

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1655th
MEETING**

Thursday, 16 October 1969,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Tribute to the memory of Mr. Abdirashid Ali Shermarke, President of the Somali Republic | 1 |
| Statement by the Chairman | 2 |
| Agenda item 103: The strengthening of international security (<i>continued</i>) . . | 3 |

Chairman: Mr. Agha SHAHI (Pakistan).

*Tribute to the memory of Mr. Abdirashid Ali Shermarke,
President of the Somali Republic*

1. The CHAIRMAN: Before we begin our proceedings this morning, may I on behalf of members of the First Committee express our deep sorrow to the Government and people of Somalia on the great loss they have suffered in the tragic and untimely death of President Shermarke. He was a statesman of wisdom and stature and the sense of loss that his country and Africa feel is, I am sure, shared by the whole world. May I now request representatives to stand and observe a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of President Shermarke.

The members of the Committee observed a minute of silence.

2. The CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Committee I shall request the permanent representative of Somalia to convey our sentiments to the family of the late President and to the Government and people of Somalia.

3. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): It is with deep sorrow that I learned of the untimely death of Dr. Shermarke, President of the Somali Republic and an outstanding leader in the African peoples' struggle for freedom and independence. I have been profoundly moved by the news, as I was personally acquainted with Dr. Shermarke, who came to the United Nations in New York many years ago in the course of his activities for his country's independence and the liberation of African peoples from colonial domination. I met him here again later, when his country had attained its independence and become a sovereign State. As the Prime Minister of the Somali Republic, he made an official visit to the Soviet Union and I had the honour to meet him, talk to him, and accompany him on a tour of our country.

4. I also met him in Mogadiscio, when I visited his country.

5. My meetings and talks with him left me with a deep, indelible impression of this outstanding African leader, his

fiery desire for freedom and independence, his wisdom, his statesmanship, and his understanding of the major international problems. In the person of Dr. Shermarke, President of the Somali Republic, mankind has lost an outstanding leader of the African national liberation movement. The assassin's hand appears to have been guided by enemies of Africa and its peoples. This assassination should be abominated as the most shameful act of our time. The memory of this great leader will be indelibly engraved on the hearts of all those who had the honour to know him, talk with him, discuss international problems with him and lend him assistance in his noble efforts, plans and intentions for the liberation of his native land and the entire African continent from the colonial yoke.

6. Mr. VINCI (Italy): I wish on behalf of all the members of the Western European and other state groups as well as on behalf of my own delegation, to join in the expressions of sorrow which you, Sir, have expressed at the tragic loss of the President of Somalia. May I add that this was a great shock for my own country. The traditional links between Italy and Somalia go far back in the history of both countries. Also, the President of the Somali Republic was a well-known figure in Italy and I had the great honour of meeting him on several occasions. The way he led his country evoked great admiration and high esteem in Government, Parliamentary and all other circles in Italy. It is a great loss for Somalia, a loss which we share. My Government and the whole Italian nation regard this as a loss to their own country.

7. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I should like, on behalf of the Asian Group and my country, Jordan, to join in the expressions of shock and sorrow at the untimely death of a great leader of Somalia, its President. This is a great loss not only to Somalia and its people, but also to Africa and, indeed, to all peace-loving nations. We should like to convey our deep sorrow to the people and Government of Somalia.

8. Mr. MUGO (Kenya): My delegation has learned with profound shock and sorrow of the assassination of the President of Somalia. Kenya and Somalia maintain very friendly relations, and this dreadful death has aroused our very deepest sympathies. On behalf of my delegation, I should like to extend our very deep sympathies and condolences to the delegation of Somalia, to the Government, and people of Somalia and to the family of the late President. The death of President Shermarke is a loss not only to Africa but to the whole world.

9. Mr. AGUILAR (Venezuela) (*translated from Spanish*): On behalf of a number of Latin American delegations, including my own, I should like to offer the representative of Somalia our condolences on the death of the President

of his country, and to ask him to transmit them to his Government and to the family of the deceased.

10. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): On behalf of the group of socialist countries of Eastern Europe, I should like to express our deep sympathy to the delegation of Somalia at the death of the President of the Republic, Mr. Shermarke.

11. The sudden death of that eminent representative of Somalia and of Africa will be deeply felt in that country and in Africa. However, we sincerely hope that it will not hamper the progressive development of Somalia and of the entire African continent.

12. We request that the condolences of our group be transmitted to the Government and people of Somalia.

13. Mr. STEINER (United Republic of Tanzania): The delegations of Tanzania and Uganda have learned with great sorrow, and with a great sense of loss, of the untimely death of the President of Somalia, Mr. Shermarke. The assassination of that great son of Africa was a wicked act, and the sense of loss is even greater for our two countries, which are such close neighbours of Somalia. Both our countries feel very strongly about this act. We would be most grateful to the delegation of Somalia if it would transmit our feeling of great sorrow to the people and Government of Somalia and to the family of the late President.

14. Mr. MOUKNASS (Mauritania) (*translated from French*): At a time when Africa and those struggling to regain her dignity have suffered a grievous blow, I should like, on behalf of the African group, to express our condolences to the people and Government of Somalia and to the family of the deceased President.

15. Such an act should not occur in Africa any more, and all the sons of Africa should once and for all outlaw such acts so that other continents may help us to continue along the road to dignity and freedom.

16. I would ask the representative of Somalia to be kind enough to convey our heartfelt condolences to his people and Government and to the family of the late President.

17. Mr. ZELLEKE (Ethiopia): My delegation would like to join those who have already expressed sorrow at the tragic loss of His Excellency Mr. Shermarke, the President of Somalia. Somalia is a neighbour and sister country and the loss of President Shermarke is not a loss for Somalia alone; it is also a loss for Ethiopia and for Africa.

18. We should like to express our condolences to the delegation and people of Somalia, and to the family of President Shermarke.

19. Mr. ANTOINE (Haiti) (*translated from French*): On behalf of the Latin American group, I have the painful duty to express the deep sorrow felt by mankind at the tragic death of the President of Somalia.

20. On behalf of the Haitian Government, which I have the honour to represent in the First Committee, I wish to

associate myself with the representative of Venezuela who has so well expressed the deep emotion felt at this tragic loss to the Republic of Somalia. I should like to express both personally and on behalf of the Haitian Government our deep condolences to the people and Government of Somalia.

21. Mr. COLEMAN (United States of America): On behalf of the delegation and the people of the United States we wish to record that we are profoundly shocked and grieved at the tragic death of the President of Somalia. We have already expressed to the Premier and people of Somalia our deep sympathy on this sorrowful occasion. President Shermarke was a wonderful and remarkable statesman and his loss will be a heavy one to his country, to Africa and to the entire world community.

