook will brighten by itself.

111. When violence is being plotted against peoples, the conspirators always conceal their intentions by peace-loving talk and false assurances, and resort to various manoeuvres to divide the ranks of the opponents of aggression and to paralyse the activities of international organizations which are called upon to guard the peace. Therefore, the sooner the danger is revealed and its consequences are weighed, and the firmer and closer to unanimity is the resistance, the more reliable will be the defence of universal peace.

112. On the basis of these considerations and guided by the aims proclaimed in the United Nations Charter, the USSR Government is in favour of again focusing attention at this twenty-first session of the General Assembly on questions whose solution would protect peoples from attacks on their sovereignty and independence, and would immobilize the aggressive forces. It cannot be said that the United Nations has never before made efforts toward this end. It has more than once taken commendable decisions in defence of the rights of peoples.

113. But what often follows such decisions? Unfortunately, what quite often happens is that a country or group of countries has only to oppose, overtly or covertly, the implementation of decisions which are serving the interests of peace and protecting the lawful rights of peoples, for such decisions to remain on paper, and for the United Nations to be unable to make any headway.

114. Let us take the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of States. Ask any delegation in this hall and surely not one of them will question the validity of this principle. But that is lip service. What happens in fact? Not only is the policy of interference in the affairs of others not on the wane, but in a number of cases it has assumed increasingly brazen and dangerous forms.

115. The invasion of South Viet-Nam by more than 300,000 United States soldiers and officers, the barbarous bombings of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, the armed interference in the affairs of Cambodia and Laos—all this is aggression. A Power with large armed forces and modern weapons has attacked a people which gained its independence after a hard struggle and does not wish to submit to new oppressors. The crimes being committed by the United States military clique in Viet-Nam have been denounced by the whole world.

116. The right of the Viet-Nameese people to peace, freedom and national unity was solemnly proclaimed twelve years ago in the Geneva Agreements.^{4/} If the United States had not acted contrary to the Geneva Agreements, had not interfered in the domestic affairs of the Viet-Nameese people, and had not sabotaged the holding of nation-wide elections in Viet-Nam, then there would be no war there today. The Viet-Nameese people would long ago have looked into its own affairs and found ways of dealing with them.

117. Every State, in whatever part of the world it may be, has been affected in one way or another by the consequences of the aggression in the Indo-China area. In fact, all international questions are now influenced by the course of events in Viet-Nam. War communiqués have not only become front-page news, but have also made people everywhere fear that yet another generation may have to put on military uniforms.

118. Washington pours out an endless stream of words intended to prove that the United States is seeking a peaceful way out of the present situation, as if it was almost against its will that the United States had found itself in Viet-Nam and was hurling more divisions, air squadrons and warships into battle. The incontrovertible fact is, however, that every so-called "peace feeler" by Washington is followed by a further escalation of its aggression.

119. What emerges from the statement made yesterday on behalf of the United States Government here in the General Assembly [1412th plenary meeting] is that the United States Government is defending its aggressive course in the Viet-Nam question and that there is still no sign of any serious intention on the part of Washington to seek a solution to this question and to halt the aggression against the Viet-Nameese people.

120. Where should we seek the solution to this problem? A programme for settling the question of Viet-Nam in accordance with the principles of international law and the interests of peace exists. This programme has been put forward by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam. It is a simple and natural plan: to halt unconditionally the bombings of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, to withdraw from South Viet-Nam all armed forces of the United States and its allies, as well as foreign weapons, and to give the Viet-Nameese people an opportunity to settle its internal problems for itself. The aggressor came to Viet-Nam and the aggressor must depart.

121. It is the duty of every State and every Government which is aware of its responsibility before the peoples of the world to speak out from this rostrum in support of the heroic Viet-Nameese people, to condemn the United States aggression and require it to be halted unconditionally both in North and South Viet-Nam, and to demand the withdrawal from Viet-Nam of all armed forces of the United States and its allies.

122. The Soviet Union and other socialist States, and all the forces of peace, are on the side of the Viet-Nameese people and its just cause. We have extended and shall extend every assistance to the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam in repulsing aggression. Those responsible for the Viet-Nameese war should duly weigh the significance of the warning issued by the socialist States meeting at Bucharest and draw the appropriate conclusions.

