

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



1972nd  
PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 21 October 1971,  
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 93:	
Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	1
Statements concerning the incident that occurred at the Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Wednesday, 20 October 1971 . . . . .	5
Statements concerning an incident that occurred in the General Assembly hall . . . . .	13

*President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).*

AGENDA ITEM 93

Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations (*continued*)

1. Mr. CORADIN (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, 1971 will be an historic year in the annals of the United Nations if it succeeds in unravelling the skein of a difficulty that has virtually taken up the greater part of its existence, the question of the representation of China, a very difficult and complex matter indeed, the solution of which depends upon the resolutions that are adopted by this Assembly, in which many representatives are putting forward the views of their respective Governments.

2. In the past year important changes have occurred in the international situation which make it possible to anticipate that an agreement will be reached among the great Powers on existing disputes and that an equitable solution will be found to the problem of China.

3. The beginning of a *détente* in relations between the United States of America and the People's Republic of China certainly will make for more flexible positions and is an important factor in the settlement of the conflict that today divides the United Nations into two groups. That is why the members of this Assembly who for 25 years have unceasingly worked to build lasting foundations for peace and security, will certainly not leave this hall without finding a just, lucid and impartial solution to the problem of the representation of China. That is the ardent wish of the Haitian delegation at a time when the search for peace is so important to man.

4. On 5 October 1971, in the general debate, Mr. Raymond, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Haiti, defined the position adopted by the Government of our country on the question of the representation of two Chinas in the United Nations in the following terms:

"... the Government of the Republic of Haiti, while accepting the principle of the representation of the

People's Republic of China, is resolutely opposed to any draft resolution which would expel the Republic of China.

"It is true that, in view of the universal nature of the United Nations, it would be desirable to open our doors to the People's Republic of China with the assurance that the latter would profess respect for the principles in the name of which we are met here in this Assembly." [1953rd meeting, paras. 13 and 14.]

5. That statement represents the essential elements of the two draft resolutions contained in documents A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2, sponsored by 19 and 22 countries respectively, of which my country is one. Those drafts, drawn up within the context of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2, sponsored by Albania and other countries, will certainly help us to take a realistic, just and equitable decision on the difficult question of the representation of China.

[The speaker read out draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2.]

6. The comments which I have to make on this draft will deal more specifically with the practical aspect of the conflict and take account of the objective elements of the problem so that the solution may be free from political prejudice or ideological considerations.

7. As this Organization confronts problems relating to the maintenance of international peace and security, nuclear disarmament and the economic development of the third world, the need becomes ever more urgent to find a settlement enabling a country controlling about one quarter of the world's population to accept the principles of the Charter and to be represented in the United Nations.

8. Today the evolution of political relations between the great Powers and their obvious efforts to find peaceful settlements for the conflicts troubling the world make desirable any attempt to enable the United Nations to adopt positions more in harmony with its vocation as a universal Organization, a vocation in consonance with which it must admit any Government having effective control over a territory no matter what its historical formation or its ideological obedience.

9. Therefore the Government of the Republic of Haiti sees no obstacle to the People's Republic of China occupying a seat in the United Nations. We think that as a nuclear Power the People's Republic of China should be seated in the Security Council as a permanent member in order to enable that body, which has among its members the five

great Powers, to assume fully its responsibilities. The balance of the world would only be strengthened by this.

10. But that balance would not be strengthened if the presence of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations led to the expulsion of the Republic of China. Neither would the balance of the world be strengthened if this Assembly were to adopt a resolution compelling the Republic of China to abandon a seat occupied by it since 1945, since the very founding of this Organization.

11. In the name of what morality can one deny to 14 million persons, who are part of an integrated whole, the right to be represented here at this gathering of nations? We claim to be universal; how could we justify tomorrow an act condemned by our own morality and our own principles? Is there anyone here who would like to see in an already troubled East a new hot-bed of civil war? How could we then ensure lasting peace to the world if the cold-war were to be established in these precincts, where harmony and friendship prevail? This "universal" Organization would be unable to justify an attitude contrary to the Charter. Is there anyone in this Assembly, any representative of a small country, who does not feel the danger of such a threat?

12. If the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations has been prevented over the years it has been precisely because the majority of the Members understood that, morally speaking, admission could not in any way lead to the expulsion of any Member, especially a Member which has not been guilty of any flagrant violation of the Charter.

13. Today the situation has changed. It is appropriate to envisage the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, but it is unthinkable that the price for this should be the exclusion of the Republic of China—a territory and a people represented in this Organization since 1945. It ratified the Charter of the United Nations as a founding Member. The Government of this Republic controls a vast territory, a large population. This is a state of fact which has existed for more than 25 years and which has enabled more than half the States Members of this Assembly to have diplomatic and trade relations with it.

14. Is it necessary to insist on the international reality represented by the Republic of China? The figures for its foreign trade and *per capita* income—described in a very significant manner by previous speakers—prove that it is not a provisional entity. These are statistics—these are facts on which the existence of this developing country are based—and if the needs of the moment lead the most faithful friends of the People's Republic of China to contend that it must be represented here, it is important to take into account the economic, social and cultural factors that give to the Republic of China its true aspect as a State and a people.

15. For all those reasons Haiti has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, which affirms the right of the People's Republic of China to be represented and recommends that that State should be seated as one of the permanent members of the Security Council since it must play an important role in the

maintenance of international peace and security. The same draft resolution confirms that the Republic of China is an active Member of the Organization.

16. Therefore we oppose the draft resolution submitted by Albania, whose radical and intransigent nature is not in keeping with the spirit of this Assembly. The Government of the Republic of Haiti considers that no draft resolution should deliberately refuse to take account of a factual situation and that it would be arbitrary to envisage the easy expulsion of a country, as if that were a question which could be settled by a mere majority.

17. That is the reason why we are a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2, which provides that "any proposal in the General Assembly which would result in depriving the Republic of China of representation in the United Nations is an important question under Article 18 of the Charter".

18. Several representatives have already spoken from this rostrum. Many of them supported the two draft resolutions co-sponsored by Haiti. They described all the aspects of the problem. All of them, with different emphasis but with the same eloquence and faith in the wisdom of this Assembly, spoke of law, of justice and of morality. Their brilliant statements could have made it unnecessary for me to speak on this problem of China if I had not wished to reaffirm the position of my Government on the most complex and difficult of the problems which have confronted the conscience of the world for the past 10 years.

19. The representative of the sister Republic of Liberia, in a luminous and pathetic statement to the Assembly yesterday [1970th meeting], appealed to the conscience, national and international, of the small countries that in the name of some political friendship or ideological solidarity with the great Powers would like to support draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 which asks for the expulsion of the Republic of China from this Organization, of which it is a respected founding Member.

20. The eloquent words of the head of the delegation of Liberia remind me of the prophetic words spoken at the League of Nations, the predecessor of the United Nations, by the representative of the Republic of Haiti. This was on the occasion of the invasion of Ethiopia by the Fascist hordes of Mussolini. This brutal act, this premeditated action was brought before the League of Nations. As there was some hesitation at taking energetic measures against Fascist imperialism, the representative of Haiti came to the rostrum and said the following: "Pray God, gentlemen, that you not become tomorrow the Ethiopia of some other Power." Unfortunately, since he was the representative of a small country, his weak voice was not listened to. You know what happened thereafter.

21. Mr. ROMULO (Philippines): In the next few days, possibly the first part of next week, we will take a decision of the greatest historical significance for the future of our world Organization and for its effectiveness in the realization of its primary objective, the maintenance of international peace and security. We have already made it clear that the Government of the Philippines is now convinced that the participation of the People's Republic of China in

the affairs of the United Nations will contribute fundamentally to ensuring the peace and well-being of the world. There is great potential for new and constructive programmes and actions to be initiated through our world Organization in the fields of disarmament, economic and social development and the settlement of disputes with the full participation of a Government representing so many hundred millions of people and seeking to play its part in the international concert of nations.