22. In times of tragedy and death, there is little that one can say, but I certainly should like to indicate that the American people has experienced on more than one occasion this kind of tragedy which struck one of its leaders at the prime of his political and public life. We have deep understanding and sympathy with the people of Somalia.

23. Mr. FAKHREDDINE (Sudan): The bonds between Sudan and the Republic of Somalia are so close that the loss of President Shermarke is indeed our loss. The peoples of our two countries have shared many trials together and there are many cultural bonds between them. May I, on behalf of the Sudan, ask the representative of Somalia to convey our heartfelt condolences to the people of Somalia and to the family of the late President?

24. Mr. MEHDI (Pakistan): It is with a deep sense of grief that I convey the condolences of my Government to the delegation of Somalia on the sad loss they have suffered. This grief is felt very deeply in my country because of the close ties that exist between Pakistan and Somalia, as well as the fact that President Shermarke was a great freedom fighter and made a tremendous contribution to the building of Somalia into what it is today. I would request the representative of Somalia to convey this deep sense of grief to his country on behalf of my country.

25. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): My delegation has been deeply touched by the moving tributes that have been paid to the memory of President Abdirashid Ali Shermarke and by the sentiments of sorrow at his tragic death that have been expressed by you, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of this Committee and by the representatives of the Soviet Union, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Venezuela, Bulgaria, Tanzania, Mauritania, Haiti, the United States of America, Sudan and Pakistan.

26. The sentiments which have been expressed will be conveyed to the family and relatives of our late President and to the Government and people of the Republic of Somalia.

Statement by the Chairman

27. The CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform the members of the Committee that I have received a letter dated 15 October 1969 from the President of the General Assembly transmitting a copy of a letter dated 14 October from the

Chairman of the Committee on Conferences addressed to the President of the General Assembly and requesting that the contents of that letter be brought to the attention of the members of the Committee. I would request the Secretary of the Committee to read out that letter.

28. Mr. CHACKO (Secretary of the Committee): The letter dated 15 October 1969 from the President of the General Assembly reads:

“I have the honour to transmit a copy of a letter from the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences, dated 14 October 1969, and should be grateful if this matter could be brought to the attention of your Committee.”

29. The text of the letter dated 14 October from the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences reads as follows:

“I have the honour to draw your attention to operative paragraph 7 (b) and 9 of resolution 2239 (XXI), ‘Pattern of Conferences’, dated 20 December 1966, in which the General Assembly requests the Committee on Conferences under para. 7 (b) ‘in the course of the regular session, to examine any further proposals for new meetings and conferences and submit its recommendations to the Main Committee concerned’, and under para. 9, ‘recommends that all competent organs of the United Nations, including subsidiary organs of the General Assembly, should bear in mind that proposals involving new meetings and conferences would be subject to the recommendations of the Committee on Conferences and to final approval by the Assembly.’

“In order to allow an orderly procedure to prevail in the examination of any new meeting and conference which would be subject to consideration by the Committee on Conferences, I should be grateful if you would kindly draw the attention of the Chairmen of the Main Committees of the General Assembly to the requirements of the above-mentioned paragraphs of resolution 2239 (XXI).”

AGENDA ITEM 103

The strengthening of international security (continued) (A/7654, A/C.1/L.468)

30. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq): As the first speaker for today in this general debate on the item under discussion, as the representative of an Arab country, and also as Chairman of the Arab Group for this month, I should like on behalf of my delegation to join you, Mr. Chairman, and those speakers who have presented their condolences to the delegation, Government and people of Somalia on the tragic assassination of the President of Somalia. Our bonds as Arabs with the Somali people are very well known. We share with them the past and the future and, indeed, we shared with them the struggle for freedom and independence. I should like at this stage to request the representative of Somalia to convey the sentiments of all the Arab nations to his Government and people on this very sad occasion.

31. Now I have the very pleasant duty of congratulating you, Mr. Chairman, on your election to the chairmanship of this Committee. After what has been said by all the representatives who have preceded me, nothing much remains for me to say except that after a long friendship and a long association with you, I am sure that the expectations of this Committee about your firmness, fairness and the dispatch with which you will direct the proceedings of this Committee will prove justified.

32. May I also add my congratulations to the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur of the Committee?

33. By introducing this important and timely item for consideration by the General Assembly at its present twenty-fourth session [A/7654], the Soviet Union has made another significant contribution to the cause of international peace and security. A few years ago the delegation of the Soviet Union introduced and supported another issue vital to the life and happiness of mankind. Its efforts and those of other delegations, in particular African and Asian delegations, were crowned with success with the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)]. That Declaration was the driving force behind the United Nations and its initiatives in the field of decolonization.

34. The statement of the representative of the Soviet Union last Friday afternoon [1652nd meeting] was a lucid and comprehensive review of conditions in the world today. The picture which he gave, though not a bright one, was indeed an honest account of the situation of the security of the world, the dangers which confront it and the causes behind those dangers. Colonialism, neo-colonialism, the arms race, aggression, foreign occupation, foreign military bases, the use or the threat of force in international relations, *apartheid*, foreign economic domination—these are some of the dangers which are still present in our international society today.

35. Twenty-four years ago there were those who expressed the fervent hope that after two world holocausts and the millions and millions of dead and wounded, humanity would have had its second lesson in a generation and that man would endeavour to make this planet a safer place to live in. Those hopes proved to be mere illusions if only because some of the big Powers were really small and short-sighted in their understanding of history and appreciation of international security and justice. Their interests, or what they thought were their interests, were placed first and foremost—no matter what happened to the peace and security of the world.

36. As far as the Arab world is concerned, it was betrayed and all its hopes were smashed both after the First and after the Second World Wars. After the First World War there were the spheres of influence which divided our homelands, and the Second World War resulted in the imposition in our midst of a foreign entity with all its dire and dangerous consequences.

37. To an Arab representative, parts of whose homeland are under usurpation, occupation or foreign domination, this call for “strengthening of international security” does

not seem entirely understandable. We would have preferred the item to read "the ensuring of international security". As a matter of fact, I borrowed the word "ensuring" from the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union in which he introduced this item. I shall tell you why.

38. As far as we are concerned, there has been no security in our region for a long time and particularly since the introduction of this alien State of Israel and its imposition on us by force and intrigue as a spearhead for Western schemes and designs in the Arab world. What kind of security does the Palestinian refugee have when he is chased from his farm and his house and home and reduced to a body and soul held together by meagre international charity? How can he be made to believe that there is security in the world when as a result of the daily criminal and indiscriminate attacks of the Israeli air force, his very bare and miserable existence is never secure, even in the camps across the lines from his homeland.

39. How can a Jordanian or an Egyptian or a Syrian believe in the existence of international security or appreciate the need for its strengthening at a time when, after more than two years of occupation of parts of his homeland, the General Assembly, the Security Council and the international world community have done nothing to give him faith in international justice or appreciate international security while the aggressor has been consolidating his occupation through his actions and the inaction of the United Nations? Scores of new Israeli settlements and villages have been built and are being built every day in the occupied Arab territories while Arab houses and properties are being destroyed daily in Jerusalem and other areas to make place for Israeli settlers.

