

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**1572nd
 PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 28 September 1967,
 at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
<i>Speech by Mr. Economou Gouras (Greece) .</i>	1
<i>Speech by Mr. Zea (Colombia)</i>	4
<i>Speech by Mr. Malik (Indonesia)</i>	7
<i>Speech by Mr. Lara Bustamante (Costa Rica)</i>	10
<i>Statement by the representative of Cuba. . .</i>	13
<i>Statement by the representative of Colombia</i>	13
<i>Agenda item 8:</i>	
<i>Adoption of the agenda</i>	
<i>Second report of the General Committee. . .</i>	14

President: Mr. Corneliu MANESCU (Romania).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. ECONOMOU GOURAS (Greece) (translated from French): Mr. President, the fact that your country is in south-eastern Europe and has already long-standing historical ties with Greece makes doubly gratifying my task of extending warm congratulations to you, both in my own stead and on behalf of the Greek delegation, on your unanimous election to the Presidency of this Assembly. Your many qualifications, your competence and your political perception, the depth of which we in Greece have had occasion to appreciate, are a guarantee for the orderly and efficient progress of the labours of this Assembly.

2. To Mr. Pazhwak, the outgoing President, I wish to express the Greek delegation's appreciation for the efficient and expeditious manner, and for the authority with which he has accomplished his task. Mr. Pazhwak, who presided over three sessions of the General Assembly, has won our esteem and admiration. We thank him and congratulate him on the services he has rendered our Assembly.

3. This is by no means the first time that we meet under extremely serious conditions. Two years ago, this Assembly was faced with another crisis which almost paralysed its work, though at that time it was a question of an organic evil, rather than of a crisis involving prestige and authority, such as is now the case.

4. In 1965, a formula was worked out under which agreement was reached which enabled us to avoid a deadlock and—as several members wanted to believe, or at least to hope—to resolve the financial problem

of this Organization. However, the problem still exists, and the terms of the agreement which had seemed to offer a solution have remained, to some, a dead letter.

5. The additional difficulties now facing us are of a different kind, but there is little doubt that the damage the United Nations has suffered could have been avoided had there been greater adherence to the principles of our Charter. As it is, we must admit that the United Nations has accomplished only a very small part of the mission entrusted to it under the Charter.

6. The Greek delegation certainly does not wish to criticize anyone's attitude. It is simply trying to give this Assembly its view of the situation in which our community finds itself and endeavouring to seek out ways by which that community can hold back from the slippery incline onto which events have led it.

7. Along with you, Mr. President, we are saying that it is necessary to "intensify the efforts of all countries to find a solution for the problems of the world of today" [1560th meeting, paragraph 80].

8. The fact that the labours of the fifth emergency special session failed to produce results satisfactory to all, or even to the great majority of Member States, was an indication of the differences in their outlook and in their conception of the way in which the Charter should be implemented.

9. Keeping that fact uppermost, unsatisfactory and disturbing though it may be, we are still forced to recognize that the United Nations, after evaluating the results of events and after as objective an analysis as possible of the opinions of Members, as fully expressed during the debates of the emergency special session, has nevertheless implicitly shown that it does not foresee, at any rate for the time being, any solution to the crisis other than that which the conflicting countries may themselves put forward.

10. If, as we think, that interpretation is correct, it is the duty of the United Nations to allow for the possibility that that path might not lead to a solution and to be prepared to carry out its responsibilities.

11. While fully aware of our Organization's limitations, we believe that we have the obligation, individually and jointly, to draw the necessary conclusions from the recent events and crises, the present world situation, and the threat which all these constitute not only to the United Nations, but to all mankind.

12. In the hope that such a spirit of allegiance to the principles of the Charter will guide the steps of our Assembly at its present session, I should like briefly to set forth the position of the Greek delegation on some of the most important items on our agenda.

13. We continue to believe that disarmament should be given high priority among our concerns. The need to put an end to the arms race, and to undertake disarmament until such time as a new balance of power based on general and complete disarmament under international control can be established, has long been an article of faith among world public opinion.

14. Firm in that conviction, it is with hope and deep satisfaction that we welcome the submission of identical draft treaties on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons by the United States of America and the Soviet Union.^{1/} As a non-nuclear country, Greece cannot but feel apprehensive of the threat of "nuclear blackmail," particularly since it is unlikely that, for some time at any rate, a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons will gain universal acceptance. However, Greece will take a positive and constructive attitude towards efforts leading to the conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty—a workable treaty designed to contribute to world security.

15. In that same spirit, we take note of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.^{2/} That is an agreement which would appear to fulfil the conditions which we consider essential in such cases, namely: first, that there should be a meeting of minds on the part of the countries of the region; second, that the agreement arrived at should substantially strengthen the security of the region; and third, that the agreed denuclearization must not disturb the world balance of power.

16. We believe that those two treaties—on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and on the denuclearization of Latin America—are two effective steps towards general and complete disarmament.

17. While disarmament is the long-term solution to the problem of peace, peace still has to be maintained on a short-term basis. In order to meet this need, the United Nations has set up machinery for peace-keeping operations based on voluntary contributions. The usefulness of these operations can hardly be denied; they proved their worth during some ten years in the Middle East, and they still do so in Cyprus. But despite its usefulness and even its necessity, our Organization has been unable to put this peace-keeping machinery on the sound financial basis which would make it an efficient and uncontroversial instrument for peace. It is inconceivable that the United Nations should not be able to solve the problem. The difficulties arising from a difference in interpretation of Charter provisions must not become an obstacle to efforts towards peaceful existence in the international community.

18. During more than twenty years of experience, the United Nations has developed certain ideas, certain principles and criteria which have enabled it to overcome real difficulties. We have in mind the principle according to which less economically developed Member States must bear only a lesser share of the financial burden, but have at the same time a collective financial responsibility in all the activities of our Organization.

19. If we base ourselves on that principle and let ourselves be guided by the spirit of the Charter and by the conviction that the development of a system of peace-keeping operations is of overriding importance, we are bound to reach a pragmatic solution that will take into account the genuine concerns and interests of all Members.

20. As regards decolonization, the position of Greece remains what it has been since the beginning of the United Nations. The Greek delegation will unreservedly support all measures promoting the liberation of peoples from foreign domination, their free self-determination and the attainment and safeguarding of their independence.

21. While the progress that has been achieved towards decolonization, thanks to the United Nations, is encouraging, it is on the other hand regrettable that stagnation seems to have set in in the case of some peoples, particularly in Africa, who have not been able to set out on the true road towards decolonization.

22. A good and sure method is to take facts into account and to seek out realistic solutions. But whereas moderation and a spirit of compromise may be displayed in the search for solutions, we must be firm and uncompromising where principles are involved. We believe that a solution to the problem of the Territory of South West Africa could and should be found on the basis of those considerations.

23. The special session convened a few months ago set up machinery which could lend itself to the peaceful solution of that problem. Unfortunately, there is no hopeful indication that progress towards application of the principles of the Charter in the case of the people and Territory of South West Africa is in sight. That is all the more regrettable in that what we are debating here today is a political problem which may well deteriorate into a security problem having serious international implications.

24. Recent reports from Southern Rhodesia constitute a warning that should provide food for thought to all of us, but more particularly to those among us who hold the key to the solution of that problem.

25. We cannot speak of the danger of creating hotbeds of trouble without recalling those that already exist, namely, the Middle East and Viet-Nam.

26. At the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly, the Greek delegation had the opportunity to state its position [1542nd meeting] on a situation which, arising as it does in a region bordering on Greece, is bound to be of close concern to it.

27. In view of the importance of the problem, I must restate now the basic concepts which have determined my country's position. Greece has long historical ties of uninterrupted friendship with the peoples of that region. It wishes to see those peoples living in peace and devoting themselves to the task of progress and prosperity. Obviously the territorial integrity of their countries is an essential prerequisite for that task. However, the recent war has encroached upon that territorial integrity. We in Greece believe that in the United Nations era, in the middle of the

^{1/} Documents ENDC/192 and ENDC/193.

^{2/} Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America [see A/6663].

twentieth century, it is inconceivable that territories can be gained by force.

28. In signing the Charter, we solemnly pledged ourselves not to resort to force in settling our disputes. There can therefore be no other outcome to the Middle East crisis than that which may be achieved through political and peaceful means, and by the withdrawal of the occupying forces. It is distressing to note that two months after the adoption of the General Assembly resolutions condemning the annexation of Jerusalem, the territory of the Holy City remains subject to provisions imposed by military force. We are convinced that calm cannot be restored in the Middle East so long as the results of military action are not eliminated and so long as the peaceful means set forth in the Charter are not applied, with a view to the lasting solution of the Middle East problem.

29. In that regard, we support the suggestion of a United Nations presence in the Middle East put forth by the Secretary-General in the Introduction to his annual report [A/6701/Add.1, paragraph 48].

30. As for the war in Viet-Nam, Greece has nothing but the greatest sympathy and understanding for the South Viet-Nameese people's struggle against subversion and infiltration. Since the United Nations is a forum for negotiations and goodwill, we believe it is its duty to be on the watch for any sign of a possible solution and to be ready to encourage and assist those who give evidence of such intentions.

31. In the area of social development and the advancement of the freedoms, rights and dignity of peoples and individuals, the United Nations has already accomplished a considerable task. Nevertheless, the vastness of the problems involved in the raising of the level of society in a great number of developing countries—problems such as the struggle against illiteracy, the struggle against disease, hunger and unemployment—calls for new efforts. The impetus given to the struggle against illiteracy through the initiative of His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran must not be allowed to slacken. All the numerous obstacles to social development are so many hidden enemies of progress, order and peace in the world. Their elimination is a task we must unremittingly pursue.

32. In the pursuit of that task, we must obviously pursue our efforts to promote the economic development of the less-favoured countries in our community and to reduce to a minimum the gap between developed and developing countries.

33. In recent years, the flow of financial resources to the developing countries has lagged far behind the rate of growth in national income of the industrialized countries, even though most of the developing countries could make immediate use of a greater amount of outside assistance.

34. Outside aid can play a double role in development. On the one hand, it can be used to augment the resources of the developing countries and, on the other, it can be of use in the mobilization and more efficient utilization of those countries' resources. Due attention should therefore be paid not only to industrialization but also to the development of agriculture and food production. A concerted effort by both

developed and developing countries will be needed to increase the effectiveness of outside aid. In general, the terms of development loans remain rather hard, and the trend towards the improvement of those terms has recently suffered setbacks. New efforts are called for, not only to ease the terms of loans in general, but also to standardize the terms under which various developed countries are assisting individual developing countries. The indebtedness of developing countries, and, in particular, the increasing burden resulting from the servicing of contracted loans threaten to bring about a serious reduction in the net transfer of resources.

35. We think we should stress the importance we attach to the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to be held at New Delhi in February of next year. It seems to me that the General Assembly must endeavour to create a more favourable climate for assistance to and trade with the developing countries.

36. It is obvious that, apart from immediate problems, the General Assembly must also consider long-term problems. The World Food Programme put into effect in 1961 is now inadequate. Large-scale programmes should be based on a multilateral approach and included in the preliminary work for the next decade. All national and international machinery should be mobilized for the eradication of hunger and the fear of hunger among the peoples of our planet.

37. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) should not confine itself solely to an operational approach, but should also carry out promotional work for continued action in a field which calls for extensive and varied efforts. Similarly, the UNIDO work programme should not be limited to study and research, but should also be action-oriented. The scope and flexibility evidenced by the United Nations Development Programme augurs well for that organization's close co-operation with UNIDO.

38. Greece is happy to be able to extend its hospitality to the International Symposium on Industrial Development which is to be held at Athens in December 1967, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2178 (XXI) of 9 December 1966. That meeting is of basic importance to UNIDO, since it will assist in the establishment of its work programme and in defining its policy. It will also provide an opportunity for an exchange of valuable information on technical matters. That meeting will make a vital contribution to the efforts developing countries are putting forth to set in motion their industrialization process. Greece will spare no efforts and will do all in its power to ensure the fullest success of the Symposium.

39. Before concluding, the Greek delegation deems it useful to reassert the firm intention of the Greek Government to continue in its policy of good relations with all countries of the international community, irrespective of differences in political and social systems. Greece has always based its policy on respect for the sovereignty, independence, dignity and legitimate interests of other States. It has scrupulously applied the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. The ways and means it has employed in the implementation of that policy

are the peaceful ways and means laid down in the United Nations Charter and in international law. Greece has succeeded in establishing relations ranging from normal to friendly with almost all the Members of our Organization, and it will not fail to do its utmost to expand and improve those relations.

40. The continued efforts made quite recently by the Greek Government to improve its relations with Turkey, which have been in a state of serious crisis for several years, must be viewed in this context.

41. Last year, during the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, the Greek Minister for Foreign Affairs stated [1426th meeting] that the Governments of Greece and Turkey had decided to hold discussions on Greek-Turkish relations as a whole in the hope of facilitating a settlement of the question of Cyprus. Contacts between the two Governments have been maintained up to the present time, unfortunately without any positive results. I would prefer to refrain at this juncture from any comments on the reasons for which we are unable to attain our objectives. My Government, for its part, engaged in the discussions with a sincere desire for their success. In the search for a peaceful solution, the Greek Government, acting in the matter in complete accord with the Government of Cyprus, has been guided by two basic principles: first, that any solution to the Cyprus problem should express the will of the people of Cyprus as a whole; and second, that any solution should be in keeping with the spirit and the letter of the United Nations Charter. These principles cannot but meet with the full and complete support of our Organization, and it is within that framework that my Government is ready and willing to pursue its efforts towards a just and permanent solution.

42. We are also aware of the need for maintaining peace on the island until a final solution is found. It is precisely this task which the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus is performing at the present time, and I should like to take this opportunity to express here my Government's gratitude to the countries which have contingents serving in that Force or which are contributing to it financially. We are also grateful to the Secretary-General, and to his assistants and all personnel of the Force, for their efforts in the accomplishment of that highly important mission. Recent events in the Middle East have proved how essential the role of the United Nations is in the maintenance of peace. We do not, however, overlook the fact, so meaningfully stressed in the Secretary-General's annual report [A/6701, page 18], that this situation must not be prolonged indefinitely; it is precisely to this end that my Government will continue to devote all its efforts. Greece wants to believe that reciprocal intentions exist on the Turkish side.

43. May I conclude my statement with a fervent appeal for a redoubling of efforts aimed at the restoration and maintenance of peace, at the consolidation of the rule of justice and equity, at the strengthening of collaboration between the States and nations of our planet.

44. We consider that the recommendations of the Secretary-General with regard to the rehabilitation

of the institutions set up under the Charter for the pacific settlement of disputes among States [A/6701/Add.1, paragraphs 155 to 160] should be given serious attention by our Assembly. The threefold provisions—the International Court of Justice, the good offices of the Secretary-General, the periodic meetings of the Security Council under Article 28, paragraph 2, of the Charter—can indeed be usefully employed.

45. If nationalism, the new dimensions of which were so well defined by our Secretary-General only a few days ago in Kinshasa,^{3/} seems to stand in the way of that goal, we should not forget that there are other factors representative of the temper of the human community which constitute, beyond any doubt, a source of hope and confidence.

46. I have in mind the agreements which have been concluded or which are being planned on an international level concerning certain aspects of disarmament. At another level, I have in mind the definite and, I hope, decisive rapprochement which has lately been achieved on the question of the unification of the Christian churches.

47. The Greek people who, during the several thousand years of their existence, have shaped their history in the light of ideals drawn from both spiritual and secular sources without distinction, is prepared yet again to contribute to the advancement of civilization and human well-being. We are now, as in the past, determined to spare no effort which can serve and promote peace, justice and international cooperation, and which may clear the way for development, progress and civilization.

48. Mr. ZEA (Colombia) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, on behalf of Colombia I should like to join in the well-justified congratulations that have been addressed to you upon your assuming the high office of President of the General Assembly at this twenty-second session. Those of us who welcome your election do so in the certitude that, in conformity with your clear record and your career as a statesman, an eminent internationalist and a staunch friend of peace, you will direct our work with impartiality, justice, propriety and intelligence, in a task that will not be easy but that, encouraged by these lofty purposes, will of necessity help towards the solution of the serious problems with which we are called upon to deal.

49. This is the second time that, as Foreign Minister of Colombia, I have come to address this august forum. I do so with the respect that my country has always felt for the representatives of all the peoples of the world that have their place here and I come imbued with my country's traditional spirit of peace and resolved to apply this spirit to the decisions of this world Organization. I am glad, therefore, to reiterate these sentiments to you, to offer you our respectful greetings and to assure you of the admiration and affection that the people of Colombia feel for each of the peoples represented here.

^{3/} Fourth Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held from 11 to 14 September 1967.

50. We could not really feel satisfied, calm or in agreement with the situation with which we are faced at the beginning of this session of the General Assembly. The world has been unable to rid itself of fear, malaise and injustice, which are still characteristics of the present era. Violence is breaking out everywhere, with its train of bitterness and sorrow, and we are all filled with a foreboding that if certain situations are not remedied promptly, it may well be that world disaster may prove unavoidable.

51. In my statement on behalf of Colombia in the general debate at the twenty-first session [1416th meeting], I analysed the defects of our Organization and the efficiency it has occasionally shown in the preservation of peace. They are structural defects which, instead of being corrected, have been accentuated; far from there being any firm collective determination to rectify them, there seems to be an inexplicable design on the part of some Governments to retain them. That explains why our Organization has been unable to take action to achieve and impose peace in Asia. It also explains why it was unable to adopt any effective means of preventing the sad conflict in the Near East. The truth is that we cannot go on like this; the truth is that we cannot look on with cold indifference, or, if you wish, with anguish, while the world moves towards the abyss, nor can we afford to refrain from action to prevent the perpetration of the deeds that are going on before our eyes.

52. The non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is the first concern of the world of today and it will remain so as long as the spectre of an atomic conflagration looms up as a horrifying future prospect. Unfortunately, the efforts that the General Assembly has been making to halt the production and expansion of nuclear weapons have not made much progress.

53. The industrialized countries do not want to fall behind or to be at a military disadvantage in relation to the countries which possess such weapons and it would not be surprising if even the less-developed countries too might want to test their devices. For the time being there are two countries which are completely outside any international control for the testing and manufacture of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons and which possess them: France and Communist China.

54. It is no good belittling the danger that the proliferation of nuclear weapons presents for the world by arguing that the very fact of their terrifying destructive power, which could wipe out our present civilization, will always inhibit States from starting a conflagration of this kind. If we review the history of mankind, we see clearly that ambition and the desire to predominate have never known any barriers, and certainly not that of consideration of the inexpressible horrors that any armed conflict entails. Even today we hear macabre conjectures of the advantage that an atomic war could be for over-populated countries.

55. It is nevertheless encouraging, in the midst of this gloomy picture, to record the adoption at Mexico City, on 14 February of this year, of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. For Colombia the paramount interest of this Treaty lies in the fact that it prevents nuclear competition

among the Latin American countries in that it imposes upon them the obligation to refrain in future from possessing or manufacturing such weapons. Our peoples are overwhelmed with need, even to achieve minimum conditions for leading a life worthy of human beings and for enjoying the benefits of civilization. All that we can invest in this effort is a mere trifle compared with the magnitude of the need, and if one of the countries of Latin America were to decide to manufacture nuclear weapons we should soon see the others following suit, committing a large part of their scanty resources to it. We do not, therefore, want to be confronted with this state of affairs, which would be fatal for a region that is desperately striving to achieve development and which would thus see all its hopes of recovery shattered.

56. The ability of our world Organization to fulfil the essential purpose of its existence, its true *raison d'être*, that of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war, is still in question and is a serious matter not only for its prestige but for its very survival. Once again, in the recent Arab-Israel conflict, to which I shall refer later, the United Nations has shown itself powerless to prevent it.

57. We realize, however, that to bring about any change in the situation I have described is no easy matter. With the passage of time since the victorious Powers of the Second World War and their then allies conceived and created this Organization, subsequent developments have produced a world in which the marvels of technological progress are accompanied by a sharpening of social conflict and international mistrust. And in this stormy process the Members of our Organization are either the main protagonists or are involved or compromised. To speak of the non-aligned countries is almost meaningless. All countries are fettered to situations which certainly do not allow them complete freedom of action and, as is natural, each one or each group wants its own interests to prevail. Thus the true and supreme interests of mankind are relegated to a lower plane in this grim struggle, this fight between the Powers, this surge of material appetites and transactions and calculations. It would be inconceivable in such a world that the members of the Security Council would be willing to forgo their veto power and in democratic fair play to submit to a competent majority that would impose certain obligations on them against their will. If that is impossible, it will be equally impossible for us to place ourselves at last in the only position that is admissible for this world Organization, which, if it fails to take that position, will see its prestige diminishing day by day in public opinion: namely, its full ability to prevent war and to safeguard peace.

58. The United Nations General Assembly will at this session concern itself once again with the conflict that has occurred in the Near East between the Arab States and Israel. I should like, on behalf of my Government, to make a fresh appeal for common sense, and even human brotherliness, in order that we may arrive at a lasting settlement based on justice.

59. Colombia must state here that its conduct, both within our regional group and in the Assembly, has been strictly confined to principles which it has

warmly defended throughout its life as a nation and which are immutable rules in relations among peoples. None of its words or attitudes could have been considered partial. At every moment it has sought justice and it has found identical intentions among its brother countries of the continent. It has never harboured any feeling of aversion for any of the countries that were involved in this conflict. I should like to express the admiration of my Government and my people, and their feelings of friendship and affection, for each one of the Arab States and for the State of Israel.

60. The tension in that part of the world affects us all. I cannot accept the idea that the situation that has been created, and that is becoming more inflammable day after day, may not at any given moment affect general peace. Even if that were not so, the sight of groups of human beings confronting each other, ready to annihilate each other, causes all nations anxiety and uneasiness. Yet everyone advises these countries to adopt an attitude in which the ardour that they have displayed would give place to reciprocal efforts of collaboration and understanding, which would undoubtedly bear fruit. This, of course, implies the comprehensive collaboration of all nations, and in particular the great Powers; not the collaboration that has been given up to now, which has consisted of arms and instruments of destruction that inevitably provoke fresh and more bloody and dangerous armed attacks, but constructive aid, mediation in the cause of peace, restorative action that would banish fear and anxiety for ever from this area that is of such importance and of such significance in the history of mankind and replace it with creative tranquillity.