22. Indeed, we are at a loss to know how to proceed further in several of the forums of our work unless and until this great question is resolved and we take a new and major step toward the agreed goal of universal membership. We must deal with the community of nations as it is; we must treat with each other in fairness and candor.

23. I have earlier noted [*1959th meeting*] that there is now a pronounced trend in Asia away from polarization, with its dangerous consequences of confrontation and conflict, toward pluralization—or a new multiplicity of interests and emphasis. We are convinced that all Asia, and indeed the whole world, stands to benefit from this welcome trend.

24. But now we come to a serious problem. We have not felt, and we do not feel now, that there is any virtue in taking one step forward only to take at the same time another step back. Of course we realize, and can even understand with some sympathy, the circumstances which have given rise to this situation. But the past is history. Let the dead past bury its dead. Let not the same ill-considered attitudes poison from the outset the hopes for new beginnings in attitudes and relationships in keeping with the reality of our world as it is today. Only to the degree that we approximate to reality and base our actions on what exists, avoiding elaborations of doctrine and dogma on the basis of abstract concepts, can we avoid error and bring the course of international affairs into line with truth.

25. Therefore, we must ask ourselves what exists, and what exists now, not in the past. What exists are two Governments, both effectively in control of the territories they govern. What exists are two Governments, two economies and two social systems, each advancing in its own way, and each bringing its peoples closer to the realization of its own concept of well-being and freedom from want. The unprecedented efforts made by the peoples of both of these existing States to improve their circumstances are an inspiration not only to Asia but to all the world. On the basis of what we see exists, we have no choice but to conclude that we are discussing the rights of two States and their place in the United Nations.

26. In the one case, the Republic of China has without question been a loyal and faithful Member of the United Nations for a great many years. Its role in assisting the well-being of other States is well known. For instance, the Republic of China has economic co-operation programmes with a score of developing countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and other parts of the world. Who can question this and how many here can compare with that work? It is wholly unthinkable that a State that has comported itself in this fashion should lose its place in the form of nations. The Philippines has traditional close ties and extensive economic

relationships with the people and Government of the Republic of China, and we vigorously object to tactics aimed at the exclusion from the United Nations of an incumbent Member which has so convincingly demonstrated its worth and its qualifications.

27. At the same time, the anomaly of the non-participation in the United Nations of the People's Republic of China, a Government representing nearly one full quarter of the earth's peoples, must be ended as quickly as possible.

28. Let our actions be in accord with these two incontrovertible realities.

29. It is unreal to insist that there exists "only one country" when we are faced with the obvious fact that there are two Governments and two societies which have had nearly a quarter century of independent and sharply diverging history. Questions of usurpation of seats are out of date and irrelevant. Questions of who represents China are also irrelevant and out of date. History has taken its course. The question no longer arises, regardless of the representations and aspirations of one group or another. This is not to state preferences, or inclinations, or even to think wishfully about what might or might not have been. The only relevancy is what we find before us. If we are to fulfil the new promise which lies before Asia and the world, then it is imperative that we be completely fair, sensitive and responsive to the situation as it is. The resolutions we support must take those factors into account. We cannot be a party to new injustice in the name of achieving justice, and we are quite sure that human ingenuity is not so limited that a just solution cannot be found. Naturally, we seek the fullest achievement of self-determination by all peoples in consonance with the principles of our Charter, and we feel that this goal is far from realized in many areas. We are equally certain that, with the reduction of tensions between nations, these ideals will become more achievable.

30. Polemics, accusations, rhetoric reminiscent of the cold-war—all these are out of place in arriving at a decision on the so-called China question, a decision which must be as magnanimous and conciliatory as possible. We do not believe that any party concerned in this discussion wishes to confront this world body with an ultimatum—of any kind. This is not the place for ultimatums, threats, or attempts at intimidation. There is only one thing to do, and that is to seek to fulfil the goals of the Charter, to achieve universal membership and the participation of all States representing "We the peoples of the United Nations", no matter how those States may differ in approaching the solutions to their own problems.

31. Reconciliation, not accusation, is the work of the United Nations. Who shall correct all the faults of the past? Who? Shall we raise the dead and disinter the warriors, the chiefs, the priests and the kings of the past in order to settle accounts? No, emphatically no. This is not our task in the United Nations. We do not feel that the draft resolution sponsored by Albania and a number of other delegations [*A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2*] accords with the task of reconciliation or is consonant with the principle of universality. Clearly this resolution is out of step with the requirements of today. A new approach is needed. The sudden barring of a Government representing 14 million

people from the forum of the United Nations cannot be condoned by its Members without risk of serious consequences. Quite apart from its far-reaching effects on the United Nations itself, such an action would have unforeseeable and dangerous consequences on the hopeful, but delicate, *détente* evolving in the Far East.

32. The proposed expulsion of the Republic of China, which clearly falls within the purview of Article 18 of the Charter, could have negative effects and grave implications for the United Nations. The Republic of China, need it be said, has faithfully met its financial obligations as a Member State. I believe there are only about half a dozen countries here whose contributions to the United Nations exceed that of the Republic of China. This fact is of significant relevance to an Organization which, as our highly esteemed Secretary-General has pointed out, is on the brink of bankruptcy.

33. Even more serious would be the substantial erosion of confidence in the United Nations that would be caused by the unceremonious expulsion of a Member State that, it cannot be overemphasized, has scrupulously discharged its obligations under the Charter. We have heard expressions of concern for the hundreds of millions of people represented by the People's Republic of China. But we seem to ignore the fact that the Republic of China is recognized by 59 other States, 56 of them States Members of the United Nations, and that these States combined also represent hundreds of millions of people whose allegiance to the Charter and support for the United Nations may be weakened or alienated by the expulsion of the Republic of China. We should ponder very carefully the implications of such a serious undermining of confidence in the United Nations, which is not only an organization of States but also an association of peoples.

34. We should also be seriously concerned with the consequences of the proposed expulsion of the Republic of China on the organization and the work of the specialized agencies, in the effective functioning of which the Republic of China is extensively involved.

35. Some speakers in this debate have described the item before us as a "simple question". So it may seem, to some. I would myself describe it as a unique case.

36. As I have already remarked, to deprive the Republic of China of its representation in the United Nations by a decision of the General Assembly is an important question within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter.

37. The General Assembly pronounced itself to that effect in 1961 when it adopted a resolution stating that any proposal to change the representation of China in the United Nations was an important question [*resolution 1668 (XVI)*]. Since then, it has consistently reiterated that decision by substantial majorities until as recently as last year. The draft resolutions voted upon during those years would in effect have deprived the Republic of China of its representation in the United Nations, which is the very aim now of the Albanian draft resolution in document A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2.

38. Why, then, should this document now be treated differently than in former years, when in fact the substance of the proposal remains unaltered? Why should this draft resolution now be described as involving a simple question to be decided by simple majority? The very same issue is awaiting decision by the Assembly this year and it would be illogical suddenly to consider it as unimportant when the important, far-reaching consequences of that decision remain unaltered.

39. The Philippine delegation believes that it would be a dangerous proposition to deprive a Government of membership in this Organization by the expedient of a simple majority vote.

40. That consideration would be even more pertinent to the unique case of the Republic of China, which is a founding Member of the United Nations and one of the five permanent members of the Security Council. Surely, if any case deserves to be considered with the fullness of the combined wisdom and constructive capacity of this Organization, it is this unique case of the Republic of China.

41. Heads of State and heads of Government, as ambassadors of goodwill are travelling or preparing to travel to many parts of the world. Hopefully we are witnessing the beginning of a decade of *détente*. It is in the spirit of *détente* that we must confront the choices and the draft resolutions before us. It serves no purpose to threaten the United Nations. In this respect we must express our regret at the statements of the representative of Albania and others who spoke in a similar vein because of the undertones of threat that they carried. We are not here to act on the basis of statements made in extremity, calculated to stampede us into one camp or another, for that is contrary to the ideal and the function of the United Nations as we have understood and supported it.