123. The policy of aggression in its most concentrated form is to be found today in Viet-Nam, but Viet-Nam is not the only country so affected. We have already referred to Laos and Cambodia. Nor can we forget the intervention in the Dominican Republic and the

^{4/} Geneva Conference on the Problem of Restoring Peace in Indo-China, 16 June-21 July 1954.

threats, intrigues and subversive activities against the peoples of a number of other countries.

124. The continuing provocations of the United States against the Republic of Cuba constitute a great threat to peace. The Soviet Union has warned and warns again those who harbour aggressive designs against Cuba that Cuba has faithful and reliable friends who are keeping a close watch on the intrigues of the enemies of the Cuban revolution and who are ready to give the Cuban people all necessary support in its struggle for freedom and independence.

125. Acts of interference in the domestic affairs of independent States, wherever they are committed, are a threat to peace and to the security of all peoples. The Soviet Union is a great Power and a permanent member of the Security Council, and it bears a substantial part of the responsibility for maintaining world peace.

126. The Soviet Union, a firm adherent of the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of other States, vigorously opposes those who disregard the sovereign rights of peoples and seek to implant lawlessness and violence in international relations. Together with other States which advocate peace, we shall use every opportunity to rebuff any manifestations of the policy of interference in the domestic affairs of others.

127. The front line in the struggle against violations of national sovereignty is everywhere. This struggle is going on in all continents, at different levels of international relations, and in a variety of forms. It is one in which the United Nations is required to play an active role.

128. A year ago, the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty [resolution 2131 (XX)]. The States Members of the United Nations acted in the belief that this important document could and should be a useful instrument for the normalization of international relations, and that those States which voted for the Declaration would adhere strictly to it. Because this has not in fact been the case, giving rise to justified alarm, the USSR delegation, on the instructions of its Government, is submitting for the consideration of the twenty-first session of the General Assembly as an important and urgent question, an item entitled "Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty" [A/6397].

129. Consideration of this question will give the United Nations an opportunity to make plain to all mankind who is violating the Declaration. The United Nations must state in the clearest terms that those who violate the Declaration by trampling on the sovereignty of independent States are assuming a grave responsibility for the possible consequences. It has been repeatedly stated here, in the General Assembly, that the Assembly's work must be made more effective and fruitful. This is a case where that can and must be done.

130. We believe that the item submitted by Czechoslovakia, entitled "Strict observance of the prohibition

of the threat or use of force in international relations, and of the right of peoples to self-determination" [A/6393 and Corr.1], is also of great immediacy. The USSR Government fully supports the initiative of the Czechoslovak Government in submitting this important question for the consideration of the General Assembly.

131. An analysis of developments in the international situation in the post-war period and particularly in the last few years inevitably leads to the conclusion that the military bases established in foreign territory by certain Powers of Western military blocs are a basic instrument of aggressive policy. Many of these bases are a legacy of colonialism. There are also other bases which these Powers have set up in the territory of weaker countries simply by imposing completely unfair agreements on them.

132. This applies primarily to the United States, which has set up hundreds of military bases and fortified points beyond its borders, and permanently maintains about a million of its armed forces, nuclear and missile equipment, aircraft and other weaponry in the territory of other States.

133. A great many facts could be adduced to show that the foreign bases of certain Western Powers have been used as springboards of aggression to force the States in whose territory they are situated, and even neighbouring States, to make political and economic concessions against the interests of their own peoples. The logic they use is simple enough: if you do not accept our political argument, we have a much more convincing argument to hand—bombers, marines and aircraft carriers.

134. Why do certain circles in the United States cling to their bases, such as those in and around South Viet-Nam, which are situated many thousands of miles from New York and San Francisco? Have they brought culture, progress and well-being to the local population? They have not. If a sculptor should attempt to depict what the foreign military bases stand for, he would have to produce a monument to violence, destruction and death. Some of the military bases serving the aims of aggression are situated hundreds rather than thousands of miles from the United States, as for example in Latin America, but their purpose is much the same.