61. The unanimous action of the countries forming the Latin American group in the discussions that the General Assembly held in order to consider the warlike conflict between the Arab States and Israel gives my country—and, I hope, its brother countries—a theme to ponder, which I think I should deal with in this speech. I am doing so precisely because it refers to what can be and what should be, in my Government's opinion, the role of the Latin American countries in the elucidation of the problems that affect the world.

62. By reason of its broad and constant tradition of respect for law, and of defence of legality and peace, its deep-rooted culture, the brilliance and mental capacity of its internationalists and the invaluable contribution that it has made in the history of culture to the formation and concept of international law, Latin America must play an important part in the decisions that affect the future of the species. But in order to do so it must work and act in unity.

63. This united position, the presence of all our countries with one single point of view—and the more so if that point of view is supported by sound moral and legal arguments—can at least gain the allegiance of a considerable part of the honest opinion of the other nations of the world. And this has proved true on other occasions. Latin America must have its own policy, which reflects the common aspiration of our peoples. It is true that the countries of Latin America have followed the line of the Western nations faithfully and with conviction—not simply out of opportunism, or for a whim, or for advantages, but on the

basis of an ordered body of philosophical and political doctrine. We believe in representative democracy, in the importance of certain spiritual values and in the permanence of inherent juridical principles. In the complex world of today, when the blocs of nations which were formed in the Second World War are disintegrating and when each of them tries to make its own interests prevail even over the principles of our basic Charter, it is necessary that Latin America should proclaim before the international community a line of conduct that may help to clear away the shadows of this confused world and produce some clarity. For this effort Colombia offers its most determined co-operation.

64. As a result of persistent acts which had been widely broadcast to world public opinion, the organ of consultation of the Organization of American States met recently at Washington.^{4/} There, decisions were taken with the object of halting the action of the Government of Cuba, which, as is well known, is designed to promote, finance and direct subversive movements in the Latin American countries. Such movements have made themselves felt in varying degrees in different Latin American countries, although in none of them have they actually represented a serious danger to the stability of its institutions. As far as Colombia is concerned, I can state that propaganda and sensationalism have exaggerated a situation that has never been so serious or marked by such unrest as they claim. My country is proceeding with its orderly and peaceful development, within a legal and political system of deeply rooted freedom.

65. The immense majority of the Latin American countries have severed diplomatic and commercial relations with the Government of Cuba. They have, however, gone no further. Their object was to form a sanitary cordon in order to protect their way of life, but they have never tried to interfere in the internal affairs of Cuba or to replace the régime in power there by one chosen by themselves.

66. On the other hand, the persistent, blatant and calculated action of the Government of Cuba in intervening in the internal affairs of the Latin American countries is beyond all doubt a scandalous violation of the principle of non-intervention enshrined in the United Nations Charter and in General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX). The international community and the world Organization which is its authorized mouth-piece cannot remain indifferent to such acts; for that reason, and in accordance with the decision unani-mously adopted by the States members of our regional system, the facts will have to be carefully analysed here.

67. In the context of the great efforts that the international community has been making to correct the increasing disequilibrium in social and economic matters in the world, Latin America can offer some comforting facts. In the Declaration of the Presidents of America signed at Punta del Este on 14 April 1967, there is something that directly concerns the leaders of the world economy: it is the part that refers to the relations of the Latin American countries with the industrialized countries and the need for external

^{4/} Twelfth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, held in June 1967.

financial and technical help to carry out the development programmes.

68. With regard to the first point, it is common knowledge that it is the adverse terms of their international trade that has seriously hampered the progress of our countries. There is still a tremendous and lamentable lack of understanding on the part of the developed countries of the terms on which their trade relations with the developing countries are carried out, and unfortunately this spirit does not seem to have changed. The whole economic orientation of international trade and industrial production is designed to make things more difficult for the countries which live precariously from the proceeds of their basic products, the prices of which decrease from day to day on the international market while the prices of manufactured products increase.

69. Recently, in an important article by Josué de Castro, attention was drawn to the impressive fact that, at a time when the external aid given by the industrialized countries to the developing countries amounted, at the most, to an annual total of \$8,000 million, the military budgets of those countries amounted to more than \$150,000 million. The author of the article said that the comparison between those two figures was the most serious indictment of the policy of the great Powers. For a world in which the elementary needs for food, housing and clothing are calling more and more urgently for some relief, even temporary, it is a source of perpetual resentment to see such extraordinary sums invested in armaments, military equipment and powerful offensive devices. And, worst of all, while that expenditure tends to increase, the money invested in external aid is daily growing less. Moreover, external aid is granted on a bilateral basis and in such circumstances it is generally the political and economic interests of the country granting the aid that prevail over the real needs of the recipient country. Thus the developing countries are placed in a position of inferiority and insecurity.

70. Thousands of voices have been raised in denunciation of this tremendous injustice, which is growing greater with every day that passes. Today the world has before it the spectacle of great prosperity on one side and poverty on the other. Such a world cannot and must not continue—and it certainly will not continue for many years. In his splendid encyclical Populorum Progressio of 26 March 1967, Pope Paul VI gave the leaders and the people of all nations a counsel that we must not forget and that I shall venture to quote to you:

"The same duty of solidarity that rests on individuals exists also for nations: 'Advanced nations have a very heavy obligation to help the developing peoples'... Given the increasing needs of the underdeveloped countries, it should be considered quite normal for an advanced country to devote a part of its production to meet their needs."^{5/}

71. As this new session of the General Assembly opens, my country expresses the hope that we may reach fundamental agreements on the real and more acute problems facing the nations, that we may find

^{5/} Populorum Progressio, Encyclical Letter of His Holiness Pope Paul VI, para. 48 (Vatican Polyglot Press, 1967).

suitable ways of settling disputes, that we may work out sound ways of relieving human suffering, eradicating violence and banishing fear, that each human being may gain some degree of well-being, however small. As mankind grows and science advances, producing the wonders that civilization has placed before our astonished eyes, the ideal of justice becomes more elusive. But we must not resign ourselves to that fact: it is our duty, in the light of our grave responsibility as leaders of our respective countries, to fight stubbornly and tirelessly, undaunted by the most formidable obstacles, to build a future of prosperity for man in a world at peace.

72. Mr. MALIK (Indonesia): Mr. President, please allow me, first of all, to congratulate you on your election to the important position of President of the General Assembly at this Session, and to thank the retiring President, Ambassador Pazhwak, for his valuable service in presiding over three difficult consecutive sessions. In extending our felicitations, Mr. President, my delegation and Government wish to assure you that we are confident that you will fulfil your new duties with the same distinction which has characterized your service to the cause of the United Nations in the past. We also welcome you as representing an important region of the world community which, we regret, has not previously been called upon to provide leadership to the Assembly.

73. Each new session of the General Assembly brings with it a new opportunity to demonstrate again our commitment to the ideals set forth in the Charter. Therefore, let us begin the work of this session mindful of that opportunity and of our obligation to unite in the spirit of the Charter for the settlement of the many and grave problems facing us. A start towards their solutions, moreover, must be made quickly in order to prevent world tensions from reaching a level that will make an explosion inevitable, thus creating further suffering to mankind and making the goal of world peace even more difficult to achieve.

74. The intensity of the warfare in Viet-Nam is increasing; those involved cling just as rigidly to their own positions and become even more suspicious of each other's intentions. The consequences of the recent war in the Middle East aggravate a problem that is of long duration. The ever-increasing arms race threatens to disrupt even the precarious "balance of terror" that prevails at present. The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples made by this Assembly [resolution 1514 (XV)] is not being implemented; instead, more obstructions are appearing to its implementation. And finally, the difference between the standards of living prevailing in the rich and poor States is becoming ever more overwhelming. In all those cases, different peoples are struggling for objectives involving rights, justice and peace.

75. If we are to be successful in our efforts, we must first understand the underlying causes giving rise to the conflicts. Mistrust and suspicions grow out of the differences in ideology and concepts between what have been called "super-Powers" and give rise to an international atmosphere in which it is easier to suspect than to trust one another. External interference in the domestic affairs of other States, compulsion

and subversion in political, military and economic forms, poison international relationships. Colonial domination is being strengthened by acts of racial discrimination, and both directly violate human rights. The more affluent States often consider only their own prosperity, while at the same time the greater part of the human race is still burdened by hunger, poverty, ignorance and disease.

76. The picture presented here is indeed dismal. Man's capacity in the field of technology far surpasses his ability to solve the more immediate problems of living together in peace. All the wonders of modern science will be useless if weapons replace words and deeds as a method of solution.

77. Individually we must do our utmost to correct our own national shortcomings, while collectively seeking to create conditions in which our common aspirations for world peace and prosperity can thrive. Since our Proclamation of Independence, Indonesia has possessed its own national guide in pursuit of that goal. The Preamble to our Constitution requires the Indonesian Government

"to protect the whole of the Indonesian People and their entire native land, to advance the general welfare, to develop the intellectual life of the nation and to contribute in implementing a world order based on independence, lasting peace and social justice".

78. These aspirations of our people, as set forth in the 1945 Constitution and embodied in our national philosophy of Pancha Shila, the five principles upon which our country and national life are founded, must be upheld. The deviations from Pancha Shila and the 1945 Constitution that occurred during the period of the old order resulted in severe and damaging consequences to the foundations of the life of our nation. The main task of the new order is to re-establish those principles in their pure form and to maintain their integrity against all attempts to revert to practices which violated them.

79. The present Government has launched a political and economic stabilization programme to create the necessary conditions for attaining these ends. In this framework, our most pressing national duty at the moment is to stabilize and rehabilitate our national economy. The sufferings of our people have gone too long unheeded. In the short term our domestic programme is aimed at controlling inflation, meeting the people's needs for daily subsistence, rehabilitating the economic infrastructure and increasing export activities.

80. In the long term we have setup a scale of priorities: first for development in the agricultural sector, then in the field of the infrastructure, and finally for the development of industry, including mining and oil resources. We have already begun to implement our programme, and in 1969 a five-year development plan will be put into effect.

81. In our foreign relations we are trying to realize the deep aspirations of our people for an Indonesia that can contribute to the building of a world community in which an atmosphere of friendship among nations and peoples can exist. With this in mind we are deter-

mined to pursue an active and independent foreign policy to achieve these goals.

82. We have begun to pursue such a policy with our neighbouring countries of South East Asia, with whom we wish to lay strong foundations for living together in peace. In August 1966 Indonesia reached agreement with Malaysia to end all the acts of hostility that had accompanied confrontation. Since that time our relations with both Singapore, which we had recognized previously, and Malaysia have continued to improve. Today we are pleased to be able to state that formal diplomatic relations have been resumed.