42. The era of confrontation is passing, and with it must go the attitudes and practices which it engendered. We urgently require in our hall statements and interpretations of principles and the development of fresh and constructive ideas, not exchanges of recriminations and attempts at intimidation. Let us lend ourselves to the question that is before us then in the spirit of reconciliation, seeking to extend and fulfil the principle of universality—not to restrict it—and to provide equity and redress for just grievances.

43. In 1949 when I had the great privilege of laying the corner-stone of this building, the United Nations General Assembly building, I reminded my audience that that stone and steel alone would not give permanence to the home of the United Nations. I said on that solemn occasion that stronger than steel, more durable than granite, goodwill is the real corner-stone of the United Nations, and that we shall have failed in our supreme duty to mankind if we do not make the permanent home of the United Nations the house of peace.

44. It is in that spirit that we have indicated, by our sponsorship, our full support for draft resolutions A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2. We hope that they will also merit the support of this august body.

*Statements concerning the incident that occurred at the Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Wednesday, 20 October 1971*

45. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would like to make a brief statement. With the agreement of the Assembly, I shall now call on him.

46. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): It is with a feeling of profound resentment and indignation that I have come to the rostrum of the General Assembly. I wish to tell the Assembly of the unprecedented criminal act committed last night against the USSR Mission to the United Nations.

47. Yesterday, 20 October, at about 8 p.m., unknown criminal elements committed a terrorist act against the USSR Mission to the United Nations. Shots were fired at the Mission building. From the roof of the building of Hunter College, situated from 200 to 300 metres from the Mission building, four shots were fired from a rifle. All four bullets entered a room in an apartment on the eleventh floor occupied by a counsellor of the Mission.

48. There were four children in the room—three school-children and one five-year-old. Only by sheer luck were they not injured. You can all imagine what a terrible state they were in.

49. The bullets made four holes in the window panes. One of the bullets went through an open doorway into the kitchen and lodged in the side of a refrigerator; another smashed a mirror near the window and dented the side of the refrigerator. The two other bullets fired through the window lodged in the wall of the room, leaving deep visible impressions.

50. Ambassador Bush, the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, was able personally to see all this when he visited the Mission building and inspected the scene of this scandalous crime.

51. Police officers summoned to the Mission building carefully inspected the scene of the shooting and the damage done and also saw that a crime had been committed. They photographed all the obvious traces and consequences of this criminal act. The staff of the Mission gave the police officers three twisted bullets discovered on the floor of the room.

52. As the Mission learned, an immediate police search of the roof of Hunter College revealed a rifle with optical sights. Near it, a musical instrument case was found, which the police suggest that the perpetrators of the crime had used to carry the rifle through the College building and on to the roof. Four spent cartridge shells were also discovered on the roof.

53. Since the shooting at the Mission building was carried out from the roof of the Hunter College building, the USSR Mission to the United Nations cannot refrain from drawing attention to the well-known fact that the premises of Hunter College are frequently used by Zionist organizations, including the notorious Jewish Defense League, for

meetings hostile to the Soviet Union. A frequent participant in these meetings, who is well known for his hostility towards the Soviet Union and has been sentenced as a criminal by a United States court, is Rabbi Kahane, the leader of the Zionist group which calls itself the Jewish Defense League.

54. The Mission has frequently informed the United States Mission to the United Nations of the criminal acts and hostile attacks against the Mission and against Soviet citizens in New York by this Fascist Zionist group.

55. Attention has also been drawn to the fact that several responsible United States politicians took part in the anti-Soviet Zionist meetings at Hunter College and this undoubtedly encouraged Fascist Zionist elements to commit these hostile activities.

56. Thus, in a note dated 22 April 1971, we told the United States Mission:

“As an example of this, we could cite the fact that Senator Javits, Representative Koch and Mayor Lindsay attended such meetings at Hunter College and Carnegie Hall.”

After such meetings, characterized by anti-Soviet statements and appeals and slogans hostile to the Soviet Union, the participants generally headed towards the building of the USSR Mission to the United Nations to picket and demonstrate. This fact obviously cannot be overlooked by the police in the investigation of this crime, which was committed from the roof of Hunter College.

57. The USSR Mission to the United Nations has brought this to the notice of the United States Mission to the United Nations. We cannot consider this premeditated shooting at the Mission building as anything but an unprecedented criminal act of political nature against a foreign diplomatic mission in the United States.

58. One naturally asks oneself how this act could have been possible. The answer is simple: it was possible only because the United States authorities have for a long time failed to take the necessary effective counter-measures and to hamper the systematic and unruly campaign waged by Zionist and other hostile elements against the Soviet Union and its citizens in the United States—a campaign of enmity, hate and vilest slander.

59. The USSR Mission has frequently drawn the attention of the United States Mission to these hostile, provocative acts and has asked the United States Mission to see that the competent United States authorities take the necessary steps.

60. Taking advantage of the connivance of the authorities, these hostile elements, and particularly the members of the aforementioned Fascist Zionist group, the Jewish Defense League, have systematically and increasingly undertaken hostile, provocative acts against the USSR Mission to the United Nations and against Soviet citizens in the United States. Beginning with a hostile, provocative campaign in the press and on radio and television, they have progressed to threats of physical violence against the Soviet staff of the



Mission and of other Soviet establishments in New York, set off bombs in the Intourist and Amtorg buildings, laid a bomb with a charge of over 10 kilogrammes at the main entrance to the residence of the USSR representative to the United Nations at Glen Cove and committed a number of other hostile acts. From threats of physical violence against Soviet citizens, they have now turned to direct terror, shooting at the Mission building with the clear intention of committing acts of terrorism against the staff of the Mission. This act of monstrous hostility against the diplomatic Mission of the Soviet Union must be viewed in the context of the general international situation and of the series of hostile acts which have recently been perpetrated in several countries against the Soviet Union and its citizens.

61. The USSR Mission to the United Nations has brought all this to the attention of the United States Mission to the United Nations and registered a strong protest against this criminal act. We have strongly requested that urgent steps be taken to find the perpetrators of this deed and to punish them severely, and that the competent United States authorities take all necessary action to protect from hostile elements and guarantee the security of Soviet citizens and the building of the Mission of the USSR to the United Nations.

62. I have been asked by the Soviet delegation to the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly to make this special statement at a plenary meeting of the Assembly to bring to the notice of all participating delegations the abnormal conditions affecting permanent missions to the United Nations in New York, one of the largest cities in the United States.

63. We delegations and delegates, as well as the permanent representatives, who have already been subjected to similar hostile acts by criminal elements in the host country, must lodge the firmest possible protest and demand that the Government of the United States put its own house in order and take effective measures to protect the permanent representatives to the United Nations, their staff and the missions of States Members of the United Nations from this kind of hostile act and from terrorism by criminal elements.

64. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

65. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia): If no one raised his voice except the representative of the Soviet Union this Assembly might to a large extent take the view that the Soviet Union was the sole target of such barbarian activities. I find it timely and necessary that I should relate some of my own experiences and those of my colleagues who, time and again, have approached me—because of the mere fact that I am much older than they and have served here in the United Nations for over 25 years—and said that their life was becoming untenable in this city of New York. My statements on the threats that have been sent in writing or translated into action as we have heard today are nothing new. We cannot go on like this in this city of New York, expressing our views candidly on momentous issues, without being beset by fears that we may be punished by this or that political faction.

66. In 1950, eggshells filled with nitric acid were thrown at my car. Fortunately, only the chauffeur's suit was

damaged. He could have been blinded. I protested at that time; but then we kept quiet, because successive mayors told us, through their emissaries and through the United States Mission to the United Nations, that drastic measures would be taken to protect us.

67. It is not only physical protection that we seek. Let it be noted that we cannot engage in free expression if we are intimidated. Many of us have families. Those who have become apprehensive and, subconsciously, prefer to use restraint in expressing even the views of their own Government if they are inimical to certain political factions in this unwieldy city.