135. Many countries would like to get rid of such bases and the unfair agreements by which those bases were imposed on them. However, they are not yet in a position to do so and their demands are not heeded. They need support, not least from the United Nations.

136. Is it in the power of the United Nations to solve this problem and should the twenty-first session of the General Assembly deal with it? For the masters of such bases have, so to speak, become firmly entrenched and it is not easy to dislodge them.

137. No one claims that the elimination of these military bases is a simple matter. But even in a simple matter no progress can be achieved unless an effort is made. We can see that the bases may not be eliminated all at once, but, to begin with, only in certain areas and in individual States. But

it is essential to move in that direction if the United Nations really intends to take action to achieve a relaxation of international tension and to create conditions in which every State will feel secure.

138. Of course, I am not referring to the formal reduction in the number of bases and other military installations abroad which certain Western Powers sometimes effect for economic reasons. Instead of, say, fifteen bases in a certain area, ten are left, but those ten bases are expanded and equipped with more powerful weapons, and the result is that the total number of foreign troops and armaments deployed beyond national borders is actually increased rather than decreased. What is needed is a genuine elimination of bases and not the appearance thereof.

139. It may be that not all States represented here will react in the same way to our proposal. We hope that the majority will adopt a sympathetic attitude. It is not any narrow interests of our own that we are promoting here. The Soviet Union is a Power which has everything necessary to defend its security against, among other things, the threats posed by the foreign bases of certain members of Western military blocs. We are motivated by broader interests—the interests of world peace.

140. The decision to eliminate United States military bases in foreign territories would not, in our opinion, jeopardize the interests of United States security. If the United States undertook their elimination, such a step would certainly not be held against it.

141. Where should a start be made on the elimination of foreign military bases serving the aims of aggression? It might be advisable to begin in Asia, Africa and Latin America. This might perhaps prove to be the easier way.

142. The Organization of African Unity has demanded the elimination of foreign military bases in Africa. A firm stand on that subject^{5/} was taken by the Cairo Conference of Non-Aligned Countries.^{6/} Many States have striven to solve this question at previous sessions of the United Nations General Assembly and at meetings of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

143. All this gives the USSR Government reason to hope for a constructive approach at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly to the question which we are submitting as an important and urgent item, entitled "Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America" [A/6399]. The adoption of a clear and unequivocal decision on this question would be a great step towards strengthening the independence of the newly-emerged States, protecting them from foreign intervention, and relaxing world tension.

144. In our day, the task of consolidating peace and of resisting aggression and interference in the domestic affairs of States is inseparably linked to averting the danger of nuclear war. This problem, which is one of the most serious in the whole history of mankind, has confronted the United Nations ever

since the establishment of the Organization. At the very first session of the General Assembly, in 1946, the USSR Government drew the attention of Governments and peoples to the dangerous situation which had arisen as a result of the appearance of nuclear weapons and submitted a Draft International Convention to Prohibit the Production and Employment of Weapons Based on the Use of Atomic Energy for the Purpose of Mass Destruction.^{7/} Since that time, the United Nations has been continuously concerned with the problem of nuclear weapons.

145. The opinion is sometimes voiced that the elimination of the nuclear threat is primarily the concern of those States which possess nuclear weapons. These States have, indeed, a special responsibility, if only because they alone possess nuclear weapons and know their destructive capabilities better than anyone else. Nevertheless, much depends on the United Nations as a whole.

146. The problem of the removal of the nuclear threat can be dealt with in different ways. For example, its existence can be mentioned from time to time in official records and resolutions and it can be referred from one session of the General Assembly to another and from committee to committee. The USSR Government does not approve of this practice. The United Nations should not work merely in order to build up archives serving as a kind of burial ground for proposals and plans directed towards the solution of one of the most vital problems facing mankind. We appeal for a different approach. The United Nations is entitled to express its opinion clearly and firmly on the ways of eliminating the nuclear threat, and to state it in such terms that those who are opposed to such action would be unable to ignore its attitude.

147. Which aspects of the nuclear problem are being placed in the forefront today? The answer to this question was given by the twentieth session of the General Assembly which gave a prominent place on its agenda to the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. This answer is, of course, still valid.