40. How can an Arab representative explain to his countrymen the apathy and indeed the ineffectiveness of the United Nations when they see for themselves how ineffective the United Nations has been in dealing with the Israeli aggression and well-known Zionist expansionist designs which claim the Arab land from the Nile to the Euphrates as the future Zionist State? Who is going to convince the Arab people or, for that matter, the peoples of the world that a new era of peace, security and justice is on the way when the President of a great Power and a permanent member of the Security Council, which has special responsibilities for world peace and security under the Charter, calls from the rostrum of the General Assembly of the United Nations at its twenty-fourth session for a change in the map of the Middle East? Why and what for? To put a premium on Israeli aggression and consolidate and encourage Zionist expansion.

41. What security is there in the world to be strengthened when frontier treaties are unilaterally abrogated and when gunboat policies have replaced good and neighbourly relations? What security is there in the world when espionage, subversion and double allegiance and dual nationality have become common occurrences in the Middle East and elsewhere? How are we going to convince the Rhodesians, the Angolans, the Namibians that the peace and security of the world should be strengthened when, by default, the present international security could mean the consolidation and the strengthening of the foreign hold on them and the perpetuation of discrimination against them?

42. What about aggression and what became of the efforts to define aggression? The Soviet representative referred to the urgent need to define it and define it urgently. We whole-heartedly support the Soviet initiative. However, we should like to remark that for some aggression is easier committed than defined. Look at Viet-Nam, look at Palestine, look at the colonies in Africa, in Asia and elsewhere. For years we argue here about what constitutes an act of aggression, while they either commit, encourage or consolidate aggression. In our region we have been the victims of many an aggressor, and the last has been the worst and the most brutal of them all. That is the Israeli aggressor. And as if to add insult to injury, the same aggressor enjoys the support and blessing of the Government of a permanent member of the Security Council, the Government of the United States, whose declared policy is to maintain the military superiority of the aggressor over the victims.

43. Our concern for international security and the anxiety of the peoples of the world over the ineffectiveness of the United Nations as an instrument for international peace and security should not distract our attention from a third important element and a component of international order, peace and legality. I mean justice. Without justice there can be no durable peace or security. It is regrettable to note that some delegations have been carried away by their fear of war to the extent that they have come to forget that there are justified and legal wars. These are the wars of liberation which have the support of all freedom-loving people.

44. Let us not forget that it was the concern for an unjust peace that led the League of Nations to disintegration when it closed its eyes to the grievances and appeals of the gallant and valiant Ethiopian people and their struggle against fascist aggression. It was international apathy and inaction that whetted the appetite of the aggressors and consequently plunged the world into the Second World War. Who was to blame? Surely not the Ethiopian people, the victims of aggression.

45. This same apathy and inaction are alas the order of the day now. It is not the fault of the Arabs in the Middle East, nor of the Viet-Nameese in Asia, nor of the Namibians and their struggling brothers in Africa if the United Nations is now experiencing some of the symptoms which the League of Nations experienced in its last days. It would not be the fault of these peoples who are struggling for their existence if the world were to reach the brink of another world war. Because of their capabilities and special responsibilities under the Charter, the major Powers owe it to themselves, to the world and to the United Nations to work for peace with justice—not peace at any price, not peace at the expense of others, otherwise they will bear the major share of responsibility in reducing the General Assembly to a debating society and the Security Council to an arena of verbal acrobatics, thus bringing about their own downfall.

46. This is not a case of *après moi le déluge*. But what does a Palestinian or a Viet-Nameese or an Angolan know about international security when he is not at peace at home? Why should he care about international security when his own existence is in danger of extinction? This is the case with the peoples of Viet-Nam, Angola, Namibia,

Mozambique. This is the case with the people of Palestine, whose very existence was so arrogantly and shamelessly denied by the Israeli Prime Minister, who told *The Sunday Times* of London a few weeks ago, and repeated recently in New York, that "it was not as though there was a Palestinian people and we came and threw them out and took their country from them. They did not exist".

47. As a representative of a small country, I do not wish to sound very pessimistic about the possibilities of peace, security and justice; but such is the dark picture of the world today. It is as though the small nations are looking for some security while the big nations are looking for more security. What an anachronism.

48. The representative of the Soviet Union emphasized the importance of regional security, which is vital and legal under the Charter. In the Middle East the Arab countries have been engaged for years now in mutual security arrangements through the Arab League and its subsidiaries. Their efforts and endeavours have met with all kinds of obstacles and road-blocks. Zionist, imperialist and monopolist interests fought hard to thwart the Arab efforts for security and unity. Their Trojan horse was then found and driven into our homeland twenty years ago. Since then, the Middle East has been in war and turmoil as a result of the imposition of Israel in our midst as an outpost of imperialism and a beachhead for invasions.

49. In the meantime, peace in the Middle East has been reduced to a consolidation of the cease-fire; and this is for the benefit of the aggressor and is his encouragement to consolidate his annexation of the occupied territories. Jerusalem is a case in point. We all know the fate of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council which demanded that Israel should rescind its measures annexing the Holy City. We all know the defiant, arrogant and negative Israeli response. Only three days ago the Israeli Deputy Prime Minister, Yigal Allon, was reported by *The New York Times* to have proposed what he called "home rule" for the occupied Arab territories, which is another step towards the annexation of those territories. We have here colonialism twentieth century style and its own brand of "home rule".

50. This brings me to the question of the occupied territories and their liberation. In this respect much has been made by the Israelis and their allies of the need and necessity for direct negotiation. I am not going to repeat here all the arguments and considerations against any negotiations between the aggressor and his victims. But let us for a moment find out what the Israelis mean by direct negotiations and what they want from them. Let us see how they are trying to fool the world by this call for direct negotiations, which to some seem both innocent and practical. I shall only quote Moshe Dayan, the Israeli Minister of Defence. On page 203 of his book *Diary of the Sinai Campaign*,¹ the then Chief of Staff of the Israeli armed forces wrote concerning the invasion of 1956: "Israel, however, did not achieve its 'war aims' by direct negotiation with Egypt. The Sinai Campaign did not end with victor and vanquished seated together at the negotiating table."

¹ Moshe Dayan, *Diary of the Sinai Campaign* (New York, Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966).

51. Indeed, these remain the Israeli war aims, and very much so after the June war: victor and vanquished seated at the negotiating, or rather, the surrendering, table.

52. And what if the Arabs refuse to negotiate or surrender? Mr. Dayan has the answer. He was quoted by *The Jewish Chronicle* of 3 October 1969 as saying that Israel was getting ready for a new war. Another Israeli high official was quoted by *The Observer* of London of 21 September 1969 as having said, "One more round and they—the Arabs—will be convinced". So we are waiting for one more round to be convinced.