83. With the formation of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations we have launched a policy of close and mutually beneficial regional co-operation with Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. In the declaration establishing the Association those countries stress their own primary responsibility for strengthening the economic stability of the region and for ensuring their own peaceful and progressive national development. By this means we are determined to ensure our stability and security from external interference in any form or manifestation in order to preserve our own national identities in accordance with the ideals and aspirations of our peoples. In this connexion the declaration also stresses that foreign bases, which are of a temporary nature, should not be used directly or indirectly to undermine the national independence and freedom of these States or to stand in the way of their national development. In its aims and purposes the Association strives to accelerate economic growth, social progress and cultural development, and to promote technical, scientific and administrative co-operation through joint endeavours. The sole aim of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations is to achieve the benefits of mutual prosperity for its members. It wishes to be on friendly terms with all countries. Its purposes are in full accord with the United Nations Charter. Furthermore, it is consistent with the spirit of Asian and African co-operation as embodied in the Bandung Declaration. ^{6/}

84. The problem of Viet-Nam is one of the major obstacles in the path of reaching closer relations among the nations of South East Asia, as well as being one of the most serious threats to international peace and security. The Indonesian Government is convinced that this situation is one which must be solved by the people of Viet-Nam themselves, without any outside interference. A Viet-Nam settlement, in the opinion of my Government, should be based upon the 1954 Geneva Agreements, reached thirteen years ago for this very purpose. If a peaceful settlement at the conference table is to be reached promptly, the first step must be the immediate and unconditional end of the bombing of North Viet-Nam in order to promote conditions conducive to mutual agreement and settlement.

85. Another situation which vitally affects the relations among nations in South East Asia and in the world as a whole is the hostile attitude displayed by the People's Republic of China towards the other States in the region. In particular, we cannot remain silent in the face of subversive and provocative acts directed against Indonesia's national integrity and people, which

^{6/} See the final communiqué of the Asian-African Conference, held at Bandung from 18 to 24 April 1955.

are contrary to accepted standards of international practice and conduct. We will exercise our right to take whatever measures we deem necessary to defend ourselves from such encroachments.

86. It is a conspicuous and highly regrettable fact that the present most serious threats to world peace and security lie in precisely those regions that would benefit most by calm, in order to develop their internal economies. The two most pressing items on the agenda of this Assembly are the situation in the Middle East and the continuing problem of colonialism. Both of these questions require our urgent attention, since both are capable of becoming focal points for the outbreak of a major war.

87. The Government of Indonesia cannot conceal its great disappointment over the outcome of the fifth emergency special session of this Assembly that recently considered the crisis in the Middle East. Again, we should like to call upon all parties concerned to exert their most strenuous efforts towards reaching a lasting settlement. The large and powerful States have a special responsibility in this direction, since their very size and power give them unique responsibilities when the peace and security of the world are at stake. It is Indonesia's conviction that Member States, by utilizing the machinery available through the United Nations, ultimately serve their own best interests; we maintain that the United Nations is the best forum in which to seek a peaceful settlement and possesses the best machinery for that purpose. We continue to support the struggle of the Arab States. We remain convinced that the first step on the only path to permanent peace in the area is for the Israeli troops to be withdrawn to the positions they occupied prior to 5 June.

88. Indeed, there was near unanimity in the fifth emergency special session on the principle of no territorial gains by military conquest alone. We fully endorse the view of the Secretary-General that such a policy would lead to disastrous consequences if the United Nations were to compromise on this fundamental principle. Only then will it be possible to solve the other urgent problems, including the plight of the refugees and war casualties.

89. I referred earlier to the seriousness with which Indonesia regards the subject of colonialism. The perpetuation of colonial relationships is a crime against humanity. Seven years after this Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples there are still 30 million people suffering from the inevitable injustices of colonial rule. This is an intolerable situation which must—I repeat must—be resolved without further delay. In the southern area of Africa the colonial Powers have actually taken steps to strengthen their domination, and long-standing policies of racial discrimination are being intensified, contrary to even the most basic concepts of human rights.

90. The Government of Indonesia continues to support and to encourage all peoples struggling to achieve their national independence. We oppose imperialism in all its forms and manifestations. Indonesia will continue to support any measures to compel the colonial Powers to follow the recommendations al-

ready made by the United Nations with respect to South West Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the colonial Territories under Portugal.

91. As to all other Non-Self-Governing Territories, the Government of Indonesia calls upon the Assembly to set an early date for the complete independence of each Territory concerned. Steps must be taken rapidly to improve the existing educational facilities, and to provide adequate measures in the social and economic fields for promoting economic viability. Equally urgent are steps to eliminate all remaining foreign military bases.

92. Still another problem endangering the peace of the world is the ever-increasing arms race. Unhalted, it may well lead to world annihilation. We must, therefore, increase our efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament. Simultaneous with those efforts, we must also strive to reach agreements on collateral measures, especially a comprehensive test-ban treaty and a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. With regard to this last aspect, the non-nuclear countries' legitimate interests and concerns should be taken into full account.

93. The attention of this session must also be turned to the problems of economic development, since, in the final analysis, a solution to those problems will be decisive in the search for world stability and prosperity. The more dramatic nature of the political problems which confront us must not blind us to the fact that the necessary pre-condition for political stability is economic stability.

94. Of course, in the first instance, economic development is the responsibility of each individual State. But economic questions today are of such an interrelated nature that many of the problems confronting the developing countries do not lie solely within their power to solve. Many economic problems are inevitably international in their range and effect. It is precisely in such areas that international co-operation must be increased. The United Nations has already succeeded in opening new channels by means of international bodies to discuss and co-ordinate their over-all aspects. There is the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development for the trade problems of the developing countries, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization for problems of industrialization, the United Nations Development Programme for technical assistance and pre-investment activities; while capital investment would this year, we hope, be channeled through the United Nations Capital Development Fund.

95. But such bodies as those will remain mere forums for discussion if there is no political will among the more highly industrialized States to take the concrete steps that are so drastically needed. In this connexion it is to be hoped that the developed States will alter their attitudes and show that they mean to co-operate in deeds. The second Session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development will be a test case as to their intention. I must stress again that world peace and stability, in the last analysis, depend on whether or not the world community is truly committed to the fact that the world is one interrelated whole in which the

economic health of one area is inevitably linked with that of every other area. The ultimate consequences of economic stagnation and collapse in the countries striving to modernize their economies will be as catastrophic to the "have" nations as to the "have nots".

96. The extent of the role of the United Nations in settling all these wide-ranging problems depends on the positive attitudes of all the Member States. We must all, surely, recognize that the existence of the United Nations in this world has had a beneficial influence upon the resolution of many international questions. It would certainly be dangerous for all of us if unilateral action were to be restored to a prominent place in international relations.

97. We therefore have no alternative but to make the greatest effort of which we are capable to ensure that this world Organization fulfils the role which the whole of mankind expects of it. Apart from efforts to adapt the structure and organization of the United Nations to the changes taking place with the passage of time, Member States must do more. It is necessary for each one of us, every Member State, every delegation, every member of a delegation, to possess the goodwill and the determination to work with devotion that the United Nations may become a truly effective instrument for building peace and creating well-being for the whole of mankind. We must approach our task with the deep conviction that, however impossible of solution our problems seem we can, through persistence, diligence and patience, eventually reach just and lasting solutions. It would certainly be unrealistic to expect quick and easy answers to problems many of which are as old as civilization itself. But we must begin in the full realization that we, meeting here, are mankind's best hope for survival.

98. Mr. LARA BASTAMANTE (Costa Rica) (translated from Spanish): In an important speech made at the University of Santiago, Chile, about the middle of last year, the eminent statesman who has acceded to the unanimous wish of this General Assembly, expressed during the previous session, and is continuing to serve mankind as Secretary-General of the United Nations, said the following:

"The future of the United Nations, therefore, rests to a considerable degree with the small nations—in their sense of responsibility, their independence and objectivity, their dedication to the principles of the Charter and, above all, their collective determination to help attenuate and bring an end to the dangerous tensions which have affected international relations so adversely during the last twenty years. . . . A constant effort, year in and year out, on the part of all nations, both large and small, is essential to build a lasting peace."

99. Inspired by those thoughts, which tally with the views that have so often been expressed at this rostrum by representatives of Costa Rica, I wish to reaffirm the faith of my compatriots in the ideals of the Charter signed at San Francisco, the determination of my country not to flag in its efforts to help to translate those ideals into living reality, and our hope that the day will come when, with the abatement of international

tension and the improvement of the lot of the men of the undeveloped world, peace may reign on earth.

100. The relief of international tension and the improvement of the living conditions of the less fortunate sectors of mankind; these are the essential objectives that must be achieved before we can consider that the aspirations that brought this Organization into being have been fulfilled. These are the objectives that we must pursue, year in and year out, without respite and without discouragement, for we know full well that they are not easy to achieve.

101. Looking back over the last year to draw up a balance sheet, we can in truth find little encouragement in the list of successes achieved. On the contrary, it must be said that the period that has elapsed since the last session of the General Assembly has been a sad period in the history of the world, a period that has closed with a negative balance for the United Nations, since the progress that has been made in some fields has been counteracted by the stagnation, and even retrogression, in other aspects of the relations between nations and, which is even more important, relations between men.

102. It is certainly not encouraging to know that blood is still being shed in the peninsula of Viet-Nam and that its lines of communication and its industrial installations are still being bombed, despite the promise made by the powerful nation that responded to the South Viet-Nameese Government's appeal for help that it would put an end to the bombing as soon as the Hanoi Government announced that it would, in turn, cease its support of the guerrillas who are trying to destroy the democratic system established south of the 17th parallel.

103. Nor is there any cause for optimism in the persistence and intensification of the racist policy of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, which is completely deaf to the appeal of the United Nations and of men of goodwill throughout the world who ask it to cease the oft-condemned practice of apartheid immediately and which does not give the slightest sign that it intends to modify or relax the laws and regulations that the conscience of mankind cannot accept in this last third of the present century.

104. Again, it does not comfort the spirit to observe that, after twenty years of the existence of our Organization, a group of Member States denies the right to existence of another Member State and refuses to recognize its legal status as a sovereign person under international law, while that State—which came into being as the result of a resolution of the General Assembly—flouts another resolution of the same body and does what it will with territories about which the international community is entitled to state its wishes, since they are sacred to more than a thousand million human beings.

105. It is equally discouraging that, despite all the promises and all the efforts, the gap between the few rich countries and the many poor countries is widening as a result of a system of international trade that is daily becoming more favourable for the rich countries, because of the constant increase in the prices of manufactured goods, and more detrimental to the poor coun-

tries because of the equally constant fall in the prices of the basic commodities they export.

106. These, however, are the very challenges that we must face, the challenges that are the real reason for the existence of our Organization. We must face them with faith, for, as the illustrious man who is the spiritual head of many millions of human beings—His Holiness Pope Paul VI—has said, the United Nations is today mankind's last hope. And hope, as a desire that is rooted in the human soul, must stay with man until the last day of his existence.

107. We must make a supreme effort to put an end to the conflict in Viet-Nam and to bring the blessings of peace and progress to that long-suffering region of Asia. As Members of the body that came into being as a result of the determination to save the generations of today from the scourge of war, we cannot remain indifferent to a state of war that has been going on far too long, the more so when no one denies the fact that the three nuclear Powers with the greatest population are day after day increasing the support they are giving to the Governments of the peninsula, whether with armed forces, with more and more advanced and deadly instruments of war or with more and more financial assistance. All these are factors that by their very nature could cause the conflict to spread beyond the geographical limits within which it is now contained, bringing the world to the brink of a nuclear war that would mean the inevitable destruction of the civilization that has been built up at such cost by more than a hundred organizations. It is the earnest hope of the Government of Costa Rica that through the normal channels provided by our Organization, or by other ingenious means which the presence of the distinguished statesmen in this Assembly may bring to light, the final dialogue may start which will lead to the termination of the conflict and will enable the people of South Viet-Nam to decide their own future through the ample means of democratic consultation, free from all pressure or interference, open or hidden, from any country or any Power.