148. Last year a constructive resolution was adopted which urged all States to take the steps necessary for the conclusion of a treaty which would be void of any loop-holes leading to the proliferation, either directly or indirectly, of nuclear weapons in any form [resolution 2028 (XX)]. So far, however, no such treaty has been concluded and the probability that more and more States will become nuclear Powers, in addition to the present five, is increasing and already almost lends itself to factual analysis.

149. It is also apparent to everyone that, if the process of proliferation of nuclear weapons continues, it may become irreversible, to say the least. An appropriate international treaty imposing clearly defined obligations on States might be an effective means of combating such proliferation.

150. The reason why it has not so far been possible to conclude a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is no secret to anyone. No sooner had all States voted in favour of a constructive resolution on

^{5/} Document A/5763.

^{6/} Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, Cairo, 5-10 October 1964.

^{7/} Official Records of the Atomic Energy Commission, No. 2, 2nd meeting.

this question in New York, than certain Powers, in Geneva, started to look for those very loop-holes for the proliferation of nuclear weapons which the United Nations had unequivocally opposed. Everyone knows that this is being done for the sake of the Federal Republic of Germany. But that only gives us cause for redoubled and tripled concern.

151. In Western Germany, preparations are already being made to equip the army with nuclear missiles. Military personnel reared by Hitler's generals are being trained in the use of nuclear weapons and missile technology. The Federal Republic of Germany is laying the foundation for its own atomic industry, is carrying out research, and has made arrangements for production and supply of nuclear materials. And who can fail to be aware of the fact that the leaders of the Federal Republic of Germany are clamouring to be allowed to participate in the control of nuclear weapons within NATO?

152. This militarist obsession is rooted in the ideology, policies and the entire mentality of those who set pre-war Germany on a course of expansion and enslavement of other nations. What is happening in the Federal Republic of Germany today is in many ways reminiscent of the path chosen by Germany more than once in the past. The ruling circles in the Federal Republic of Germany have taken over, like a baton in a relay race, the slogans and aims for the sake of which, first, the Prussian junkers and after them the Nazi invaders twice plunged Europe into a bloodbath before breaking their own necks. These slogans are well known to everyone: so-called equal rights in armaments, the creation of a military striking force, and the redrawing of European frontiers.

153. Those who have not learned the lessons of the past sometimes refer to the fact that Western Germany is much weaker militarily than the Soviet Union, and much weaker still than all the socialist countries and the peace-loving countries taken together. That, of course, is true. And we would not like to describe from this rostrum what Western Germany would draw upon itself if the intoxication of militarism and revanchism should cloud the minds of its leaders and drive them to an act of madness. But it is also true that, although the Federal Republic of Germany may not be in a position to win a war, it can precipitate one if political recklessness oversteps the bounds. This is why the question of maintaining the security of Europe has become so urgent at the present time.

154. For historical reasons, the state of affairs in Europe affects the interests of all States Members of the United Nations. Even when centres of international tension appear elsewhere, Europe remains the barometer of the world's political climate and Europe's reply to the question of whether there shall be war or peace is to a great extent decisive. If any Government or any statesman of a country situated thousands of miles from Europe should argue that European affairs are too remote and need not be of any concern, we can only say that the Second World War has put an end to this way of thinking: with a few exceptions, virtually all States,

however remote from Europe, were directly or indirectly involved in that war.

155. The peoples which fought against fascism and which performed feats of heroism during the Second World War did not do so simply in order to gain the upper hand on the battlefield. No, the battle was also waged for the future of peace in Europe and against a third world war. And this battle continues.

156. The Soviet Union, like the other socialist countries, deems it its bounden duty to do everything in its power to save Europe from the danger of devastating wars, and to make way for peaceful co-operation among all European countries regardless of their social structure. The recent conference of countries members of the Warsaw Pact, which adopted the Declaration on the strengthening of peace and security in Europe, put forward a broad and realistic programme for the solution of these problems. Among the measures suggested by the socialist countries for strengthening European security, I should like to mention two, namely, that the inviolability of the existing European frontiers must be ensured and that the forces of revanchism must not be allowed access to nuclear weapons. Unless these conditions are met, there can be no lasting peace and security in Europe or elsewhere.