68. Why have I asked to speak on a point of order? Because there is a lot of disorder in New York City. Every year I receive letters threatening me and members of my Mission and sometimes containing vilifications or insults to our national origin. And we are expected here to keep silent or to resign ourselves to hearing promises that cannot be fulfilled. We cannot accept this deteriorating situation.

69. The crux of the matter is not the American people; the American people and the inhabitants of New York are themselves victims of such acts. Who is responsible? The politicians? The Mayor is responsible. He dons the yarmulke and goes to the synagogue—I think he is a Christian, is he not? I do not know what denomination he belongs to—and acts like a rabbi to please the Zionists in order to obtain their votes. One day he is a Republican, the next day he is a Democrat, the third day he is nothing—a sycophant.

70. It is hard for me to state this. But is the Mayor alone in these actions? No. We are living here in New York City, which is the biggest city in New York State. Governor Rockefeller, with his millions, puts on the yarmulke and goes to the synagogue. If I were a Jew I would despise them because they are hypocrites. They are inviting trouble.

71. Why am I calling names? They have vilified our own people. They have called us all kinds of names. We are human beings and should be treated on the same level. I recall that in 1967 Robert Kennedy—may God rest his soul in peace—and Governor Rockefeller said: "A great thing has happened; Israel has been victorious and is bringing civilization and culture to the Arabs."

72. What a sad day it was when Christopher Columbus discovered America! A country 200 years old wants to bring civilization to us. We are being insulted. I understand that only yesterday three threats of bombing were addressed to the Syrian Mission and against its personnel by the Jewish Defense League. Who will receive threats tomorrow, and the day after tomorrow? As long as the Mayor is a politician and inviting votes he will do anything. Who are we here in the United Nations? We should live like the Soviet Union representatives on Sixty-seventh Street, beleaguered. For indeed we are beleaguered.

73. I have great sympathy with the American people, and especially with such civilized persons as we find in the United States Mission. This is not their fault. It is the fault of the City. That is why we do not want the United Nations to be in New York. If I were to enumerate the incidents which have happened during the last 25 years or so, it

would take half an hour to do so, even without any comments. Why do not the Chinese who are demonstrating outside these halls in favour of the Republic of Taiwan and those who are demonstrating against it do any shooting—as some have been doing just recently at the Soviet Mission? They do not because the Chinese are really civilized. The Chinese people are a civilized race. If we, the Asians, do not exercise power we are called backward, developing; but at least we are civilized—we do not engage in such activities.

74. Upstarts, mayors and all: because of the power of the country they belong to, they are self-righteous, and think that they can get away with murder—by proxy, of course. They are gentlemen; they have well-tailored clothes, sideburns, glamour, charisma, they are political figures. But they may be committing murder by proxy through their irresponsibility.

75. I want to offer a verbal resolution—and if anyone objects to it he may come to this rostrum—that we ask our beloved colleague Mr. Bush, as the head of the United States Mission, to tell his Government in Washington to communicate with the Mayor of New York, to tell him that the measures which have hitherto been taken by the City to protect missions are inadequate and, if possible, to admonish the Mayor not to play politics with any faction whether Zionist, Arab, Chinese, Russian, rebel—not to play politics lest the United Nations should cease to function. We must have an atmosphere of freedom of speech and not the anarchy of licence. People walking in the streets of New York, going to their abodes, whether in Manhattan or in Queens, must not be molested or robbed.

76. Drastic measures should be taken. It is not for us to legislate for New York City. Who are we but members of different States? I once told Mr. Yost, Mr. Bush's predecessor, when he met with us, when we Arabs were being subjected to bombs and threats of bombs, that drastic legislation should be enacted to ensure that the utmost punishment should be meted out—even hanging or sending to the electric chair, or anything else—so that, until we can decentralize our Security Council and our political committees from New York, we can function in a calm atmosphere without being subjected to insults and injuries and harm by the rabid.

77. What happened yesterday to the Soviet Union Mission may happen tomorrow to any one of you sitting here. Speeches are not enough, no matter how cogent. We demand action, with the courtesy of our colleagues. No doubt Washington has heard what we are saying now. Will the leaders in Washington remain with arms folded, or will they come forth with a formula concerning us—far be it from us to interfere in their domestic affairs—whereby the Mayor will be a Mayor *par excellence*, not a cheap politician?

78. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

79. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): Let me say that the United States delegation has listened with great interest and understandable concern to the very moving statement by Ambassador Malik and to the statement by Ambassador Baroody. I should like to read out the

following statement that I have just made to the news media during a press conference at the United States Mission:

"I strongly condemn the cowardly and hostile action of the extremists who fired four bullets into the USSR Mission Wednesday evening.

"The outrageous, cowardly and hostile act represents the very worst in the fanatical fringe of our society.

"The incident works against everything we are trying to do in seeking improved relations between our country and the Soviet Union"—and, let me say parenthetically, between my country and every other country represented here in this hall.

The statement continues:

"There were four little children in the room where the bullets hit. Any one of them could have been killed. Naturally they were terrified."

80. Last night, on the scene, I expressed my most profound regrets to the delegation of the Soviet Union. Today I have expressed our formal regrets to Ambassador Malik. And I stand here before representatives today to repeat to the General Assembly of the United Nations the depth of emotion, the profound regret, felt by my country at this moment.

81. The statement goes on to say:

"I have been assured by the New York Police that the highest level of attention is being devoted to this matter."—I have also been assured of the full co-operation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—

"I would appeal to those who threaten, those who attack and violate the law, those who cower and shoot from rooftops—you are damaging our country—and whatever end it is that you seek to achieve will not be achieved by barbaric acts such as this shooting incident.

"The New York Police Department is doing its level best to protect the USSR Mission against hostile acts, but all would agree that the hidden coward"—cowering on some rooftop—"is tough to protect against"—in New York city or in any large city of the world.

"We are making no accusations as to what particular individual, group or members of a group are involved and responsible for this crime. We simply appeal to decency and common sense that those who perpetrated this incident and other similar incidents will stop acting the part of madmen.

"We cannot afford to do less.

"There is too much at stake."

82. I should like to make some additional comments in reply to the statements we have heard here today. This morning I received a telephone call from the Mayor of the City of New York stating that he had assured the Soviet

representatives both here and in Washington of his desire as the Mayor of this city to do everything that can be done.

83. I noted in the statement of Ambassador Baroody that he quite rightly said that we should not get into matters of internal affairs. But I think that any implication that the Mayor, who is the top official in the city and one of the top elected officials in the country, is not concerned about the loss of human life, cannot go unanswered. I would not want that impression to prevail from this rostrum. I must reject the contention that he or the Police Chief or any other official of this city is less than zealous in his desire to protect all the representatives here and the members of their missions.

84. And yet in no way am I asking that an act which we take most seriously and which we condemn should be condoned.

85. In our country and in our society and in much of the world a man is innocent until he is proved guilty. But lest there be any doubt about our views on violence, let me say that we condemn it.

86. In direct response to Ambassador Malik, I wish to state that, until the time arrives when an official inquiry links any organization to this regrettable act, we must, and I will, reserve judgement on who the culprit or culprits may be. But let me say from this rostrum that when any organization, be it, the Jewish Defense League, mentioned by Ambassador Malik, or any other organization in this country, advocates or condones violence or terror of the kind of harassment that the Soviet Mission has undergone, we condemn it, we condemn it with heart and soul, and we shall prosecute it to the fullest.

87. Let me say parenthetically that to condemn all of one faith, to condemn a people whose forbears in some instances were herded to the gas chambers not so long ago, to condemn all as Fascist and Zionist, is simply unfair. Part of the price that we pay in our country for freedom—and I know it is difficult for some representatives here to understand this—is freedom of speech, sometimes outrageous freedom of speech. But no part of the price of freedom should be terror, no part should be cowardice, no part should be harassment and no part should be threat.