53. We could not agree more with the representative of Brazil when he said in his statement three days ago that "never have power and violence enjoyed such a degree of respectability" [1653rd meeting, para. 5]. Mrs. Meir, a grandmother, was recently in the United States. She said on arrival that she had come with a shopping bag. She said on departure that her bag was more than full. It was not full of toys and clothes for her grandchildren, but with tanks, guns and aircraft to kill Arab children and destroy their homes.

54. In her press conferences and television interviews here in New York, and elsewhere in the United States, Mrs. Meir assured her American audience that the killing by these tanks and aircraft would not be done by the Americans; that it would be done by the Israelis, and that the Israelis have not and will not ask American soldiers to fight for them. We all know why she wanted to appear so emphatic on this point. We all know what happened in Viet-Nam and about the escalation of American involvement there, from moral support to financial support to military advisers and, finally, to the half million American soldiers in Viet-Nam. Will history repeat itself in such a short span in the Middle East? God forbid.

55. Only yesterday the *Washington Post* quoted a UPI dispatch from Tel Aviv—while we were discussing security here in this Committee—reporting that a United States Embassy spokesman had said that Americans could now become citizens of Israel and serve in the Israeli armed forces without losing their citizenship. He continued: "Of course, fighting against the United States would lose a man his citizenship. But that hardly applies here." Good for the United States of America. Whom are we to believe? Mrs. Meir or the American spokesman?

56. The speakers who preceded me discussed in detail the general theme of international security and ways and means to ensure or strengthen it. If we in our turn have spoken in detail of the dangerous and explosive situation in the Middle East it is because we feel and suffer the brunt of this situation, which cannot continue and indeed must not continue. If it does, the security of the world will be jeopardized. Even those who feel that they are far removed from the area and its dangers, and who thus can afford a detached and disinterested posture, will very soon wake up to see the fire all over the place and find the world engaged in a general and devastating war.

57. This is the most important consideration which prompted the delegation of the Soviet Union to take this most important and urgent initiative. My delegation has been studying very carefully document A/C.1/L.468, con-

taining the Soviet proposals which deserve our utmost attention. In the meantime we venture to submit for the consideration of the First Committee some ideas in connexion with this item and the proposed appeal.

58. First, when we speak of peace and security, emphasis should be placed both in the appeal and in the resolutions, on the importance of justice, without which international peace and security cannot be durable.

59. Secondly, the Security Council should be asked to consider ways and means to ensure the implementation of its resolutions and those of the General Assembly and to make recommendations thereon to the General Assembly at its next session.

60. Thirdly, now that the General Assembly by considering this item is in effect engaged in a general review of the world situation and the role of the United Nations, it would be a good idea if a study group representing the different continents were appointed to study the effectiveness of the United Nations and its organs in the field of international security, in its political, economic and social aspects.

61. Fourthly, in the light of the spirit of co-operation of the representative of the Soviet Union on the subject of the individual provisions of the draft appeal, my delegation ventures to suggest that the Committee might find it necessary to appoint a drafting committee to consider whatever amendments might be presented in the course of our deliberations. That will save time and energy and will also enable us to take into consideration all the different views and ideas.

62. Fifthly, mass information media have a great role to play and in the appeal the General Assembly should make sure that mass information media all over the world, and especially in certain countries, should have a special mission toward peace and security in the world. They should be called on to resist all sorts of pressures from all quarters: Zionist, imperialist or monopolist. They should try to disseminate the ideas and ideals of the United Nations and of peace and security in the world. They should at least try to cover what is going on in the United Nations. For example, I read the papers every morning and I see practically nothing about what is going on here in the United Nations, but the newspapers are full of all sorts of stories that are not important, that can never be considered important by anyone, especially when we consider international security and peace. One reason that was given for locating the United Nations here in the United States, in New York, was to ensure the most widespread dissemination possible of information about the United Nations. But look at what is happening here. Nothing, absolutely nothing, is being said about the United Nations in American newspapers, and especially in New York newspapers, though the lobbies and meeting rooms of the United Nations are full of correspondents from different newspapers from all over the United States and other parts of the world.

63. Finally, may I share the hope of the Soviet delegation that the consideration of this item on international security will have a favourable effect on the state of international relations. We hope that it will contribute to the cause of peace, security and justice in the world.

64. Mr. BEAULNE (Canada) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, I have already had the opportunity at the first meeting of this Committee to express to you my congratulations and good wishes, and today I am happy to reiterate them.

65. The Soviet delegation has placed before us a wide-ranging proposal. Every nation must share the ideal of strengthening international security. As Mr. Gromyko rightly pointed out in the general debate on 19 September last:

“Although it is absolutely necessary and will continue to be necessary, to put out fires, this of itself cannot suffice. It is more important to take effective measures to safeguard the world in general from fires, and to remove in good time the centres of potential conflicts and complications.” [1756th plenary meeting, para. 135.]

66. Furthermore, consideration of these matters is timely. Every country is aware that the processes of political, economic and social change in the world are becoming evermore rapid. No country is exempt from their impact, none can seriously seek to arrest the movement, and all must help to ensure that they follow constructive and creative channels. In such a body as ours it is superfluous to point to the dangers inherent in adjustment to change that might be too slow or misconceived. Our common objective must therefore be to ensure that the stable world order we want is indeed stable, not because it is rigid or monolithic and resists change, but because it is resilient and capable of organic evolution.

67. In principle, therefore, the Canadian delegation agrees that the question raised by the Soviet Union is of fundamental importance. We particularly welcome the fact that the draft resolution [A/C.1/L.1468] of the representative of the Soviet Union was submitted by Mr. Malik [1652nd meeting] in a spirit devoid of polemics. We thus think it appropriate that this Committee should examine the draft in the light of the general observations I have made and in the hope that our discussions can benefit all of us.

68. In examining the draft document before us, I must confess to some disquiet about the terms in which it is expressed, about the principle underlying this approach to the broad question of international security, and about the general effectiveness of this way of achieving its professed aims.

69. Let me explain the points in the order mentioned. First, some of the terms employed seem somewhat at odds with the spirit in which the draft was presented to us. In the task of strengthening international security for the future, we must turn to the future and not to the past. The Second World War and the hard-won victory, in which Canada played an important part, were momentous events in history but they are becoming less and less relevant to the questions of peace and security in the years to come. Yet we find in the preamble and in section I of the draft appeal—as well as in the statement of the representative of the USSR in introducing the item—repeated references to the Second World War and to “victory over the fascist aggressors”.

70. I submit that there have been many events in the past quarter of a century which have much greater relevance to our task. We wish to avoid any kind of recrimination. We are concerned with contemporary problems and problems of the future. Let us therefore avoid language which—no doubt by inadvertence—suggests a backward-looking attitude and at the same time leaves a rather invidious impression inconsistent with our common aim.