157. True security for the European nations can only be assured if this problem is solved at the all-European level, by co-operation between Eastern and Western European States. Peace cannot be considered secure in Europe when one military grouping of States confronts another, and when both sides are piling up weapons and concentrating their troops. Such a situation is contrary to the interests of the peoples of Europe, and of others as well. It benefits only those who would like to keep Europe permanently in a state of military tension and who pursue their own ends, which have nothing to do with the security of the European nations.

158. The Soviet Union, like the other socialist States, is ready to sit down at the negotiating table with all European States to discuss the pressing problems of European security.

159. We would not exclude from these talks any European State, not even the Federal Republic of Germany if it expressed a readiness to participate. The USSR Government is far from being motivated by any prejudice against the Federal Republic of Germany, with which we would like to develop good relations, or by any desire to put it on a lower footing than other States.

160. This attitude fully applies also to the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. No people and no country would lose anything or suffer in any way from the conclusion of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. All would benefit for the cause of peace would gain.

161. Is there any prospect at the moment of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons being concluded? We believe that there is, but it is essential, of course, that the United States of America, whose representatives admit that the proliferation of nuclear weapons is fraught with danger for its own people,

too, and declare that the United States recognizes the responsibility imposed upon it by the possession of nuclear weapons, should take practical steps in keeping with these statements. That is all that is needed.

162. The USSR Government's own position remains unchanged: we are ready to continue the search for a solution enabling a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons to be signed. We shall listen attentively to all constructive observations, including the opinions of those States which do not possess nuclear weapons.

163. In our view, negotiations on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons could be concluded in a relatively short period. In the meantime, it is important that no one should take any steps which might lead, directly or indirectly, to the spread of nuclear weapons. With this in mind, the USSR Government submits for the consideration of the General Assembly an item entitled "Renunciation by States of actions hampering the conclusion of an agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" [A/6398].

164. We believe that the item we propose corresponds to the wishes of the majority of States Members of the United Nations and will serve to develop and supplement the decision adopted by the General Assembly at its twentieth session. The USSR Government appeals to all States represented in the General Assembly to give due consideration to our proposal.

165. The whole problem of disarmament also requires the close attention of the General Assembly. Everything that can be said about the significance of this problem must surely have been said within the United Nations. The harsh truth is that, whereas virtually nothing is done towards disarmament, the arms race mounts, year by year in an increasingly steep line. Not only are there every year more weapons in the world—especially the most destructive ones, nuclear weapons and missiles—not only is the annual absolute growth of this death-dealing potential increasing constantly, but the rate of this increase is also rising. The arms race can be compared to a rapidly widening inverted pyramid and the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee, which has now been in existence for five years, to a monotonous movement in a closed circle. The reasons for this situation have been revealed here on more than one occasion. There are some Powers whose Governments do not want disarmament.

166. We reject the pessimistic philosophy which maintains that the world is simply incapable of dealing with the arms race. Such an approach is convenient only for those who seek to conceal their arms race policy. If it had not been for the struggle for disarmament, if it had not been for the efforts made by many countries which genuinely want to achieve a solution to this problem and to reach agreement both on separate measures and on the broad programme of general and complete disarmament, what would have been the world situation? It would have been even more complex and dangerous.

167. It can be said with certainty that if all States recognized their responsibility for the maintenance of peace, the problem of disarmament would be

solved. The United Nations can and must find the strength to give a fresh impetus to the disarmament talks.

168. The impasse these talks have reached makes the idea of convening a world disarmament conference with the participation of all States even more timely. No opportunity must be neglected to utilize material and human resources, the achievements of science and technology, the brains of scientists and the skills of engineers and workers solely for the benefit of mankind and not to develop the arms race.

169. The United Nations was born of the struggle of the peoples against the fascist oppressors. Its mission is to support any nation fighting for its freedom and independence.