88. And so, on behalf of my Government, I express my regrets not just to the Soviet Union—starting with the parents of the four little children the lovely mother and the obviously concerned father: and, as Ambassador Malik said, the minute I heard of this I went to the Soviet Mission and I was accorded the most courteous, although understandably strained, reception by the highest officials present there—but also to others who have, as Ambassador Baroody said, undergone harassment. I do not ask your understanding of this kind of harassment—this kind of cowardice, if you will accept that definition. But I ask you to understand that this shakes the heart and soul of every American from the highest levels of the United States Government to the plainest, most average citizen walking the streets in the Middle West or wherever it may be, far removed from the United Nations.

89. That is the way our country feels. We do want to be responsive. We do recognize that some incidents like this

one are terribly hard to guard against. But I pledge you here a renewed effort to do the best that can possibly be done, given the confines of this open society that is so hard for some to understand, and we shall redouble our efforts to see that not a single person representing his country in this hall is harassed, because this, my friends, is the real America and not the America of harassment, intolerance and abuse.

90. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): I wish to start by expressing on behalf of my delegation our very sincere and deep appreciation for the statement that has just been made by Ambassador Bush, in which he assured us that all precautions are being taken and will be taken by the New York authorities and the American authorities in order to see to it that the security of the Missions to the United Nations is safeguarded. Indeed, I want to tell Ambassador Bush how very appreciative we are of his own official and personal stand on this matter.

91. However, from 1966 up to the present time my Mission also has been subjected to such acts of threats, vandalism and occupation, into which I shall not go at all, except to tell what happened yesterday and on Sunday, 17 October so as to give Ambassador Bush more cases to investigate, because they are very serious cases that need investigating.

92. To start with, yesterday, between 1 and 1.20 p.m., we received no fewer than six calls threatening that bombs would go off at our Mission. I immediately contacted the security officer at the United States Mission, who gave immediate and urgent attention to the matter and detached a squad of policemen in order to investigate it. Those policemen are, at this very moment, still at our Mission, and for this I want also to express my appreciation.

93. Then, on Sunday 17 October, on radio station WINS, there was a commentary by Rabbi Tannenbaum. I am sorry that I do not have the text of this commentary, which called on Americans to gather forces for this Saturday and Sunday in order to single out Syrians in New York and attack them as revenge for the alleged persecution of Jews in Syria. The editorial stated that they were ready to send the text of this commentary to whomever asked for it, but, although from Monday until today we have been telephoning and writing to that radio station asking them to send us the text of that editorial by Rabbi Tannenbaum, we have failed to get it. This morning I again spoke to the security officer in the United States Mission and told him of the situation. I also told him that the bomb scares we had yesterday, because of which policemen are in our Mission today, are perhaps the result of that very inciting, provocative editorial that was repeated every hour on the hour on Sunday last on radio station WINS. I also suggested to the security officer of the United States Mission that he himself try to obtain the text of that editorial.

94. We heard the very reasoned and very well-delivered statement of Ambassador Bush, but I felt that in order to strengthen his hand in looking into such cases I should mention these two incidents that happened this week. Ambassador Bush said in his statement: "We shall prosecute it to the fullest." Now the editorial on radio station WINS was heard by everybody. It is not something secret; it is not a bomb scare on the telephone; it is an incitement against



persons—foreigners in New York—called Syrians, because of certain allegations that were made by the rabbi who spoke on that radio station.

95. I respectfully request that the text of that editorial be obtained, since we have failed to obtain it ourselves, and if Ambassador Bush, in his wisdom, and his legal advisers and lawyers can see that that editorial is really out of step with what we call freedom of speech, then I am sure we may expect the appropriate action. Because, as Ambassador Bush put it very well, that is part of the price that should be paid for freedom of speech, and we understand it.

96. But, on the other hand, we do not want to be living all the time under the threat of the use of force like a sword of Damocles hanging over our heads by a hair; this can only hinder the proper conduct of our work at the United Nations.

97. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

98. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I listened carefully to the statement of the representative of the United States, Ambassador Bush.

99. We take note of his statement, of his expression of regret and of the information he gave about the measures taken by him and by United States authorities. We are grateful to him for his personal intervention in this matter, for the visit he made yesterday to our Mission, for the letter he wrote today to the Mission and for the remarks he has just made from this rostrum.

100. It is, however, necessary to clarify the situation. He stated that he was not accusing anyone—no particular individual or group. This implies non-resistance to evil, and non-resistance is always a means of fostering evil. Moreover, this morning the telephone rang in our Mission. A cheerful, insolent and cynical voice said: "We are the ones who fired at your Mission. We are the Jewish Defense League." Then the voice uttered the silly, false slogan "Never again", the well-known slogan of that Fascist league which I cannot describe as other than a Fascist group of Zionist extremists inside and outside New York. Incidentally, what is the meaning of this slogan, "Never again"? The representative of Israel has made frequent appeals both in the Assembly and in the Security Council, reminding us of the extermination of 6 million Jews in Hitler's Germany. We, with our policy of peace, friendship, and highest respect for peoples of all countries, no matter who they are or what they are, have declared that we share the grief of those who lament the tragic fate of those 6 million people. But we have reminded the representative of Israel that we Soviet people lost 20 million lives in the struggle against fascism, against the brown plague, in order to save ourselves, our freedom and independence, in order to save the world from the Fascist plague.

101. We have told the representatives of Israel that Hitler dreamed of becoming the master of the world. Had he been able to achieve his madman's goal, we would have become slaves and those who were already slaves would have remained so. Fifteen million Jews throughout the world

would have been destroyed, like the 6 million Jews in Hitler's Germany.

102. However, the Israeli representatives and their propaganda and agents are waging a systematic campaign of slander and spreading enmity and hatred against the Soviet Union here, in this country. It is they who invented the non-existent problem of the situation of Jews in the Soviet Union. The situation of Jews in the Soviet Union is the same as that of persons of any other nationality. We are proud of the fact that people of more than 100 nationalities live in our country and are all equal before the law and enjoy the same respect; we are the first in the history of our homeland to have created a true family of peoples.

103. This story about the situation of the Jews in the Soviet Union had to be invented by the Israeli aggressors and their protectors throughout the world and in this country in order to divert attention from the wrongdoings and the crimes of aggression committed by the Israeli leaders in the Middle East against the Arab peoples, and to divert attention from the peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union, which strives for peace and friendship with all peoples of the world on the basis of the principle of peaceful coexistence.

104. It is clear that some people in this country and in certain of the countries allied to the United States are not pleased at the abatement of international tension; they do not appreciate the active efforts of the Soviet Government to reduce international tension, to improve the political climate in Europe and to develop co-operation with many countries inside and outside Europe.

105. The reason is, apparently, that the military-industrial complex is troubled by the reduction of international tension. In this context I cannot help recalling how the late Winston Churchill, the leader of the Western world during the coldest years of the "cold war", himself told me in the summer of 1953, when I was Ambassador to the United Kingdom, that he considered the greatest threat to him after the Second World War was the improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. "And that is why", he told me, "I spoke at Fulton: in order to spoil relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, for I feared that the development and improvement of relations between them might weaken the position of the United Kingdom."

106. And now his Tory successors, the Bourbons of the modern world, have committed an act of provocation against our country. This has been followed by other provocative attacks in other Western countries, and finally by yesterday's crime against our Mission to the United Nations, the firing of shots at the Mission with the clear intention of committing an act of terrorism. One concrete fact must be added to this. Only the day before, on Tuesday, the ringleader of that gang of bandits which calls itself the Jewish Defense League spoke on New York television. As was widely reported in the United States press, he had just come back from Israel. He probably received instructions there on how to act. On the eve of the attack, on Tuesday, in his speech on New York television he threatened to kill two Soviet diplomats. That is an actual fact.

107. Thus, not only did the United States authorities take no counteraction, no measures against this type of criminal, who was sentenced by a United States court to pay a heavy fine, but he was able to find benefactors who paid his fine. This criminal walks around freely. Not only that, but he appears on television and threatens to kill two Soviet diplomats. What sort of a country is this? Have you ever heard of such a thing, my fellow delegates? In what other country would a criminal, convicted of a crime by a court, be thus permitted to speak officially on the radio and threaten to kill two foreign diplomats? Is that not proof of who is guilty?