108. This Assembly must also endeavour to find the difficult, but necessary, formula that will bring permanent peace to the Middle East, putting an end to the undeclared war that has been going on intermittently throughout the life of the United Nations. The passage of time will not stanch the wounds, for passions run deep and there are great interests that could take advantage of them in a political manoeuvre of world-wide dimensions, to start the conflict all over again. On the other hand, it is not beyond hope that calm consideration of the facts and the circumstances will enable the enlightened leaders whose responsibility it is to watch over the destiny of these peoples to find the middle term of the just solution that will establish peaceful conditions where hitherto people have lived in a state of war. The heat of the battle is over, the smoke of gunfire that darkened the skies has disappeared and they can now see more clearly where the solution lies that will bring their peoples great and lasting benefits. We still think that, in its broad lines, the formula submitted by the delegations of the Latin American group of countries at the last emergency special session^{2/} offers the best possibility of a

^{2/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Annexes, agenda item 5, document A/L.523/Rev.1.

temporary solution which will lead to a final solution of the related problems of the Middle East.

109. Another extremely dangerous situation is that which is still prevailing in southern Africa and to which I had occasion to refer during the general debate at our last regular session [1421st meeting] and that I subsequently described to the Legislative Assembly of my country in summary form, in the following terms:

"The policy of racial discrimination practised by several Governments in southern Africa and in extreme form in the Republic of South Africa has been condemned by the United Nations from the first days of its existence and has already given rise to a large number of resolutions calling for the abandonment of that policy. Indeed, these practices of separation and different treatment among men on the sole grounds of the colour of their skin and their ethnic origin run counter to the most fundamental human rights and the principles underlying the very concept of democracy; and today they are constituting a dangerous phenomenon that may one day lead to an armed clash of gigantic proportions between the men of different races who inhabit the African continent. Costa Rica has always supported proposals designed to condemn these inhuman practices and to ask the Governments to abandon them, and has bent all its efforts in favour of this noble cause from the seat it occupies in the Ad Hoc Committee of nine members set up for that purpose.

"Another of the serious problems facing the United Nations is the attitude of the Government of the Republic of South Africa with regard to the territory of the former German colonies in South West Africa, for that Government refuses to recognize the authority of the United Nations to declare the Mandate given to South Africa by the League of Nations terminated and claims that the territory belongs to it by right of conquest. This institutional conflict is extremely serious and the delegation of Costa Rica has made known its firm intention to uphold the validity of the legal principles that deny the existence of the right of conquest in the present era and its opinion that it is a basic right of any people to exercise self-determination and to live an independent life whenever the majority decides upon it by a free vote."

110. The situation has not changed since then and my Government, which still considers this to be one of the most dangerous problems for the future of large sections of the human race, promises that it will continue to give all its support in this struggle for the respect of human rights, which cannot end except with the victory of a noble cause.

111. This is the second time that I have attended the opening meetings of the General Assembly session and I thought it necessary to state my Government's views on the major problems which at the moment seem to be threatening the peace of the world, because of the possibility that they may jeopardize a large number of countries and because of the danger that one day or another they may give rise to large-scale international conflicts. They are not the only parts of the world where there is armed peace, or disguised belligerency, but today they are the greatest source of constant

clashes and the greatest potential peril of a future holocaust. I have voiced the views of my country, which has made a religion of its love of peace and democracy, for no other reason than to demonstrate my people's solidarity with the high officials of the United Nations who are devoting all their energies to putting out the fires wherever they may break out and are sparing no effort in their quest for acceptable solutions that will enable mankind to contemplate his immediate future with less anxiety.

112. I shall now venture to take up a few more brief minutes of the General Assembly's time in order to refer to another big problem—a bloodless one this time, but none the less important—that should continue to receive the attention of the United Nations. It is a problem that directly affects my country, as also another eighty-five States Members of this Organization. I refer to the constant deterioration in the terms of trade between the products of the nations which we call "developing" and the products exported to those nations by the industrialized countries. And here I should like to quote some passages from a speech made recently by the President of Costa Rica in the presence of the Chiefs of State of twenty-one countries of America:^{8/}

"Indeed,"—said Mr. Trejos Fernandez—"the terms development and under-development seem, primarily, to be euphemisms, through the use of which the economic literature of our time has sought to mitigate the dramatic reality of extreme wealth existing side by side with extreme poverty—persons in the latter category not poor through any fault of their own, but because of the action of economic interests beyond their control. And just as there is no longer any question of the need for social action to prevent the wretched inequalities in income among the peoples within one country, so must we encourage acceptance of the idea that the welfare of humanity demands a firm effort to attenuate the disparities in incomes among two or more countries. . . . This is the concept on which development policy and, in general, relations between the developed and the developing countries should be based. The latter certainly do not want a charitable hand-out from what might be called international income; they merely want an opportunity to improve their condition by their own efforts. We of the developing countries do not make our appeal to the people of the industrialized countries as taxpayers but as consumers. It is not our desire that they should pay more taxes to increase public aid for development policies. . . . It is not a policy of favouritism that we ask; what we demand of the highly-developed countries is an opportunity to specialize and improve our production and to obtain therefrom the income that will enable our people to live with simple dignity . . . the firm determination to integrate our action to bring price-levels of Latin America's agricultural and mining products in line with the rising prices of goods that science and technology make available to man to increase the enjoyment and ease of his life and work. In other words, if we have to pay high prices for the goods that our peoples so urgently and justifiably demand for their well-being, the prices of the products of

our own soil and labour must be proportionately high."

113. The United Nations has been working through its specialized agencies on development programmes designed to correct the existing imbalance, which with the fall in agricultural prices is becoming worse. Those programmes, however, are far from reaching the recommended minimum of 1 per cent of the gross national product of the industrialized countries and they are considerably weakened by the premature servicing of interest and amortization to which the countries receiving the loans are committed. We have therefore welcomed the recent resolutions of the United Nations setting up such institutions as the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and the United Nations Capital Development Fund, which supplement the work of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and offer new prospects for improving the economic and social conditions of the peoples who have not yet reached the minimum level acceptable in this century.

114. Costa Rica has always played an active part in the field of human rights and its delegations have been resolute in pursuing, day after day, the ideals of promoting and ensuring respect for those rights which are inherent in the human person. It therefore gave my Government great satisfaction to sign the Covenants and Protocols on human rights adopted at the last session of the General Assembly [resolution 2200 (XXI)] and it is happy to note that at this session the Assembly will study the final stage of the plan for the establishment of the office of High Commissioner for Human Rights, on the basis of the draft resolution submitted by Costa Rica at the twentieth regular session of the General Assembly.^{9/} My Government wishes to express the hope that this important office will be created during this session, despite the suspicion and reluctance with which the draft resolution has been viewed by a few highly respectable delegations.

115. I must also state that my Government is firmly convinced that the Treaty for the denuclearization of Latin America, which the Latin American countries signed recently at Tlatelolco, as a result, in particular, of the persistent efforts of prominent Mexican statesmen, constitutes a model for the signature of similar agreements that will finally lead to the prompt and total denuclearization of the world, so that the advances which the splitting of the atom has brought will be used only for the good of man and not for the destruction of mankind. My Government hopes, in particular, that the Governments of other regions, especially those which already possess nuclear weapons and those which are in a position to possess them in the future, will subscribe to the Additional Protocol II,^{10/} so that the Treaty may have its full value and effect.

116. Before I close, Mr. President, I should like to offer you my congratulations on the well-deserved distinction that the General Assembly has bestowed upon you by electing you to this office, thus demonstrating its recognition of your merits and emphasizing the universality of our Organization, which is

^{9/} Official Records of the General Assembly, twentieth session, Annexes, agenda item 98, document A/5963.

^{10/} Treaty of Tlatelolco, concluded in Mexico on 14 February 1967, Additional Protocol II (see A/6663).

^{8/} Meeting of American Chiefs of State, held at Punta del Este, Uruguay, 12-14 April 1967.

open to countries of every system and ideology, based on the principles of unity of the human race and the equality of rights of sovereign States. I also wish to state my Government's appreciation of the skilful, discreet and intelligent way in which Mr. Abdul Rahman Pazhwak directed the discussions at the last regular session, the emergency session and the emergency special session and to state how pleased our Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Mr. Luis Demetrio Tinoco, was to collaborate in those important functions as a Vice-President of the General Assembly and a member of the General Committee.

117. In conclusion, I should like to pay a tribute of respect to the Secretary-General and to express my wishes—which are those of the Government and people of Costa Rica—for the success of the work we are starting and for a future of peace, harmony and well-being for all the nations which have come together to offer mankind the blessings of progress and welfare.

118. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of Cuba, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

119. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): I find myself obliged once again to exercise the right of reply in order to refer to the interesting statement made by the Colombian Minister for Foreign Affairs this afternoon. We cannot disregard this statement, for there is a highly significant paragraph in it which will no doubt have attracted the attention even of his own Latin American colleagues.

120. According to the Colombian Foreign Minister, the great majority of the Latin American countries have decided to sever diplomatic and trade relations with Cuba simply as a defence mechanism against my country's aggression in that continent and, to use the Minister's very words, "they have gone no further". He also added, with an extraordinary ignorance of what has happened in that continent, that those countries "have never tried to interfere in the internal affairs of Cuba or to replace the régime in power there...". Yet in this very Hall there are people within the Colombian delegation itself who have direct evidence that this has not been so and that such, at least, has not been the attitude of the Colombian Government.

121. The fact is that from 1959 to the present day the Cuban nation has been the victim of aggression of every type, acts of hostility, sabotage, infiltration of spies, encouragement of armed bands and organized terrorism, planned and directed by the imperialist Government of the United States, with the co-operation, asked for and given, of the majority of the Latin American countries, in particular the Colombian régime.

122. The Organization of American States has not adopted a single resolution and has not uttered one word of condemnation, or even rebuke, of Yankee imperialism in this aggression against Cuba. We can provide a concrete example for the Colombian Minister, who has perhaps forgotten it, although his honourable colleague, the Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations—who at that time occupied the post that the Colombian speaker occupies today—must remember the aggression of which my country was the victim at Playa Giron, six and a half years ago.

123. That aggression was carried out with the active co-operation of various Central American countries, which have never concealed their responsibility in the matter. Moreover, the invasion was organized, directed, planned and financed by the imperialist Government of the United States, as President Kennedy was obliged to admit publicly.

124. Perhaps the present Colombian Minister does not remember, or does not know, what his country did on that occasion, but Ambassador Turbay Ayala may possibly remember. What did Colombia do with regard to that aggression? Did it utter one word of reproof in the Organization of American States? Did it perhaps venture to criticize the policy of the Washington Government? No. The Colombian Government, whose international policy was at that time directed by Ambassador Turbay Ayala, was a year later the chief instigator of the subsequent meeting of the Organization of American States at which, at the specific request of Colombia, it was decided to condemn Cuba and to exclude it from the inter-American system, simply because of the way of life that its people had chosen after a heroic struggle.