71. As for the results of the Second World War some, such as the extirpation of nazism and fascism, are lasting and unchangeable. To dignify minor and aberrant recurrences here and there in the world as a major problem is to allow ourselves to be distracted from more serious tasks. The poverty, hunger and suffering we must contend with now and in future have other causes and other remedies. There is nothing to be gained by dwelling on the past. The world is a very different place from what it was in 1945 and is becoming more different every day. As the representative of Brazil, Mr. Araujo Castro, said at the 1653rd meeting, let us not create the impression that we have become fixed in a period in history that is receding into the past.

72. I am also uneasy about the expression “peace-loving forces” used in the opening of section I. This seems to imply that there are nations inside or outside this Organization which are not peace-loving. We cannot accept this implication. We know of no nation which would want to bring about a new world war. The United Nations can rightly take credit for having prevented the world from being engulfed in a war which would destroy all of us. Let us leave it at that.

73. These examples are perhaps enough to make my point clear. I should, however, like to make some general remarks about some of the concepts which the draft appeal contains, and some which it does not.

74. In the first place, my delegation has reservations of principle about the propriety of wanting to interpret the Charter in a document of this kind. This a matter of some concern to us in considering the whole proposal. To be specific, we see, for example, at the end of section II a declaration that the actions of States which do not observe the requirements laid down in paragraph I of that section “constitute a gross violation of the Charter”. Canada could not subscribe to a draft declaring in advance that a whole range of undefined acts or omissions are necessarily and automatically in all circumstances violations of the Charter. The representative of the Soviet Union himself, in his statement to this Committee on 10 October [1652nd meeting], rightly remarked that the strength and durability of the Charter lay in our ability to prevent it from becoming a rigid and dogmatic code. We were disturbed however, at his further characterization of the Charter as a “regulator of relations between States with different social systems”. In our view, the Charter also regulates relations between States having the same social system. It does not rest upon the concept of political blocs. We should thus be ill-advised to attach to it essentially abstract interpretations which, by their nature, could only make it more rigid. The full and searching discussions which have been going on in the Special Committee on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States have shown the well-balanced way in which the

interpretation of the principles of the Charter should be approached. I am glad that the Soviet draft appeal endorses that approach in section VI. In the interests of the United Nations itself we should refrain from demanding the uniform application of special interpretations of the Charter.

75. In the same way, at the end of section V of the Soviet draft appeal we find a formulation which, unexceptionable in itself, might well have an unduly limitative effect: the functions of the Security Council in the sphere of international peace and security are clearly stated in the Charter. Canada has long maintained that measures to increase the Council's effectiveness were necessary. A former Prime Minister of Canada dealt with this subject in his statement in the general debate as long ago as the eighteenth session in 1963.² The Charter itself, however, does not exclude other United Nations organs from playing a useful part, and if we were to ignore them we should be ignoring resources of the Organization which, in the interest of international peace and security, we cannot afford to do without.

76. As the draft appeal shows, there is another general aspect of the Soviet approach to international security which must give us cause for reflection. This can be seen most clearly in sections III and IV. In section III the principles of peaceful coexistence of States irrespective of their social system, are stressed and in section IV the utility of regional collective security arrangements embracing all States of various regions. As a medium power, Canada must necessarily approach these ideas with caution. Certainly nobody would quarrel with the principles of the sovereignty, equality and territorial inviolability of States or of non-intervention and self-determination, principles which have been laid down in Asia in the *Pancha Sila* and which are expressed in Latin America by the term *convivencia*.

77. Nor could any conscientious Member of the United Nations fail to subscribe to the view that regional security systems should not be directed against, or exclude, any State in the region. However, we cannot ignore—nor, I am sure, would the Soviet delegation expect us to ignore—the numerous interpretations and special explanations of the concept of peaceful coexistence which Soviet statesmen have worked out in the past. These, if I may so put it, are the interpretations of a super-Power and as such naturally reflect the reactions of a super-Power. The super-Powers, precisely because of their enormous prestige and far-reaching involvement in world affairs, just do not see international relations in the same way as smaller States.

78. For our part, we are, frankly, a little apprehensive. We reject the concepts of spheres of interest, of limitations of the rights of States in the name of some higher cause or other, or of closed political systems. The world has seen far too many of them, and the lesser Powers cannot accept them. If such concepts are perpetuated, they can produce only a rigid and inflexible world order that would stifle the evolutionary process. I have already stressed the speed of that process and how its power might become explosive.

79. Furthermore, I would remind the Committee of the considerations trenchantly advanced by the representative

² Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1208th meeting, paras. 72 to 74.

of Ceylon in his statement to the General Assembly in the general debate on 8 October 1959 [1783rd plenary meeting].

80. This does not mean that Canada is opposed to all regional arrangements for collective security or other purposes. However, as the representative of Sweden pointed out yesterday [1654th meeting], they must be consistent with the principles of the Charter. In fact, experience has shown the great usefulness of such arrangements in several parts of the world. In the long run, the problems of divided Europe will be solved only by some such means. What makes us apprehensive here, as in other cases, is the notion of a blank endorsement of imperfectly defined ideas. All members of the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, for example, are working to define and determine such principles as sovereignty, equality of rights and the territorial integrity of States, non-interference by whatever means in the internal affairs of a State, and absolute respect for the rights of all peoples freely to choose their own social systems and, we would add, also to change them. In our view, to attach the ambiguous qualification of "peaceful co-existence" to those principles would not help to advance that work.

81. I have said enough to show our reticence in this matter, not as regards the aims of the Soviet proposal, but as regards the means by which it is proposed we should achieve them. We have taken the representative of the Soviet Union at his word and offered our views in an open and constructive spirit. We have doubts about the way in which certain concepts in the draft are expressed. We have doubts even about some of the concepts themselves and doubts too about why some less important ideas are included at the expense of others in the draft—those of development and disarmament for example—which are more important for future international security. But above all, we have doubts about the total impact of the approach proposed. We want to strengthen international security. Will an appeal such as this in fact do so? Is there not a risk that we may be obscuring dangers that should be exposed if they are to be avoided? Might it, like the Kellogg-Briand Pact³ between the two wars, create a false sense of security and thus in effect impair our ability to foresee and avert threats of international peace in time?

82. I do not assert that it will be so. I only raise the question so that we may be sure of precisely what we are doing. This Committee is most grateful to the Soviet Union for including this item on the agenda. Because of its importance the Committee should give it the closest and most serious examination.

83. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): Before making a statement on the agenda item under discussion, I wish to say that it was with regret and sorrow that we learned of the tragic death of President Abdirashid Ali Shermarke of Somalia. The great loss suffered by the people of Somalia is shared by all peoples throughout the world who cherish the freedom of nations and the freedom and liberty of man. On behalf of my delegation and my Government and on behalf

of the people of Yugoslavia I wish to extend deep sympathy and condolences to the delegation of Somalia and, through it, to the Government and people of Somalia.