108. Ambassador Bush, you say: "We do not accuse anybody, neither individuals or groups." I am presenting you with concrete facts. Can it be that these facts are not sufficient for United States justice to find the culprits, to convict them and to give them the most severe punishment? Your Government has concluded an agreement with the United Nations. Unfortunately, it has not yet been ratified by your legislative organs. This cannot be considered normal. The obligations of your country and of your Government under this agreement are to ensure the normal functioning of the United Nations. You are obliged to ensure safety and normal conditions for the functioning of foreign missions to the United Nations. That is your duty and international obligation, and I should be grateful if you would fulfil it.

109. The additional facts given, and the indignation expressed from this rostrum by my respected colleagues and friends, Ambassador Baroody and Ambassador Tomeh, confirmed before us all, before the plenary meeting of the General Assembly, that the United States authorities are not taking all necessary, requisite and effective measures to fulfil their obligations under the agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America. We are entitled to demand that the Congress and the administration of the United States, its Mission to the United Nations and the Mayor of the City of New York—that all the official authorities take steps to provide normal conditions for the United Nations in New York and to ensure security and normal conditions for the functioning of each of the foreign missions, of which there are now 131, in New York.

110. Those are our demands, and we insist upon them.

111. Furthermore, one cannot help but express indignation—and this has already been mentioned by those who have spoken from this rostrum—when all the official channels of United States television are made available for the most unbridled and hostile slander against the Soviet Union. A rabbi being a representative of a religious sect, a "man of God", Rabbi Kahane, should be an altruist and a humanist; he should pray to God for the well-being of men. That, at least, is how we atheists understand religious dogma and the essence of religion. But what does he do? He organizes a gang, attacks foreigners, threatens to kill two Soviet diplomats, plants bombs and blows up buildings, and yet the United States representative who spoke here does not have sufficient facts to accuse anybody, whether an individual or a group, of anything. This, you know, is really connivance, bordering on encouragement of such acts by hostile elements.

112. Furthermore, this rabbi preaches racism. I listened carefully to one of his speeches on television. His opponent was a distinguished professor, also of Jewish nationality, who attempted to decry the extremism of this ringleader of the Fascist—that is the only word—Zionist gang. Kahane, however, beat him down and the interviewer—please note what I say—gave Kahane more opportunities to speak and interrupted the professor's reasoned opposition to his views. What does Kahane preach? He says that in his view the worst thing that can happen in the United States is for young people of Jewish nationality to marry young people who are not Jews.

113. In the Third Committee, in the committee on decolonization and in the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, we discuss racism. In the Security Council, we speak out decisively against racism in any form. Our Soviet Constitution definitely and firmly forbids any form of disrespect and discrimination on grounds of nationality. Discrimination, racism, disrespect for the feelings of other peoples and nations are severely punished by law. But here, on television, a speech is delivered by the leader of this gang expressing indignation at the fact that young people of Jewish nationality marry non-Jews and thus sully the purity of their Jewish blood. That is blatant fascism, blatant racism, and I thus had every justification for stating recently in the Security Council, when we were discussing Jerusalem, that fascism and zionism are racist theories. Fascism preached the idea of a superior Aryan race, a race chosen by God, with blonde hair and blue eyes. I do not know the distinguishing marks of a Zionist, but the Zionists also preach the theory of "the chosen people". I addressed the representative of Israel in the Security Council and said: "Try to prove from the rostrum of the United Nations that you are the chosen people and that the others are nothing."<sup>1</sup> I should like to hear such a speech and see the reaction of the General Assembly, a peaceful gathering of representatives from the 131 States Members of the United Nations. Of course, he did not speak, and I am sure he will never put forward that kind of silly and criminal racist theory.

114. In the United States Congress, one speaker criticized my statement in the Security Council. He said that Malik did not understand the essence of the phrase "chosen people", that "chosen people" is a religious concept, that "chosen people" is an ancient theory, the ideology of the Jews in biblical times who considered that the Jews were closest to God and that it was through them that God expressed his will. But that is religious racism. Why should the Jews be closer to God? Why should other nations, believers also, be further from God? We do not believe in God, we are atheists. We have an objective approach and cannot understand the theory that one nation, one people, should be closer to God while all the others are pushed aside; that is discrimination. We do not think that God was a racist and pursued a policy of discrimination. But, judging by the speech of one of the members of the United States House of Representatives, one nation is closer to God and the others are further away. Even we atheists cannot agree with such an approach to religion.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, 1582nd meeting, para. 272.*

115. Those are the few explanations which I wish to make in exercise of my right of reply. I refer again to that very stormy, I might even say dramatic, meeting of the Security Council in which representatives of many Arab countries took part and when the Council condemned the acts of aggression by Israel against the Arab countries and, in particular, against the Arab sector of Jerusalem where Israel is destroying unique historical monuments of Arab culture and trampling underfoot the best traditions and national feelings of the Arabs. I said then to the representative of Israel: you and your Government should erect in the capital of your State a monument to the Soviet soldiers who, by sacrificing their lives, saved humanity from fascism and from enslavement by Hitler and saved all the Jews in the world. And you slander the Soviet Union.<sup>2</sup>

116. Today, at our Mission, I welcomed a group of Soviet scientists and well-known public figures, who have come to this country as tourists to see the United States. We have always displayed and continue to display the deepest respect for the people of the United States. It was Lenin who taught us this and we follow his teachings. They came with the best possible intentions. The group includes the well-known Lieutenant-General Dragunsky and the well-known scholar and lawyer, Zivs, both of Jewish nationality. But how were they received by the local Zionists? At Kennedy Airport they had organized scandalous acts of hooliganism, shouting, noise and insults. What is this? I can assure the Assembly that in our country we never greet foreigners in this way. From time immemorial all those who come to us with good intentions have always been received as honoured guests from overseas. Only those who come to our country with evil intentions are dealt with harshly. Hitler and his supporters learnt this, as did all those who tried to invade the territory of our homeland long before Hitler. And here our scientists and public figures came with the best of intentions towards the people of the United States, wanting to discover the life, the culture and the civilization of which the Americans are so proud, only to be greeted by a gang of Zionists. You can imagine with what feeling and indignation my compatriots talked to me about this today at our Mission.

117. These are the facts, and I believe that the General Assembly and all Member States are entitled to demand firmly and insistently that the United States authorities, Government and Congress put an end to this type of outrage, provocation, hostile acts, terrorism and threats in any form and that normal conditions be established for the United Nations and for foreign Missions to this Organization to work normally towards that noble goal for which this Organization was created, and for which we are all working collectively and as one body in the interests of the strengthening of peace and international security, development and strengthening of mutual respect among peoples, co-operation between peoples and observance of the first commandment inscribed on the tablets of the United Nations Charter. The first line of the Preamble to the Charter states that the United Nations was created "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". The Soviet Government adheres strictly to this policy, as is fully confirmed by the activity and participation for 25 years of the USSR delegation in the work of the General Assembly and all other organs of the United Nations.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 274.

118. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

119. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): It was not my intention to take the floor today, but the last speaker has compelled me to do so. The representative of the Soviet Union challenged me to come up here to this podium and to reply to the question, why has Israel not established a monument to the Red Army for the role it played in saving Europe and the entire world from the scourge of Nazism. My reply is that if Ambassador Malik were to devote no more than the time that he devotes to the frenzies and orgies of attacks against my people, my State and the Jewish religion in general, to the study of facts, he would not have put this challenge forward, because there are not only one but several monuments in Israel to the Red Army—to the Red Army that fought against the common enemy of mankind; forests planted in the name of the Soviet armed forces; museums established in towns and villages commemorating the role played by the Soviet Union and its forces in the struggle for freedom and equality in the world.