125. The truth is that Yankee imperialism, with the help of the majority of the States members of the OAS, has done everything in its power to destroy the Cuban revolution. The plain fact is that they have failed. And that is because in Cuba we have a sanitary cordon that is much more efficient and well tried than that mentioned by the OAS. This cordon is a wall that is absolutely impervious to imperialism and its agents, a wall built with a material that the members of OAS have not yet discovered; the courage, dignity, valour and patriotism of our people.

126. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call on the representative of Colombia, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

127. Mr. ZEA (Colombia) (translated from Spanish): I am sorry to have to distract your attention for a few brief minutes, in order to reply to what the Cuban representative has just said. I have already, on other occasions, had the good fortune—if you like—to be confronted by representatives of Cuba. On one occasion it was Che Guevara himself—Ernesto Guevara—who was then Minister of Cuba and the leader of his delegation and who from this rostrum made an impassioned attack on all the Latin American countries. He was indeed an important man. The fact is that today we do not know what has become of Che Guevara. A little time ago our Bolivian colleague told us at Washington that there was a suspicion that Guevara was leading the guerrillas in Bolivia. But there are sceptical people who think that this important man, this embattled orator, this well-informed man, has probably been the victim of those dark, mysterious, tortuous and conclusive dealings to which throughout history totalitarian systems have had recourse in order to rid themselves of people who might become too prominent. It is still, however, an open question.

128. I wish to tell the Cuban representative that there is nothing in his statement to show—and moreover it could never be proved—that the Latin American countries have tried in any way to replace the Marxist-type Government that is now in command in Cuba by a

government chosen by the Latin American countries. I can state on behalf of my own country that such has never been our intention. On the contrary, day after day we are suffering action which, while it does not—as I have said—imperil our institutions or represent any real danger either for society or for the Government, is nevertheless deplorable: bands of guerrillas instigated by Havana, who carry out raids on our troops and on defenceless peasants, always leaving a legacy of tragedy, tears and blood and obliging our Government to spend money on efforts to preserve our security and to defend all our helpless people from this homicidal fury, money—I repeat—which we could use in our efforts to overcome the phenomena of under-development.

129. There is a General Assembly resolution [2131 (XX)] which is familiar to us all, since it was adopted by the representatives of all the countries seated here, and which prohibits interference in the internal affairs of States; in the face of that resolution, there are the constant statements by the Prime Minister of Cuba in which he blatantly declares that he wants to intervene in the Latin American countries in wars of liberation, in order to free our people from aggression and imperialism.

130. Moreover, there is a great deal that could be said on this question of imperialism. I myself, for example, told Che Guevara on that occasion that perhaps the only Latin American country that was really a satellite was Cuba, for none of us representatives of the other countries watched to see how such and such a Power voted so that we could vote the same way, and we could adopt absolutely independent positions, which was certainly not the case with the delegation of Cuba.

131. In any case, there is only one problem involved here, that of intervention, and we shall see how, when the facts are brought to light, and evidence produced, it will be clear that this is a serious transgression in the international life of the Cuban régime.

132. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of Cuba has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I now call upon him.

133. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): I do not wish to prolong this discussion with the honourable representative of Colombia, because he was definitely not able to reply to my arguments or to cite one single case in which the Colombian Government has defended the principle of non-intervention when that principle has been violated even slightly by the United States Government.

134. In addition, the representative of Colombia is trying to perform a very difficult feat, which is to transform history in the presence of the very protagonists, the very witnesses, of this history. He spoke about the Cuban vote, Cuba's satellite position and the sovereign, independent and heroic position of Colombia. He said all this in the midst of the General Assembly, before the representatives who have been present at the debates, who know what has been done. I simply submit to their judgement, for they know which is the independent attitude, that of Cuba or that of Colombia.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda (*continued*) *

SECOND REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/6840/Add.1)

135. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We now turn to agenda item 8. In this connexion, the Assembly has before it the second report of the General Committee [A/6840/Add.1], concerning the inclusion of the following new items in the agenda of the twenty-second session: "Need to expedite the drafting of a definition of aggression in the light of the present international situation" [A/6833 and Corr.1]; and "Conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons" [A/6834].

136. The General Committee recommends that those two items be included in the agenda. May I take it that the Assembly adopts the recommendation of the General Committee?

It was so decided.

137. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now invite the Assembly to consider the recommendation of the General Committee concerning the allocation of the item on the definition of aggression.

138. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): As you know, the Soviet Government, guided by a desire to reduce international tension and to strengthen peace and security, has introduced the item entitled "Need to expedite the drafting of a definition of aggression in the light of the present international situation", for consideration by the twenty-second session of the General Assembly as an important and urgent matter.

139. The political significance of this question and the urgent need for its solution have been explained in great detail in the statement made on 22 September 1967 by Mr. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union during the general debate [1563rd meeting] and in the explanatory note submitted by the Soviet Union [A/6833].

140. One of the most important tasks of the United Nations is to maintain peace and to halt and prevent aggression. However, of late there have been increasing instances of the use of armed force to commit acts of aggression against States and to crush peoples struggling against colonialism and for freedom and independence. It is generally known that these acts of aggression, which are undermining world peace and international security, are causing grave concern among peoples. They are increasing the danger of the outbreak of a new world conflict, with all the disastrous consequences that would follow.

141. In conjunction with the vigorous condemnation of aggression and the adoption of measures for preventing it, the formulation of a definition of aggression could, particularly in the present international situation make an important contribution to the cause of peace. It is well known that the States which are resorting to armed force in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations have often, taking advantage of the absence of a generally accepted concept of aggression, sought to make use of various artificial pre-

*Continuation of the discussion at the 1564th meeting.

texts and unfounded reservations in order to cover up and justify their aggressive actions against peace-loving States. A definition of the concept of aggression would contribute greatly to the maintenance of international peace and the adoption of effective measures to prevent aggression; it would be a stern reminder to the forces of aggression and war that they bear responsibility for violating international peace.

142. The Soviet Government hopes that the General Assembly will consider this matter at its current session with the utmost seriousness and with a sense of responsibility for the fate of the world.

143. We are pleased to note that the General Committee recommended almost unanimously that this item should be included in the agenda of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly. We are thus all the more pleased to note the approval of the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly. However, the Soviet delegation can only regret that the General Committee was not able to decide that this item should be given due consideration in the First Committee and that instead it proposed to allocate it to the Sixth Committee, thus making the whole matter a purely juridical one.

144. Allow me to remind you that the Soviet delegation has already expressed its views on this matter in the General Committee, and that we consider it necessary to repeat them here in the General Assembly.

145. It seemed obvious to us that the item "Need to expedite the drafting of a definition of aggression in the light of the present international situation" should be allocated to the First Committee for its consideration.

146. Firstly, as we have already stressed, what is required is the adoption of a political, not a juridical decision—a decision to expedite the drafting of a definition of aggression. Thus, we are not concerned with the formulation of the definition of aggression itself, for which, of course, the help of the competent legal experts would be required. As you know, Soviet experts have been participating in this work for several decades.

147. Secondly, our proposal indicates that this question should be considered from the outset in the light of the present international situation; in other words, in the light of the political facts.

148. Moreover, reference to the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet delegation on this matter [A/6833] will surely make it clear that this question should be considered primarily from the political point of view.

149. Of course, we are by no means opposed to the participation, at an appropriate stage, of the Sixth Committee, which is concerned with the legal aspects, in the examination and formulation of a definition of aggression.

150. It should be noted that the above considerations met with fairly broad acceptance and support in the General Committee, and we recall that opinions were more or less divided. It is regrettable, however, that the General Committee was unable to find a formula which would meet the views of the various delegations,

and the question was in fact settled by means of the voting system.

151. The Soviet delegation wishes to take this opportunity to appeal earnestly to the members of the General Assembly, with the utmost seriousness and in a spirit of goodwill, to solve this question by supporting the Soviet proposal that this item should be considered by the First Committee.

152. Mr. FAKHREDDINE (Sudan): It will be recalled that when the question of the definition of aggression came before the General Committee there was no disagreement that it was essential for the General Assembly to give urgent consideration to this question.

153. The Sudan is of the opinion that the question of the need for accelerating the definition of aggression in the light of the present international situation should in the first instance properly be considered in the First Committee, and we maintain this for the following reasons.

154. What is required in the first place is an analysis of the international situation in order to demonstrate the urgency of the question of defining aggression. This analysis seems necessary because the question of the definition of aggression has been with us since the days of the League of Nations. The attempt to come to an agreed definition has been made repeatedly and abandoned every time. Many formulas have been proposed but none of them has been universally acceptable.

155. The United Nations first considered the question at its fifth session in 1950 and referred it to the International Law Commission [resolution 378 (V)]. The International Law Commission could not agree on a full definition. At its sixth session the General Assembly decided [resolution 599 (VI)] that it was "possible and desirable ... to define aggression by reference to the elements which constitute it". Thus the directive on how to proceed on the definition of aggression is already there. It was given by the Assembly at its sixth session. It should be by reference to the elements which constitute aggression. That is the kind of directive that is given by the General Assembly to a legal body and was in fact given to such a body. But we are not at this stage primarily concerned with that kind of directive. We are concerned here at this stage with a political kind of directive. We are concerned with analysing the international situation in order to bring out clearly—in the light of this situation—why it has become necessary that the United Nations should come to an agreed definition of aggression for "the future guidance of such international bodies as may be called upon to determine the aggressor". [Resolution 599 (VI).]

156. My delegation maintains that it is possible to argue, as the Soviet Union has argued, that this is all that the present item as submitted by the Soviet Union [A/6833 and Corr.1] requires us to do and if this is all that we are required to do, the item should be considered exclusively in the First Committee.

157. The First Committee is designated according to rule 101 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly as the Political and Security Committee, and it is a political and security question that is involved in the consideration of this item. For this is

intrinsically a question of a political nature and any fruitful continuation of the legal discussion, which is also necessary, requires some political guide-lines. I should like to make it clear that my delegation thinks that it is only at the first stage that the question should be discussed in the First Committee. At a later stage it will have to be considered by the jurists; but hopefully when that stage is reached the political difficulties will have been ironed out.

158. However, the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union as part of its explanatory memorandum for the proposed item anticipates the latter stage in its operative paragraph 2. Operative paragraph 2 of the draft calls for the establishment of a special committee to draw up a draft definition. That is clearly a legal committee, and the task of its establishment is properly within the realm of the Sixth Committee. But we have not reached that stage yet.

159. The delegation of the Sudan therefore supports consideration of this item in the First Committee, although we would not be averse to its consideration in plenary.

160. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (translated from French): This is the first time that the Algerian delegation has spoken at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly. For that reason, Mr. President, we wish to congratulate you most warmly on your notable and unanimous election to the high office of President of the General Assembly. The fact that for the first time a representative from the socialist world is assuming this great responsibility has for us a great political significance at which we cannot but rejoice.