84. We consider that the initiative of the Soviet delegation, proposing the inclusion of the problem of international security in the agenda of the General Assembly, makes it possible to examine more thoroughly some of the most important questions relating to the present state of international relations and, above all, the questions of security and the safeguarding of peace, and at the same time, allows a larger number of countries to take part in solving those questions. We have listened with great attention and interest to the statements, made by the delegations that have thus far taken part in the debate which embody a number of interesting ideas and viewpoints.

85. My country has always paid the greatest attention to the problems of international security, as a basic precondition for the complete independence of all countries and their existence as free and equal partners in international relations. Throughout their history the Yugoslav peoples have fought for their independence and freedom, and during the Second World War, in particular, they made their well-known contribution to the struggle against aggression and for the achievement of peace in the world. Proceeding from our own experience gained in the struggle for national freedom and independence and for its full preservation, as well as from the experiences of other peoples, my Government has constantly believed that, in the current constellation of international relations in particular, countries and peoples of the world can be secure and feel safe only if they enjoy the right to decide freely, without outside interference, their internal development and their foreign political orientation and actions on the basis of full respect for, and application of the principles of, the equality of all countries.

86. The problem of international security has been at the centre of attention for a long period of time, especially during the last few years. The Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Cairo in 1964, as well as the Declaration "Programme for Peace and International Co-operation" adopted on that occasion, reflected the great interest and concern of those countries for the strengthening of international peace and security; they also drew attention to the causes of instability and to the ways to eliminate them.

87. That was also confirmed in the communiqué of the Consultative Meeting of the representatives of fifty-one non-aligned countries held in Belgrade in July last,⁴ in which the principles of the earlier conferences of non-aligned countries were reaffirmed.

88. Last year's and this year's general debates have shown without any doubt that the large majority of Member States of the United Nations is convinced that the independence of peoples and States and their full security constitute the most urgent problems of our time, owing primarily to the great number of violations of the principles

³ General Treaty for Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy, signed at Paris, 27 August 1928 (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2137).

⁴ Consultative Meeting of Special Government Representatives of Non-Aligned Countries held in Belgrade, 8 to 12 July 1969.

of the Charter as a result of the use or threat of force in various parts of the world, the threatening or jeopardizing of the independence and sovereignty of countries for the purpose of imposing foreign domination and hegemony or preserving the system of colonial domination over a number of peoples.

89. In this connexion the communiqué of the Consultative Meeting of Special Government Representatives of Non-Aligned Countries pointed out the following: "The participants in the Consultative Meeting observed that present trends in the world are characterized by the confrontation between peoples struggling for their political, economic, social and cultural independence, on the one hand, and forces of imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and all other forms of foreign domination, on the other, which are with increasing frequency resorting to power politics and pressure, including armed intervention, subversive activities and interference in the internal affairs of others, thereby violating and menacing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of many independent States."

90. The Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States, held in Geneva last year, devoted great attention to the problems of security and adopted a number of recommendations of importance for the solving of the problem of security. The Declaration of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States,⁵ which was endorsed by the General Assembly of the United Nations by a large majority [*see resolution 2456 (XXIII)*], also pointed to the ways and means conducive to the solving of the acute problems of international security.

91. The achievement of genuine security in the world obviously constitutes a complex and long-term problem, the solution of which makes it incumbent on us to exert persistent and systematic efforts with a view to dealing effectively with the numerous aspects of this problem. In that light my delegation has carefully studied the initiative of the USSR proposing the inclusion of the item "The strengthening of international security" in the agenda of this session, which could encourage common efforts directed towards strengthening collective security in the world.

92. May I now set forth the position and views of the Yugoslav delegation with regard to this item. The basic objectives of the United Nations are the safeguarding of peace and the creation of such a system of international security as will promote equitable co-operation among free and independent countries and peoples. The Charter of the United Nations provides for a system of collective security that has never been able to function owing to the post-war development of international relations, nor has a substantive common effort been made to translate the idea of such a system into generally accepted measures for maintaining security in the world. Owing to the absence of such a system, countries have been obliged to depend solely on their own ability and forces for the defence of their freedom and independence, when developments have compelled them to do so. The readiness of countries to resist, by all available means, attacks on their independence is

undoubtedly an essential and indispensable factor in the struggle against aggression and the threat of use of force.

93. The non-existence of effective collective security based on full respect for the principles of the Charter reflects at the same time the prevailing state of instability in the world and the acute crisis of international relations, as manifested by the existing hotbeds of conflict and local wars. It is understandable, therefore, that the problem of establishing lasting general and genuine security is gaining in urgency, particularly from the point of view of newly liberated countries and developing countries in general, which are subjected to various pressures.

94. On the other hand, as far as the great Powers are concerned, security has been based in fact on the so-called balance of terror or balance of the nuclear deterrent. This has not provided genuine security in the least to other countries which have also been offered the alternative of alignment with military blocs. Practice had shown that bloc policies, far from eliminating conflicts and instability, have only further aggravated international relations and created a state of general insecurity, involving even countries belonging to military alliances.

95. The problem of security has been further complicated and is posed differently in the nuclear era. In addition to the division into big Powers and other countries, into blocs and countries outside blocs—all of which has had a direct impact on the problem of security—we are also confronted today with the fact that the problem of security facing the nuclear Powers is not of the same nature as the one facing the non-nuclear countries.

96. In that connexion I should like to quote the statement made by the Yugoslav representative in the general debate on disarmament in the First Committee last year:

"The nuclear States—or, to be more precise, the two nuclear super-Powers—see this problem above all from the point of view of their respective and comparative nuclear potential. Thus, they seek a certain degree of common security in the balance between them and they both appear at present to be favouring an initiative designed to preserve the balance in their respective arsenals which they have achieved at the present time. For the non-nuclear States, the problem of security is totally different. . . . Their main point dealt with their own experience or that of other similar countries over recent years, an experience arising from the fact that violence was for the most part employed by nuclear countries or by their protégés acting in the shelter of the nuclear arsenals of their protectors." [*1607th meeting, paras. 27 and 28.*]

97. My country has been constantly dedicated to the establishment of an adequate, generally accepted system of collective security, based on the fundamental principles and objectives of the United Nations Charter, as an essential component of international security in the wider sense, through which the international community could effectively prevent every violation of the sovereign rights of countries and every threat to their independence. Of course, regional aspects of security are also of interest in this context, but only if they are based on the Charter and reflect the interests of all the States of a given region.