120. But in the Soviet Union, where millions of my brethren were butchered by the Nazis, in a place called Babi Yar, where 90,000 Jews, men, women and children, were brought out of Kiev and machine-gunned by the German forces and buried there, there is still no monument commemorating the martyrs. And I am not the only one to raise his voice against this travesty of morality and justice. One of the Soviet Union's greatest poets, Yevgeny Yevtushenko, got up and spoke out against this contemptible attitude to the memory of innocent men, women and children murdered by the Nazis.

121. If Ambassador Malik dares to come up here and draw comparisons between the Jewish people's movement of national liberation—zionism, a movement which dates back centuries, if not thousands of years, before Leninism and Marxism, a movement which precedes the national liberation movements that have brought new peoples, new States in Africa and Asia and Latin America and other parts of the world to freedom and independence a movement which fought against imperialism and the consequences of imperialism long before the Russian or Ukrainian peoples were on the map of the world—if he dares to draw a comparison between such a movement and fascism, my reply to him is that it was he and his Government that concluded a pact with Hitler and von Ribbentrop, and not the Jewish people and not zionism.

122. I think every one of us will dissociate himself from acts of violence directed against diplomatic missions of the kind that occurred yesterday. The Government of Israel has done that on previous occasions. But similarly every one of us will dissociate himself from the exploitation of such regrettable occurrences in order to attack from this podium the highest and dearest values of a people, a religion, a civilization. Again I wish that Ambassador Malik could devote no more than the time that he does to statements in the spirit of the one we heard today to the study of what Judaism means, of what zionism means, what the Jewish people stands for, what the State of Israel is really struggling for.

123. There is no justification whatever for coming here and speaking out as he has in anti-Semitic terms reminiscent

of the darkest of the tsarist days. If he looks up the forgery, produced by the tsarist authorities, called "the Protocols of the Elders of Zion," he will find that he stood here before the nations of the world and repeated exactly the words and ideas which were produced by the tsarist security organs in order to encourage anti-Jewish violence, *pogroms*, butchery. There is no justification to take out of Judaism a theory about the Jewish people, that the Jews were chosen in order to prove the goodness and the righteousness and the non-violence and the equality that should prevail—according to our faith, to our belief—among nations, states and individuals. This is the doctrine of "the chosen people". And, some of us add, in the light of the experience of thousands of years of suffering and discrimination, that apparently we must have been chosen also to suffer to prove perhaps that suffering can sometimes be overcome—but also to prove as a living example that those who uphold the kind of ideals that are enshrined in our Charter do sometimes suffer for them.

124. To take a belief of this kind and to trample it into dust, to throw it into mud, is nothing but pure, primitive anti-Semitism reminiscent of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, reminiscent of the well-known Stalinist terminology—and all of us had thought that those days were gone.

125. It is because of this kind of attack, this kind of exploitation of a regrettable act of violence that I have asked for the floor. We reject such attacks. To such exploitation, to such unwarranted attacks against the values of religion, faith, civilization, culture, national movement, there can be only one reaction—contempt, especially when these attacks come from the representatives of governments of countries which pursue a policy that is contrary to our ideals and to the precepts of the Charter of the United Nations.

126. Here we heard the representative of Syria appeal to all of us to behave correctly. We heard him protest certain acts. Now, who is going to raise his voice on behalf of the remnant of Syrian Jewry, a community which preceded the Arab conquest of Syria, a community that has lived in Damascus and Aleppo and other places for thousands of years, a remnant which is today closed in ghettos, deprived of freedom of movement, denied sources of livelihood, its leaders in gaol, its young people tortured, those who try to leave Syria to reach freedom arrested, interrogated, tortured? Is the community of nations to accept preaching on how to behave and how not to behave from a representative of that type of Government?

127. When we speak of the kind of regrettable, unfortunate acts that occurred yesterday evening, I think it is incumbent on us to look not only at the results but also the causes. The representative of the Soviet Union found it necessary to deny that there is any Jewish problem in his country. Well, the hundreds, the thousands of appeals which have been smuggled out of the Soviet Union on behalf of hundreds of thousands, millions of Jews, addressed to you, representatives of the nations, transmitted by me to the President of the General Assembly and to the Secretary-General, belie that statement by Ambassador Malik. There are 3.5 million Jews in the Soviet Union. They want to live like other nationalities in the Soviet Union.

They too claim their simple human rights to live, to breathe, to be able to educate their children, to be able to produce newspapers and books in their own language. Or if all that is denied to them, if all the rights that the Kalmucks and the others who associated themselves with and co-operated with the German armies that occupied the Soviet Union are denied to the defenceless Jewish minority in the Soviet Union, they appeal to you, help us at least to leave. Help us at least to be able to join our families, to be able to join our people, to live in the midst of the Jewish people, to live like Jews, if we are denied the right to live as Jews in the Soviet Union.

128. We are gratified when here or there small numbers are at long last being allowed to leave the Soviet Union. But look at the immensity of the tragedy of those who remain behind. Only yesterday, I was visited by a young lady who arrived in Israel a few months ago, her husband left behind in the Soviet Union, she was allowed to leave and he was not. She has since given birth to his son in Israel. All she is asking for is the simple human right to be able to live with her husband, with her family. And here we have to be witness to outbursts of anti-Jewish, anti-Israeli frenzy because we, the Jewish people of Israel, a Jewish State, are concerned about the situation of our brethren, about the denial of their rights.

129. This morning we were told that the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Kosygin, had announced in Canada that those Jews who desired to leave the Soviet Union to join their families, to unite with their people, were free to do so. The Prime Minister of the Soviet Union finds it advisable to make such a statement. I do not think it behoves the Soviet representative here in the General Assembly to get up and to abuse the desire of my brethren of the Soviet Union to live like human beings, to live as Jews, and our concern and our desire that they should be allowed to do so. It is a concern that is not only ours: it is a concern of enlightened world opinion in general; it is a concern which is rooted in the tenets of the Charter of the United Nations; it is a concern which this General Assembly could and should give expression to. Then we shall not have to waste our time listening to the kind of statements we have just heard in the midst of an important debate on a global issue.

130. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

131. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): If I have inadvertently raised my voice in favour of keeping to the procedures of this Assembly, it is not in order to cast aspersions at any one.

132. Sir, I respect you as our President, but I felt compelled to draw your attention not only to procedure but to practice.

133. Ambassador Malik this morning made a complaint about the necessity of safety and security for the representatives of Member States in the United States. After he mentioned this, the whole debate—or rather that point of order by Ambassador Malik—deteriorated—because of some people here who were even surreptitiously planted—into a show for the Zionists. Mr. Malik would not have mentioned



the Zionists had it not been that all the harm to his mission as well as to other missions, including the Syrian Mission, has come from Zionists. I submit that this legitimate point of order of Ambassador Malik deteriorated into a debate on the Palestine question, on the Jewish people and on Judaism. I will in good time exercise my right of reply to what the preceding speaker said, but I will not commit the same fault now, because if I did I would be committing the same error as he did. Therefore, I believe that this question should be closed. The United States of America, through its representative here, is taking all the measures of which it is capable in order to see that we will not be subjected to such indignities and even to threats to our lives. But if we are going to reopen the question of the Middle East, I would, Sir, ask you to inscribe me forthwith for the right of reply, when I will observe the rules and not speak on the question at large.

134. If we do not observe these rules and practices, this Organization will founder. Its sinews have become weak, it has been exploited for propaganda. We cannot afford to let it deteriorate more than it has deteriorated. If Ambassador Malik perhaps went into detail, it is quite natural. After all, members of his Mission might have been killed and he was saying what lies at the root of all the trouble.

135. Of course, the representative of the usurping State of Israel—and I say “usurping” and I will explain that—not in the Council but from this rostrum also became emotional and used platitudes; but we cannot go on like this, because every reply generates another reply and we will never finish the Chinese question before us.