170. Every year the peoples of the world have been gaining new victories in doing away with colonialism. Today it is only in the southern part of Africa that colonialism retains a strong base. But there, too, as in all other territories whose peoples have not yet achieved their national liberation, the struggle against colonialism is active. The Soviet people are on the side of those, in Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea, in South West Africa and in Southern Arabia, who are fighting for their freedom and independence, even as they are on the side of those, in the Republic of South Africa and in Southern Rhodesia, who are defending their human, civil and political dignity in the struggle against the racists. We are firmly convinced that the peoples of every single colony will be victorious and that the hour of this final victory is not far off.

171. The United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)], the recognition of the legality of the national liberation struggle, decisions concerning the need to render moral and material assistance to the national liberation movements in colonial territories, the condemnation of the activities of international capitalist monopolies, the branding of colonialism and racism as crimes against humanity—these are genuine political contributions made by the United Nations to the cause of eliminating colonial régimes. But this is no longer enough.

172. In the opinion of the USSR Government, the General Assembly has a real duty to adopt resolutions which would help to make 1967 the year of the complete and final elimination of colonial régimes. In the first few days' work of the current session of the General Assembly we are to consider the question of the elimination of foreign racist domination over South West Africa. The Soviet Union is ready to support the independent African States which sponsored the inclusion of this item in the agenda. In the struggle against the racists and their protectors, justice is on the side of free Africa.

173. The United Nations must also firmly and resolutely oppose all manifestations of the policy of neo-colonialism, that policy of the re-enslavement of peoples which have achieved their political independence after a hard struggle but which have not yet thrown off the bonds of economic dependence. Joint and resolute action by all anti-colonialist forces will provide the peoples with the surest

guarantee of success in their continuing struggle for freedom and independence.

174. The United Nations faces interesting and important tasks in the development of peaceful co-operation between States in the economic, scientific, technical, cultural and other spheres. But here, again, not everything is going smoothly. For example, the first United Nations Conference on Trade and Development^{8/} formulated the principles of equal trade relations among all States. This was to a great extent the result of co-operation between the socialist and the developing countries, which advocate genuine equality and the abolition of all discrimination in international trade. Certain Powers, however, have a persistent habit of using trade as a means of plundering the economically less-developed countries. They have resolved to frustrate a reorganization of world trade on a fair basis. The Soviet Union, for its part, is ready to co-operate with all States in order to achieve the implementation of the decisions adopted by the First Conference and to move ahead to the establishment of normal world trade relations.

175. The United Nations has been discussing social problems for twenty years and invariably those who demand the implementation of the provisions of the United Nations Charter proclaiming the lofty principles of the equality of nations large and small and respect for human rights without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, meet with stubborn opposition from the forces of the old world, the world of inequality and oppression. But the United Nations has by no means said its last word on these matters. Together with all those who value justice and the dignity of every human being, in whatever country or continent he may live, we shall strive for the adoption by the United Nations of workable decisions on international social problems.

176. In recent years a completely new direction has been opened up for the development of civilization—the conquest of outer space and the heavenly bodies. Our people are proud of the fact that they were the first to embark on the task of conquering the cosmos.

177. Bright prospects of utilizing outer space for the benefit of mankind are already apparent. They include long-distance communications, television relay through outer space, and a reliable meteorological service, and that is not the end. It is natural that the question should arise of co-operation between States in research into the peaceful uses of outer space. The Soviet Union is prepared to co-operate in this matter and will proceed on this basis during the current negotiations.

178. An important and essential step in this direction would be the establishment of rules of international law for the activities of States in outer space. With this aim in view, the Government of the USSR has proposed the conclusion of an appropriate international treaty [A/6341 and A/6352]. My delegation expresses the hope that the General Assembly will give due attention to this whole question.

179. The twenty-first session of the General Assembly opens the third decade of the existence and activity of the United Nations. The tasks facing it in the maintenance of universal peace and the development of international co-operation are not becoming any easier, but rather more complex and more important. But their complexity is not the only reason why United Nations organs are often in no position to give the right answer to the questions of the day.

180. Under the United Nations Charter, the principal responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security rests with the Security Council. At best, however, the Security Council merely registers international crises, and then not always. The responsibility for the abnormal and irregular state of affairs in the Security Council rests with those Powers which strive to attain their own narrow aims in the United Nations, aims which have nothing to do with the strengthening of international peace.