161. Turning to the matter under discussion, may I congratulate the delegation of the Soviet Union for having proposed the inclusion of a matter as vital as that of the "Need to expedite the drafting of a definition of aggression in the light of the present international situation" [A/6833 and Corr.1] in the agenda of the twenty-second session. A discussion was held in the General Committee on the allocation of that item [168th and 169th meetings], and arguments were put forward in favour of allocating it to the First Committee and to the Sixth Committee. I must say that, a priori, it is difficult to choose between these two alternatives, all the more so since in annex II, sub-paragraph (g) of the rules of procedure, we find the following recommendation:

"That, when a Committee considers the legal aspects of a question important, the Committee should refer it for legal advice to the Sixth Committee or propose that the question should be considered by a joint Committee of itself and the Sixth Committee."

Obviously, we could choose that solution, which might be somewhat cumbersome and perhaps even somewhat ineffectual.

162. On the other hand, in another discussion in the General Committee, also concerning a question of a legal nature, the Chairman of the Sixth Committee drew the attention of members to the fact that jurists were also men, in particular, political men, and that the discussions they might have as jurists, even in the Sixth Committee, were not discussions in

abstracto, but arose out of political discussions. In addition, precedents were cited; our attention was drawn to the fact that such discussions had been held in the First Committee. We were also informed that that sort of question had been referred to the International Law Commission.

163. In fact, all that leads to one conclusion: that the nature of the problem is both political and legal. Furthermore, the very wording of the item, as just approved by the Assembly, implies that dual nature, since on the one hand it deals with the drawing up of a definition of aggression—which is basically a legal matter—and, on the other hand, the definition must be worked out in the light of the present international situation, and that is essentially a political question.

164. I must ask pardon for dwelling on such obvious matters. My delegation would prefer to avoid this duality which I have attempted to point out to the Assembly, particularly in view of its possible implications; cumbersomeness and perhaps even an ineffectual discussion.

165. Would it not be appropriate, useful and more efficient to take up this matter in plenary meeting? In this way, all its aspects—legal, political or other—could be freely discussed. This would in no way prevent the Assembly from referring the matter to the Sixth Committee at a later stage, in the light of the outcome of the discussions.

166. Taking all those considerations into account, and in conformity with article 92 of the rules of procedure, my delegation would like formally to propose the following amendment to paragraph 3, sub-paragraph (a) of the second report of the General Committee [A/6840/Add.1]:

"[The General Committee] decided, by 13 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions, to refer the item to the plenary Assembly and, in the light of the discussions and the results obtained, to consider the advisability of referring the same question to the Sixth Committee."

167. We realise the delicate and pressing—I might even say explosive—nature of this question. However, to the extent that that proposal meets with the agreement of the Assembly, we believe that it would enable us to avoid a double impasse: that which would consist in treating the problem solely from the legal angle, though we are aware of its political aspects; and that which would consist in discussing it basically on the political level, though we shall of necessity have to formulate the outcome of our discussions. We believe that by debating that question in plenary Assembly, we shall be able in large measure to sort out the various viewpoints and schools of thought on the subject and, in that way, to assist jurists to arrive at practical results at a later date.

168. In conclusion, I should like to appeal to the delegations of the Soviet Union and the Sudan not to press the proposals they have just advanced. I feel sure that if we make a common effort in a spirit of full understanding—taking particular account of the pressing nature of the problem—we can effectively deal together with this problem in the plenary Assembly.

169. Mr. CERNIK (Czechoslovakia) (translated from Russian): There is no doubt that the prohibition of aggression, which is the crudest form of the inadmissible use of armed force, is one of the cornerstones on which the United Nations is built. It is therefore a very serious matter that there is so far no exact definition of the meaning of aggression.

170. The question of the definition of aggression is of the utmost importance for the maintenance of international peace and the safeguarding of collective security. The adoption of a definition of aggression would be a serious obstacle to the realization of aggressive aims and would place the responsibility for wars on those who really initiated them.

171. None of the proposals so far submitted by the Soviet Union in pursuit of this aim has yielded any results. The position of the United States of America has been an obstacle to any intensive work in this direction.

172. The general situation with regard to the question of defining aggression is all the more serious since in recent times aggressive acts have been committed in various parts of the world, and the consequences of these acts have not only not been eliminated, but are even being justified. The international community of nations is therefore most anxious that measures should immediately be adopted which would provide the basis for the elimination of a situation which is profitable for aggressors.

173. The aim of the proposal [A/6833] submitted by the USSR at this session is precisely to create favourable conditions to expedite the drafting of a definition. This is clearly demonstrated also by the title of the item proposed by the Soviet Union.

174. There is no doubt that the definition of the concept of aggression has political and legal aspects. The obstacles which have persisted for a number of years, and which still exist, relate primarily to the political aspects. Only the removal of these obstacles and a clear mandate from the Special Committee, as the Soviet Union proposes, can create the necessary conditions for the drafting of a definition of the concept of aggression.

175. The General Assembly of the United Nations must adopt a decision giving a clear and fundamental political mandate for the First Committee which would establish all the conditions for further constructive work, otherwise certain States will continue their attempts to exert pressure by every available means, including postponements and procedural delays, in order to hinder serious efforts to formulate this definition.

176. From the political point of view, it is essential to dispel the doubts as to the impossibility of working out a definition of aggression which certain States, in particular the United States of America, attempt to create and to spread. It seems to us, therefore, that a decision should be taken in a political context in order to establish the conditions for the organ which will be entrusted with the task of formulating a definition of aggression.

177. In our opinion, one most important consideration is that, since this question was last discussed in a

political body, the number of Members of the United Nations has increased, and we should give them an opportunity to state their political positions on this question.

178. In view of the arguments which have been put forward, we support the proposal that the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union should be considered in the First Political Committee. This would give special emphasis to the importance of the whole question, and that in itself would constitute a first step towards the elimination of the present extremely alarming situation which must be considered by us in all seriousness.

179. Mr. SEATON (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, the leader of the Tanzanian delegation will in due course express Tanzania's gratification at your election to your high office. For the moment, allow me to express our congratulations on your election.

180. The Tanzanian delegation has given careful consideration to the item before us entitled "Need to expedite the drafting of a definition of aggression in the light of the present international situation" [A/6833 and Corr.1]. Its importance is obvious, particularly to those countries of the Third World, the smaller countries, which will obviously be the first to suffer if this principle of non-aggression is not adhered to. The question of the allocation of items in the General Assembly should not in our opinion be one of detailed discussion and intricate manoeuvring. The basic principle, surely, can only be one of convenience. What contributes most to the efficient discussion and settlement of the problem?

181. The answer to this problem cannot be sought by reference to any magic formulae or set of rules. On the other hand, our delegation is fully aware that the elaboration of the principles enshrined in the Charter can have, and has had, a beneficial effect on international relations generally. If any proof were needed, one would only need refer to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, elaborated by this Assembly previously.

182. To which Committee should the item which has been proposed be allocated? It has political, legal and other elements. We recall that the question of non-intervention was discussed in the First Committee at the twentieth session but so many legal principles were involved that representatives from the Sixth Committee were brought in to assist and, at times, to replace the representatives in the First Committee. Then we recall that the following year the question of the non-use of force was discussed in a plenary meeting [1482nd meeting] at the twenty-first session and satisfactory results were achieved; a wide measure of agreement was the result.

183. We know that the question of consideration of principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States has been before the Sixth Committee for several years. The elaboration of those principles has not been an easy task. Progress is being made, but it is possible that progress might have been greater if some of the elements which are troubling the members of the Sixth Committee had been considered in other Committees.

184. We have given careful consideration to the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union and also to the comments of the representative of the Sudan. It would seem to our delegation that the question of aggression would be relevant in the discussion of another question which is before the plenary, namely, the question of the Middle East. It would seem to our delegation that to pass from the specific to the general would not be too inappropriate in the plenary, and we have been impressed by the arguments of the representative of Algeria that the plenary, where, after all, all of the representatives will be able to present political, legal or other arguments, might be the appropriate forum, the one that could produce the most effective results.

185. For these reasons the delegation of Tanzania wishes to support the amendment proposed by Algeria to the effect that the item proposed by the Soviet Union, relating to the definition of aggression, should be referred to the plenary and, in the list of the debates and the results obtained, the Assembly should consider the possibility of the question being discussed in the Sixth Committee.

186. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (translated from French): My delegation has noted with satisfaction the proposal of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the inclusion of this item in the agenda [A/6833]. The item is not a new one. It has been debated in the General Assembly, and thus far no solution has been found.

187. In the opinion of my delegation, the reason for this negative aspect—for the General Assembly's failure so far to adopt a definition of aggression—is that the item was originally referred to the Sixth Committee. That Committee considered the question of the definition of aggression for several consecutive sessions. During the course of those discussions, it became apparent that the problem was not exclusively of a legal nature. The problem has political aspects. Had it not been for these political aspects, there would have been no problem. For that reason, if we bear the present international situation in mind, to refer the question of the need to define aggression to the Sixth Committee is in my delegation's opinion to beg the question; it means deciding at the outset that there will be no definition of aggression.

188. Indeed, if we analyse the organization and work of the General Assembly, we find that the Legal Committee—the Sixth Committee—acts as the Assembly's legal adviser. In every organization, as in every administration and every society, such an adviser can give his opinion on a specific question only if he is informed of the situation which gave rise to that question. Thus the Sixth Committee cannot give its opinion or take a decision in the matter if the precise and actual problems involved are not placed before it.

189. I myself recall that the debates in the Sixth Committee centred around politics. But those debates led nowhere. One began to wonder if it were possible to define aggression, and that has been the negative attitude adopted up to the present time.

190. We see that the current international situation is highly explosive. The Middle East question, which was debated over the summer during the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly, showed

how precarious peace was. Peace must rest on basic principles, and one of those principles, embodied in the Charter, is the principle of non-recourse to aggression.

191. On 5 June 1967, an aggression was launched against an entire nation, against countries. That aggression was launched by Israel, acting as the agent of imperialism. I know that some representatives do not like to hear this, but I am not addressing myself to them. I am not speaking to those who committed or encouraged aggression; they may think what they please. But it remains a fact that an aggression was committed which threatened the integrity, independence and sovereignty of a number of States and peoples and of an entire nation.

192. If we wanted to have a definition of aggression as a criterion for determining whether aggression had been committed or for describing how it had been committed, we would be unable to do so, for up until now the Sixth Committee has found it impossible to arrive at a definition of aggression.

193. We are aware that during its twentieth session the General Assembly decided that imperialism constituted a crime against humanity. In the present world situation and in the conditions prevailing more particularly in the newly independent countries, aggression is closely linked to imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. All those concepts are concepts of a political nature. They are not purely legal concepts. The legal adviser must be able to work out a definition, taking the facts into consideration, and those facts can be provided only by a political organ.

194. Since, according to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the First Committee is that political organ, the question of the definition of aggression should be allocated to that Committee. I should like to recall that during the fifth session of the General Assembly it was the delegation of Syria that suggested the definition of aggression^{11/} — I am happy to bring this up here, since I am proud of it—following which the Assembly referred the problem to the International Law Commission. The report of the International Law Commission having been discussed in the Sixth Committee, we thus arrived at the present situation, in which that Committee has until now been the one responsible for discussing the question of the definition of aggression. But if we really want to deal with the matter at issue, if we want to give things their exact meaning, we must recognize that the item we are now discussing must be allocated to the First Committee.