136. Therefore, without being tempted to rebut the statement of the representative of Israel, I ask my colleague, none other than Ambassador Bush,—who is whispering to another colleague of his—to investigate how this thing could occur. A potential orator comes to this rostrum, and this happened last year too and on several occasions. How can we have security if we cannot have security even inside the United Nations? I have finished, my good friend. You do not have to raise a point of order to a point of order because it would create disorder. I give you the floor.

137. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of the United States on a point of order.

138. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): Mr. President, mine is indeed a point of order. Our Government has been the subject of much conversation here today. My point of order is, as representative of the United States of America, I should like to reply to some of the comments here and ask clarification from the Chair as to what a point of order is. Is a point of order asking a question such as this, or is it making a speech, because I want to reply on behalf of the Government of the United States but I want to do so within the procedures and order of the United Nations.

139. The PRESIDENT: I shall recognize you on a point of order; if you want to speak in exercise of the right of reply I shall give you the time after the China debate.

140. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): Mr. President, a further point of order.

141. I will certainly comply with the ruling of the Chair, but wish to ask that further points of order be technically points of order, and that others be asked to fall into line, as we have done in asserting our right of reply. Is it my understanding that a point of order is a legal procedure, as we have tried to define it here, and that any substantive remarks on the subject-matter before the General Assembly will be allocated to rights of reply and representatives will be called on in the order that the names appear on the list of speakers? Is that a correct assumption, Sir?

142. The PRESIDENT: That is correct.

143. The representative of Cuba is asking for the floor. Does he wish to speak on a point of order or in exercise of the right of reply?

144. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, my delegation will speak strictly on a point of order; I shall not refer to the subject which was discussed this morning. Ambassador Malik knows exactly what our feelings are and that we associate ourselves with his delegation in the case of the outrage committed.

*Statements concerning an incident that occurred in the General Assembly hall*

145. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like specifically to ask the Secretariat—through you, Mr. President—a question. At an appropriate time can the General Assembly be given an explanation of another incident which occurred in the Assembly hall during the discussion which was taking place this morning? At the very time when in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly we were discussing the conditions and security under which delegations accredited to the United Nations work, at that very instant a person, apparently having no right whatsoever to do so, came into the Assembly hall, after having entered a building which we presume to be protected and guarded by United Nations security officers; he mounted the rostrum, stood in front of the microphone, and no one—no official, no authority—stopped him.

146. Last year a similar incident took place, and at that time my delegation asked for an explanation from the Secretariat [*1924th meeting, para. 6*]. The then President of the General Assembly, Mr. Hambro, gave his opinion that such an explanation should be forthcoming [*ibid., para. 21*]. One year has now passed but we have not as yet received any explanation. We have not received any satisfactory explanation from the Secretariat of how it was possible for a person without legal identification or adequate authorization not only to come into the United Nations building and through the doors of the General Assembly hall, but also to enter through the delegates' area, mount the rostrum, stand before the microphone and, perhaps as occurred last year, address the Assembly.

147. Since we are only in October—there is still time for the Secretariat to give us an answer to that question—my delegation will, at this moment, formally state that the Secretariat is in duty bound to explain to all States Members of the Organization how such an occurrence is



possible. How, why and through what procedure did that person come to the rostrum? Who is that person? In one word, we want to know all the details surrounding that incident because this has a direct bearing on the norms and way in which the Organization works. And so that this session of the General Assembly will not adjourn before such an answer is given—we still have two months ahead of us—I am now taking advantage of this early opportunity to ask this question in public.

148. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs.

149. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs): The question is being investigated. The representative is quite right that this is the second time this has happened in two years. It is interesting to note that the gentleman, in the midst of this discussion on the question of whether a point of order or a right of reply was involved, had intended to speak about China.

150. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Bulgaria on a point of order.

151. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): It is in fact amazing that someone would come to the rostrum and speak without being a representative of any country. At the outset I thought that the Secretariat had arranged to have someone stand at the rostrum to prevent our friend, Ambassador Baroody, from speaking, because the Secretariat thought he should not be permitted to speak. That is why I did not ask to speak right away. However, now that someone has taken the trouble to investigate the fact that someone came to the rostrum to speak without authorization and without representing a Government, I must say that I am shocked at the way the Secretariat has tried to clear itself with a perfunctory answer.

152. I do not consider that an answer. It is not an answer because tomorrow the United Nations could be invaded by irresponsible persons, people who might surround the building and make it impossible for us to do our work. How is it that the Secretariat here at Headquarters has not taken the necessary measures? Why do we not find out who is the sole person responsible, for allowing this gentleman to come here, and on whose behalf he expected to speak?

153. There have been other cases, and that is why I must insist that the Secretariat find who is responsible, who has made it possible for this individual to come to the rostrum.

154. I do not wish to prolong this debate by expressing my sympathy to the Soviet delegation. But I do believe that measures should be taken so that all delegations, whoever they are, should enjoy the necessary security, both outside the United Nations building and inside it—in this hall, as well as in all other Committee rooms. Irresponsible individuals must not be allowed to disturb the order of our proceedings. If that were permitted how could we work? How could we perform our functions and adopt responsible decisions?

155. I should therefore like whoever was responsible for this interloper's entering the Assembly hall be denounced

to the United Nations and for measures to be taken to punish him.

156. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic on a point of order.

157. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): I fully associate myself with the two previous speakers, the representative of Bulgaria, Mr. Tarabanov, and the representative of Cuba, Mr. Alarcón.

158. I was seated right here and in a very good position to see everything that happened. The Under-Secretary-General has confessed that this is the second time this has happened. He has made the brief, official, routine statement that the matter is being investigated and that an answer will be given in due time. The matter should be investigated right now and the answer should be given right now. It is our own security that is in jeopardy.

159. The man who came here does not belong to any delegation of the United Nations. I have seen him with my own eyes among the members of the Jewish Defense League, who are being accused here as criminals harassing the United Nations. They are not satisfied with attacking our missions, attacking our families, attacking our persons in the street, but they come here to this rostrum to interfere and create a threat.

160. Furthermore, I officially request that the Zionist agents who represent a criminal like Tekoah, who roam the delegates' lounge, and others whose names I would be ashamed to pronounce, who are running after delegations one after another, should be investigated and should not be permitted to enter the delegates' lounge and walk among the delegates and ambassadors to the United Nations.

161. This is not a problem of the United States Mission only: it is also a problem of the security of the United Nations itself. I insist that we should not leave this room before an answer is given regarding this outrageous act that has taken place here.

162. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs): The Secretariat is of course, even more shocked than delegations are by what happened this morning. The only answer I can give at this moment—since I have not yet been able to leave the podium—is that the matter is being investigated and that we shall report as soon as possible. The only thing I can say to the Assembly at this moment is that the paper which I seized from that person's hands relates to China, and to China alone. It says that he welcomes China in our midst. That is the only thing I can tell the Assembly immediately.

163. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I do not intend to argue with the Secretariat but, since I felt in duty bound last year to make a similar request, I should like to place on record our requirement now, supported as we are by two other delegations, that this Assembly be given a complete explanation when the Secretariat has one. We did not ask the Under-Secretary-General to read out to us the paper that the person was prevented from reading. Responding to a serious question that we all have a perfect right to pose, Mr. Stavropoulos

has twice told us only that the gentleman wanted to speak of China, or something to do with China. I want to speak about China and I am on the list to speak. For years we have defended the rights of China in this Organization, and will continue to do so and we have the right to do so. The individual who came to the rostrum did not have the right to speak of China, or any other subject.

164. I asked the Under-Secretary-General to tell me not what that gentleman wanted to say but how he was able to reach the rostrum to try to speak, and I repeat my requirement that the explanation be given in public to this

Assembly. The Secretariat is bound to give us that explanation. It has no other recourse, than to fulfil its duties to Member States and give us that explanation and not merely to read us a putative statement that a frustrated speaker tried to deliver to the Assembly this morning.

165. The PRESIDENT: At the end of this afternoon's debate I shall call on five representatives who have asked to be allowed to exercise their right of reply.

*The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.*