181. But we are far from drawing the conclusion that the Security Council should be considered doomed to inaction. There are sufficient means at the disposal of the States represented in the General Assembly to breathe new life into this most important organ of the United Nations and to enhance its role, as well as the role of the United Nations as a whole, so that it can fulfil the purposes set out in the Charter.

182. In order to achieve this, we must first of all ensure the strict observance of the provisions of the Charter by all Member States and discourage all attempts—and there have been many—to violate the Charter.

183. How urgent this has become is shown by the fact that every so often pressure is again built up in favour of setting up an armed force outside the framework of the Security Council, that is, in violation of the United Nations Charter. Such a force would be at the disposal of a small group of States, would serve their special interests, and would be entitled to act as an international police force. Such a scheme would be very much to the liking of certain circles. Together with all other States which value the freedom and independence of peoples, the Soviet Union categorically opposes and will continue to oppose any such plans.

184. The United Nations must not only prevent violation of its own constitution—the Charter. It is called upon to defend the system of rules of international law on which peaceful relations between States are founded. The struggle to ensure strict observance of the rules of international law by all States, large or small, is acquiring special significance in the prevailing circumstances.

185. This means that the United Nations must help States to cleanse their international relations of the incrustations of the cold war and, above all, dissociate itself from questions which poison the atmosphere, such as the so-called Korean question. The only useful decision which the United Nations can take on this question is the decision to withdraw immediately all foreign troops from South Korea and dissolve the ill-fated United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. If others stop interfering with them, the Korean people them-

^{8/} Held at Geneva, 23 March–16 June 1964.

selves will find peaceful ways to settle their own domestic problems and that is what the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has been consistently urging.

186. The delegations of the socialist countries, on the instructions of their Governments, have submitted for consideration by the General Assembly at its twenty-first session an item entitled "Withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" [A/6394]. We hope that the General Assembly will take a decision on this question that will be in the interests of respect for the rights of the Korean people and of peace in the Far East.

187. Enhancing the role of the United Nations in international affairs would mean turning it into a genuinely universal organization. Any political discrimination against States which declare their readiness to assume the obligations set out in the Charter of the United Nations strikes a blow, in the first instance, at the United Nations itself.

188. An application by the German Democratic Republic for membership in the United Nations [A/6283 and A/6443] has now been submitted for consideration. There is no doubt that the participation in the work of the United Nations of that peace-loving German State, the German Democratic Republic, which is making such a significant contribution to the maintenance of European security, would give our Organization greater scope and effectiveness. It would also be proper to admit simultaneously to membership in the United Nations the other German State—the Federal Republic of Germany.

189. The Soviet Union is also in favour of putting an end at last to the unnatural situation in which the People's Republic of China is deprived of its lawful rights in the United Nations while its place is occupied by the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, which has been repudiated by the Chinese people and is being kept by a foreign Power. The lawful rights of the People's Republic of China must be restored and the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek régime must be expelled from all United Nations organs.

190. We would like to take this opportunity to mention the great and constructive role played by Secretary-General U Thant in the activities of the United Nations. If he should express readiness to continue his work as Secretary-General, the USSR Government would be only too pleased.

191. States with different social systems are represented in the United Nations. They have different views on the future course of history and on ways of solving the domestic problems of States. We Soviet people have our own convictions and we are sure that they are right. They find their expression in the practical building of communism, in the decisions of the XXIII Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which also defined the aims of our country's foreign policy, and in those great social and economic achievements which are the lifeblood of Soviet society. We do not seek to impose our

convictions or our methods on anyone. Not a single Soviet missile, not a single Soviet gun is aimed against the social systems of other countries and peoples. Their domestic affairs are their own concern. But let no one count on being able to interfere in our affairs or in the affairs of our friends and allies. If all States adopt this position of principle, peace in the world will be truly secured.