⁵ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Annexes, agenda item 96, document A/7277 and Corr.1 and 2, p. 17.*

98. An essential prerequisite to the creation of any system of security is universal respect for and application of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and primarily of the principles relating to the independence of all countries and peoples, the sovereignty of all States and their territorial integrity, non-interference in internal affairs of other countries, the right of peoples to self-determination, respect for the principles of peaceful solution of disputes and, in particular, the prohibition of all forms of the threat or use of force and pressure in international relations. Those are, at the same time, the principles of peaceful coexistence among States and peoples and it is upon these principles that friendly relations and co-operation among all States and peoples should be founded. It is precisely the violation of these principles that has often resulted in actions threatening the independence of many small and medium-sized States, in interference in their internal affairs in armed intervention and wars against independent countries, regardless of whether such actions were motivated by strategic, socio-economic or some other interests, including attempts at dividing the world into so-called spheres of interest or influence.

99. There can be no effective collective security nor individual security for any country if we do not ensure the application of these principles in relations among all countries, irrespective of whether the socio-economic systems are different, similar or the same, irrespective of the size of the countries, their economic or military strength, and regardless of whether they are members of specific groupings or organizations or are outside them. No country and no nation can be excepted—under any conditions or for any aims or motives whatsoever—from respecting and applying these basic principles. My delegation would wish to see this spelt out in clear, explicit and unequivocal terms in every document that we may adopt.

100. Considerable efforts are now being exerted, especially on the part of the non-aligned countries, to elaborate these basic principles—principles which actually constitute the foundation of the policy of non-alignment—and to incorporate them in a declaration of principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States. The United Nations Special Committee⁶ which has been working on the formulation of these principles for some time has already made significant progress in this direction. My Government is interested in having such a declaration adopted as early as the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, as this would represent a concrete contribution towards the creation of conditions for the strengthening of peace and security in the world. The finding, by common agreement, of an adequate definition for aggression could likewise facilitate the struggle against aggression and strengthen the possibilities for collective security. My country, together with non-aligned and other countries, is also actively participating in the solving of this issue. For that reason my delegation maintains a constructive attitude towards all proposals aimed at realizing these significant objectives.

101. One is appalled by the frequency and extent to which the policy of force is used for the solving of disputes

in contemporary international relations. We are confident that there can be no effective security as long as peoples remain under the colonial yoke and as long as full-scale wars against peoples aspiring to freedom and full national emancipation are conducted before the eyes of the international community. The policies of colonial and racist régimes are transforming the southern part of Africa into a source of instability in the world and this threatens the security of the neighbouring independent African States.

102. Yugoslavia has always fully supported and assisted the struggle of colonial peoples for freedom and against colonial domination, racial and other forms of discrimination. It is high time now, in the interests of peace and security, to take appropriate measures and concrete actions for completing the process of decolonization, which has reached an impasse, and for finally breaking the resistance of the colonial Powers to this process. It is essential not only to ensure the full implementation of the Declaration on decolonization⁷ and the pertinent resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly, but also, if these are found to be insufficient, to take other more effective steps.

103. On this occasion, I should like to reiterate once again the well-known position of my country regarding the need for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from all the territories of other countries. This, in turn, would contribute towards safeguarding peace and security and promoting confidence among nations. We are also strongly opposed to the occupation of foreign territories and to all attempts at making territorial gains or acquiring privileges, or at imposing arbitrary solutions or decisions in the spirit of the well-known practice of *fait accompli*, through the threat or use of force, military intervention or occupation.

104. The efforts of the super-Powers to avoid a thermonuclear war—with all due credit to the positive aspects of such an orientation—have failed to alleviate the feelings of danger, insecurity and concern for survival among a large number of small and medium-sized countries.

105. It is not possible to strengthen international security in the absence of effective disarmament. To the same extent that peace and security are interdependent and inseparable, peace, security and disarmament are mutually interrelated and organically conditioned in every part of the world. As a matter of fact, the absence of any genuine progress in the field of disarmament explains the non-existence of real security in the present-day world.

106. If we were merely to note that the arms race is continuing at an increasing pace and that it is consuming vast material and financial resources, we would not be saying anything new. We, however, must recognize the fact that no genuine progress has been realized in the field of disarmament. Therefore, the dissatisfaction and anxiety of the largest number of countries vitally interested in having the process of disarmament initiated is fully justified, since the arms race serves as a basis for the pursuit of the policy of force.

⁶ Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States.

⁷ Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (resolution 1514 (XV)).

107. For these reasons my delegation feels that the additional efforts exerted by the United Nations for the taking of concrete measures aimed at strengthening international security should open up clear perspectives for the initiation of a process of genuine disarmament. A true strengthening of security calls for an urgent initiation of the process of nuclear disarmament and, in this context, a clear reaffirmation of the commitments of nuclear Powers to halt the arms race and to start with nuclear disarmament, as provided in article 6 of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [see resolution 2373 (XXII)]. I must add that it is difficult to feel secure in the conditions of an intensified arms race, when the nuclear Powers refuse to renounce the use of nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear States.

108. The problem of security in the world cannot be resolved exclusively along the lines of military-strategic relations and military-material factors. Security is directly and essentially bound to the complex of economic and social development as well as to universal respect for human rights. The problems of development in the world are actually at the root of the grave crisis of present-day international relations. The bigger the gap between the developed and developing countries, the graver this crisis becomes. The widening of the gap continues to maintain and create new conditions for relationships of domination and dependence, for interference and intervention in internal affairs, for every form of pressure and use of force—practices because of which the problems of security have become so pressing.

109. Consequently, there is no need to explain at great length the close connexion between development problems and the bridging of the gap between the developed and the developing countries, on the one hand, and the safeguarding of world peace and strengthening of collective security, on the other. In supporting the general trend evidenced in this year's debate to integrate the Second United Nations Development Decade with the Disarmament Decade, we should reach an over-all agreement and express our common determination to ensure the success of the Second United Nations Development Decade which will greatly influence the consolidation of peace and strengthening of genuine security in the world.

110. Recognizing the role entrusted by the Charter to the Security Council in the area of promoting peace and security in the world, we wish to emphasize, at the same time, the need for democratizing the world Organization and the indispensability of improving the efficiency of the General Assembly, which, being the representative of the entire membership of the United Nations, has also a great responsibility in this area. All countries enjoy a natural and unquestionable right to participate in decision-making and the solving of all questions of vital importance for their independence, freedom and existence in general. The right to decide on such matters on behalf of all other States cannot be granted to anyone, nor can anyone—under any pretext whatsoever—pretend to exercise such a right.

111. Recognizing that our common goal is to strengthen collective security in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and by strengthening the role of the world Organization, we wish to point out that the question of

universality of the United Nations is of vital importance for its role and contribution towards that end. It has been widely accepted and confirmed by the present debate in the General Assembly, that major international issues cannot be resolved successfully on a lasting basis when a considerable part of mankind is excluded from the United Nations. In saying this, primarily we have in the absence from the United Nations of the People's Republic of China and of other States which are significant factors in the present-day world. The realization of the principle of universality also implies the enabling of the remaining colonial peoples to achieve their freedom and independence and to assume the place in the United Nations and in the international community which rightly belongs to them.