192. The Soviet Union's policy of maintaining international peace was made manifest at the time of the well-known Tashkent meeting,^{9/} which led to the cessation of a dangerous military conflict between two great Asian States, India and Pakistan. The Soviet Union sought nothing for itself at the Tashkent meeting. Neither do we seek any unilateral gains for ourselves when we bring forward a number of pressing problems during this session of the General Assembly in the interests of averting acts of aggression and combating aggressive policies.

193. In the United Nations and in international affairs as a whole, the Soviet Union, like other socialist States, bases its position on peace among nations, respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all States, and support for peoples fighting for their national liberation. These basic principles of our foreign policy are inseparably linked to the socialist social system of our country, in which there is no place for the exploitation of human beings and in which no one has or can have a material interest in maintaining international tension or in a war, but in which there is a natural need for a lasting peace, since the far-reaching plans for the building of communism require peaceful conditions for their execution.

194. Not only do we proclaim the principles of peaceful and equitable relations among States, but we use all our international authority to defend just causes, and to secure the affirmation of these principles in everyday international relations. In this, too, the nature of our socialist system and the profound humanism of its ideals are apparent.

195. The Soviet Union opposes any situation in which a small country, simply because it is small, is placed in an inequitable position, in a position of subjection and dependence, and in which the principle of peaceful coexistence is taken into account only in relations between certain States, generally large States, and is ignored where relations between a great Power and small countries are concerned.

196. The diversity of international developments brings many different questions before each session of the General Assembly. We must concentrate on those problems which can be solved and the solution of which will truly contribute to the relaxation of tension.

197. We are inspired by the knowledge that the majority of Governments represented here are striving towards this same goal, and it is therefore with considerable confidence in the future that we approach the work before us.

^{9/} Held 3-10 January 1966.

198. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States in exercise of his right of reply.

199. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): Yesterday, my delegation sought to deal with the situation in Viet-Nam in the spirit of the Secretary-General's letter of 1 September to Members [A/6400] and in the spirit that you, Mr. President, wisely invoked in your noteworthy address on assuming the office of President of the General Assembly last Tuesday [1409th meeting]. Yesterday, my Government made serious and genuine offers aimed at breaking out of the tragic impasse in Viet-Nam [1412th meeting, paras. 32-42]. We have offered to take the first step in reducing the intensity and extent of the military conflict. We have offered to begin, together with North Viet-Nam, the process of phased withdrawal of external forces from South Viet-Nam under effective international supervision. We have offered to enter into immediate contact, private or public, to explore these possibilities, Hanoi's four points and any other points which any party to the conflict may raise.

200. If the sincerity of these offers is to be tested or questioned, it should be tested not by verbal attacks, nor by veiled warnings, but by exploring our willingness to take action, to perform deeds to match our words. For the responsibility for the next steps falls not on Hanoi alone but also on every Power that can help toward a solution.

201. As my delegation pointed out yesterday, the greater a nation's power, the greater is its responsibility for peace [*ibid.*, para. 42]. We of the United States will persevere in our efforts for peace in Viet-Nam. We still await a considered reply to our

affirmative proposals, and we continue to hope that all Members of this Organization will join in this great endeavour. What counts is not prowess in the art of invective but prowess in the art of peace-making.

202. The PRESIDENT: As you must have observed from the Journal, five speakers were listed to speak in the general debate today. We have listened already to three of them. This leaves the distinguished Foreign Ministers of Japan and Senegal. I understand that they are both anxious to make their interventions this afternoon if possible, and I am sure that the Assembly would wish to hear them today. I therefore propose to observe the following procedure this afternoon: we shall begin our proceedings with item 66 of the provisional agenda: Question of South West Africa. There are four speakers inscribed on the list of speakers for this item, and after listening to them, we shall revert to the general debate and listen to the interventions of the Foreign Ministers of Japan and Senegal, before concluding our afternoon meeting. We have to make every effort to give the floor to all the speakers inscribed for today in the course of the day. I very much hope that this proposal will be acceptable to the Assembly.

It was so decided.

203. The PRESIDENT: Before adjourning this meeting, I would like particularly to use this opportunity to thank all the distinguished representatives for responding this morning to my appeal of yesterday [1412th meeting, para. 1] and enabling us to start our meeting on time. From that time until now it has been on my mind that I should thank them all.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.