112. Having outlined our positions of principle with regard to the complex problem of security without considering in detail the specific aspects of the proposal submitted by the Soviet delegation and the ideas expressed by other delegations, we reserve the right to present our concrete views and possible proposals at a later stage in our debate.

113. The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker on my list has indicated that he would prefer to speak in the afternoon, in view of the length of his statement. Therefore, I shall now call upon the representative of Israel who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

114. Mr. LOURIE (Israel): The Soviet representative, in introducing this agenda item last Friday in a carefully considered statement, made it clear that the object of the item was to raise matters of basic principle and international organization. He urged Member States to study the Soviet proposal

“bearing in mind that it is not directed against any State but is intended rather to strengthen the security of all countries and peoples of the world” [1652nd meeting, para. 67].

115. Mr. Malik's carefully measured remarks were followed by statements by other delegations which were likewise directed to an earnest quest for international peace and security. The representative of Iraq this morning, however, has deemed it proper to ignore the spirit of this debate and has used the item as a platform to embark on precisely the kind of virulent and polemical attack against another Member State which, in view of the overriding importance for all countries of the need to strengthen measures for international security, it has been the hope of the sponsors of this item to avoid.

116. If, instead of a discussion on basic issues of principle and organization, this debate is directed to the specific issue of the Middle East, the representative of Israel will have no alternative but to respond. We shall in that case be obliged to correct the gross distortions of fact and history of which the representative of Iraq has already given us a foretaste, and to counter falsehood by truth. We shall in that case be obliged to recall to this Committee the history of Arab belligerency, blockade and aggression against Israel over the past two decades by States which to this day regard themselves as in a state of war with it, the avowed aim of which is to eradicate Israel and which obstinately refuse, as

enjoined by the Charter, to enter into negotiations with it for the settlement of outstanding problems.

117. In this connexion my delegation would also have something to say about the character of the régime which the Iraqi represents—the barbarous treatment of its minorities, ranging from mass hangings in public to its genocidal operations in Kurdistan, of which horrifying details were recently revealed in the Press. The Iraqi Government has a long way to go before qualifying as an arbiter, not only in questions of international security but as an adherent to basic norms of humanitarian behaviour. However, I do not propose, unless the course of the debate so compels, to embark any further at this stage on the issues raised by the Iraqi representative and I accordingly reserve the right to amplify these remarks should occasion arise.

118. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq): Being a nation suffering from aggression and not having any security at all, when we agreed to the discussion of this item in this Committee we did not do so purely and simply to talk about principles. We have come here to use this platform to talk about cases. Of course, principles are important. Principles are enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, which is 24 years old, but the reason the Soviet representative brought this item to this Committee was not because the United Nations is lacking in principles. All of us can read the Charter of the United Nations. The Soviet representative introduced the item because of the situation of the security of the world—because there is Viet-Nam, because there is Israeli aggression against the Arab world, because there is colonialism, and I do not think it is for the Israeli representative to explain the statement of the Soviet representative and to say that the Soviet Union did not want to make that statement as an attack against anyone. Indeed, the Soviet Union did attack colonialism, did attack aggression, did attack the Zionist and Jewish occupation of Palestine. One only has to read that statement to see what he was talking about. Of course, names were not mentioned, but all of us who considered that statement, and indeed some other statements, know that in the minds of those delegations these specific and special cases are important.

119. What are we going to do here? Just speak about the principles of coexistence and international security when we know that there are millions of people who are suffering? As an Arab representative, as an Afro-Asian representative, I know that there are people who are not suffering from aggression. They can talk about general principles, but what do you want? Someone who is suffering from aggression and foreign domination to have the luxury of making speeches and talking about general principles? This, of course, would be to the benefit of the aggressors—the Israeli aggressors and other aggressors.

120. The Israeli representative said that I had distorted facts, but what did I say? I quoted Moshe Dayan from his book, and I quoted what Mrs. Meir said when she came to New York. I quoted the *Jewish Chronicle* also, and if I did not quote correctly I hope the Israeli representative will come to the next meeting and tell me where I misquoted. I quoted Mrs. Meir who said on her arrival that she had come to New York with a shopping bag. As she was a

grandmother everyone thought she was going to shop for her grandchildren, and to buy toys and clothes. She went back and said that the bag was full through the good will of America. But what was that bag full of? It was full of tanks, guns, and airplanes with which to attack our children in the Arab world. After that statement, Mr. Chairman, and after the distortions which we see on American television, can we come here and talk about principles? Never, and this is not the last that this Committee will hear from us, Iraqis and Arabs, if only because we are suffering, if only because our rights are being crushed, if only because there are some people who feel they can be detached and are not interested.

121. The representative of Israel mentioned the treatment of minorities. I know why he did that. He did it because I mentioned the question of dual allegiance and double nationality. The Israeli Government has been trying very hard to use religion for its subversive and expansionist activities in our homeland in Iraq. Of course, we all know the fate of spies. Spies were hanged here in America, and they were a certain religion too. Spies have been hanged all over the world. What does he want us to do—just leave spies alone because they happen to be of a certain religion?

122. On this question of dual nationality I quoted the spokesman of the United States embassy in Tel-Aviv when he said that Americans can go to Israel and serve in the Israeli armed forces without losing their nationality. What does this mean? Americans can have two nationalities, Israeli nationality and American nationality. This was quoted by the *Washington Post* of yesterday. Is this a distortion of fact? Whom are you going to believe, the Israeli representative here, Mrs. Meir or the United States spokesman? Mrs. Meir we shall never believe. For once maybe we can believe the United States spokesman.

123. Now on this dual nationality and its use in different parts of the world, let me in concluding quote what the same General Moshe Dayan said—and this again is taken from the *Jewish Chronicle*, not from an Arab paper: “The entire land of Israel from the River Jordan to the sea is the Jewish homeland. There is room in it for the Arab population to live together with the Jews. But we Israelis and you Jews abroad”—he was addressing a Jewish meeting—“must have the faith and the confidence that this is our land”—it is the land of the Israelis and the Jews abroad—“and I include Nablus, Jericho and Hebron”. That was how the Defence Minister, Moshe Dayan, concluded a most frank security briefing to the Economic Conference Trade Committee meeting in Jerusalem. I have been quoting from the *Jewish Chronicle*, 4 July 1969. Do I have to say anything else? I do not think so.

124. The CHAIRMAN: I should like to say that given the nature of the item I do not consider that any ruling is called for in regard to the raising of specific situations. Representatives enjoy wide latitude and freedom of expression and what they should say or not say is best left to their judgement and good sense. I appeal to all of them to exercise restraint.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.