195. Nevertheless, in the light of the pertinent arguments put forth here by the representative of Algeria, my delegation supports his proposal that the question should be discussed by the General Assembly itself, to be referred later, if necessary, to the Sixth Committee. I consider this a sensible proposal which should therefore be adopted.

196. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): My delegation strongly supports the recommendation made by the General Committee [A/6840/Add.1, para. 3 (a)] to allocate the proposed item entitled "Need to expe-

^{11/} See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 72, document A/1500.

dite the drafting of a definition of aggression in the light of the present international situation" [A/6833 and Corr.1] to the Sixth Committee—the Legal Committee. This recommendation was made after exhaustive debate in the General Committee, and it is well to recall some of the considerations which led the General Committee, by an overwhelming majority vote, to make the recommendation. It is also necessary to dissipate some of the confusion which apparently exists in the minds of some concerning what we have before us.

197. We do not have before us any controversy about the inscription of this item. My country voted for the inscription of this item; it did not oppose it. Therefore, the inscription is something that, I take it, this body accepts, namely, that this matter, which was brought to the General Committee and proposed for inscription in the agenda by the Soviet Union, ought to be considered.

198. We are dealing with the allocation of the item. Where should it go? What is the appropriate Committee or body of this Organization to consider the item, which concerns the need "to expedite" the definition of aggression. That is the question we have before us—the question of allocation.

199. I want to make it very clear that my delegation does not enter into this debate nor did it enter into this debate in the General Committee on the basis of trying to delay, or defer, or postpone, or bury consideration by the United Nations in an appropriate way of aggression and what it means—what is its definition?

200. What we have before us is not that, but the question of which body of this Organization is the competent body to define aggression. I think the issue is a very simple one. It was put, I think, by one of the proponents of another method of defining aggression in this way: it should be considered as a political matter, and, after it is considered as a political matter, perhaps then jurists ought to be given an opportunity—in the light of the consideration of this matter as a political matter and under political guide-lines—to determine what juristic consideration should enter in a definition of aggression. That is a completely topsy-turvy method of developing international law. It is a completely unacceptable method, in fidelity to the Charter, of developing international law.

201. I put to this body a simple question: is any nation in this body ready to accept the principle that a matter of this magnitude—which is a matter of international law, whether or not aggression should be defined in one manner or another—should be determined not by principles of international law, in accordance with the Charter, but by political considerations?

202. The United States has no objection to debating political matters. And we have no objection if any Member brings before this Organization matters involving breaches of the peace, regardless of their cause, which are obviously political matters under the Charter. Indeed, we have made determinations on that subject in this Assembly. For example, several speakers have referred to the situation in the Middle East. Obviously, that involved a breach of the peace.

We agreed in the General Committee, and the Assembly endorsed it, that this matter should be considered as one of high priority; and we shall consider it as such.

203. It has been a matter of great speculation to me what other matter the sponsor—the Soviet Union—desires to submit to this body as a political matter. Is it Viet-Nam? We invite the Soviet Union to inscribe it as a political matter in the agenda. We shall vote for it either in plenary or in the First Committee.

204. Now, what other matter is involved? We ought not to beat around the bush, offer a resolution and then give no enlightenment in the memorandum which has been submitted, concerning the object of the exercise. If it is to define aggression, then that is a legal matter; that is a matter of international law and one which under any conceivable interpretation of the rules or the Charter should go to the Sixth Committee.

205. We are all experienced in United Nations affairs. Every nation is represented in the Sixth Committee, and represented by eminent lawyers and jurists who can and should devote their consideration to this important subject. If, as I have heard from the proponent, it is to discuss this subject "at a political level, in the light of the present state of international affairs", if we are to refer it to the First Committee or to the plenary, are we not merely doing what we are now doing in the general debate?

206. What else are we doing in the general debate? Every speaker, including the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, the proponent of the item, has spoken about the present state of international affairs. Indeed, that has been the subject of all the speeches that have been made thus far by everyone who has addressed this Assembly. So is this a proposal for another general debate upon the conclusion of the general debate we are now having?

207. I cannot conceive this to be a serious proposal. I can only conceive it to be a propaganda proposal. We are entitled to know before we vote what is the basis for this proposal. This question was raised in the General Committee, but we received no enlightenment on it. Indeed, the counter-proposal which has been made—to have a discussion in plenary and then, mind you, not refer the question to the Sixth Committee but have the Assembly consider whether it should be referred to the Sixth Committee—illuminates the fact that this is merely another way of saying that this matter of defining aggression is a political matter and not a matter of international law; that is the way the proposition was put.

208. I believe that the basic purpose of this Organization is to establish a régime of law. If we succeed in that, we will succeed in our great task of bringing peace to the world. If we fail in that, we will fail in our task of bringing peace to the world. I can conceive of no possible basis for substituting, as is now contemplated, in an area which is one of the great areas of international law and one of vital concern to every nation in this hall, political tests rather than juristic tests of that important international law principle. Then we would all depend upon majorities rather than on a rule of law to determine the fate of international

relations, our country's security and, ultimately, the peace of the world.

209. I am not being unrealistic about this. I know how difficult it is to arrive at a concept of this type. Nevertheless we must persevere with the best help we can get from lawyers and judges genuinely dedicated to international law and, I repeat, not guided by political considerations but rather guided by principles of law and justice on the question of what a definition of aggression is.

210. The General Committee correctly allocated this item. It makes no sense to send it to the First Committee, where there will be a repetition of the general debate here. It certainly makes no sense at all again to convene plenary meetings to repeat the general debate.

211. Mr. BERARD (France) (translated from French): I should like briefly to set forth my delegation's position, as I have already done in the General Committee [169th meeting]. My delegation's position is as follows.

212. We are of the opinion that such a difficult and technical question as that of the definition of aggression must be studied by competent specialists in a truly technical body. That is why we believe that a definition of aggression can be drawn up only by a body such as the Sixth Committee, and that is why we are not in favour of the allocation of that item to the First Committee.

213. On the other hand, we have been very receptive to the arguments advanced by a number of delegations [*Ibid.*]; I should mention in particular the delegations of the United Arab Republic, of Libya and of Jordan, which expressed their concern at the time which has elapsed since this question was first considered by the United Nations.

214. We understand, and we acknowledge, that it is necessary and advisable that the attention of the United Nations should be drawn to that question, and not only the attention of the United Nations, but that of international public opinion as well. We fully understand, too, that there should be a desire to attribute a certain political character to that question. It was for that reason that I stated, at the meeting of the General Committee, that it would seem logical to us that the question should be brought up for debate in the plenary Assembly and should subsequently be examined by the Sixth Committee.

215. A proposal was made a few minutes ago by the representative of Algeria. The French delegation is of the opinion that it should be made quite clear in advance that the item will be sent to the Sixth Committee for study after it has been stated that it is to be debated in plenary Assembly. My delegation will concur in any wording proposed along those lines. If it is a wording which reflects the views of my delegation, it will vote in favour of it.

216. Mr. HERRAN MEDINA (Colombia) (translated from Spanish): I should like to explain my delegation's point of view on this matter of referring the item on the definition of aggression to the body which is most competent to consider it and to obtain positive results.

217. First and foremost, the inclusion of this item in the agenda is commendable, for the definition of aggression is an indispensable factor to enable the competent international organs to pronounce judgement on situations in which there is alleged to be aggression. We are not discussing the facts here, however, but only the need for aggression to be defined by the organ of the Assembly best qualified to do so.

218. Hitherto the item on the definition of aggression has always been considered by the Sixth Committee. It has been proposed that, in view of the difference of opinions about whether to refer it to the First or to the Sixth Committee, we should adopt a unique procedure—at least it seems rather unusual—whereby the Assembly would consider the item in plenary session and then refer it to the Sixth Committee, thus reversing the procedure which logically seems the most useful and suitable.

219. I would venture to point out that in any case, after the item has been referred to the Committee best qualified to consider it, the General Assembly will have to consider it on the basis of the report submitted by that Committee. That being so, I fail to see why we should reverse the normal procedure and submit this item first for discussion in the General Assembly and then send it to the Committee.

220. Moreover, as the Latin American members of the General Committee have maintained, surely the Committee most indicated to consider the item is the Sixth. It would be the First Committee were there any question of trying to judge acts which were alleged to constitute aggression, but as it is simply a matter of providing international organs with a definition of aggression, a definition which is an indispensable instrument for determining whether acts alleged to be acts of aggression are really so, it seems quite clear that the competent Committee is the Sixth.

221. We do not share the view of the delegations which have skilfully argued that the item on the definition of aggression is predominantly a political one. It is a definition, and as such is predominantly technical work, as has been pointed out here, and is predominantly legal, admittedly with political consequences; but the first necessity is to have a definition, so that subsequently it can have the political consequences of its application when acts or situations in which there are allegations of aggression are to be judged.

222. Thus the Sixth Committee would be called upon to formulate a definition of aggression which would be permanent and could be used at all times with respect to every type of deed which might be described as aggression.

223. Resolution 599 (VI), which the Assembly adopted at its sixth session, had its origin in the Sixth Committee, which was then dealing with the item, and the phrase "elements which constitute it", referring to aggression, which appears in the resolution and to which attention has been drawn here, certainly indicates that the elements which constitute aggression are those which, on a permanent basis, can identify any class of aggression. Consequently, my delegation is in favour of adopting the recommendation of the

General Committee and referring this item to the Sixth Committee.

224. Mr. SHAW (Australia): At this very late hour, I shall be brief. But, as a member of the General Committee, I should like to remind the Assembly that the subject that is being debated this afternoon was discussed at great length in the Committee [168th and 169th meetings], including the suggestions that the item we are considering should be considered by the First Committee and the Sixth Committee, either jointly or separately. Also, many members went over the earlier history of the attempt to define aggression: the attempts that were made at the time of the League of Nations; the attempts that were made at the time of the San Francisco Conference; and later, the attempts in the Committees of this Assembly. This is not a new problem. Mention was also made of the fact that the problem of the defining of aggression has probably become slightly more complicated. Aggression is now something which is not very easily identifiable. Aggression is not always something which is a simple movement of armed forces across a fixed border. We have other forms of indirect aggression: subversion, infiltration and incitement to revolt. These also are the subject-matter when we come to try to define aggression.

225. The debate this afternoon has been principally on the point of whether, in trying to make further progress in the definition of aggression, we should first of all have a political debate. I have listened with respect and interest to the arguments put forward on behalf of this. But as has been pointed out, if Members of the Assembly wish to indulge in a political debate on items which are rightly and properly their concern, they can do so, and will do so, either in the course of the general debate or perhaps in the discussion of an item such as that concerning the Middle East, which is inscribed on our agenda. There is no impediment to any Member of this Assembly in bringing up, here in the general debate or elsewhere, any situation which is of particular concern to that Member.

226. As to Viet-Nam, this already has been a subject very much under discussion in the general debate. If there is to be a more formal discussion of Viet-Nam, in our view this could quite properly, and quite easily, be put on the agenda of the Security Council at any time. Indeed, I think we should not overlook the fact that in the absence of a definition of aggression, the Security Council does in fact operate. It is not inhibited by the absence of a formal legal definition of aggression. When it is considering its functions under Article 39, for example, it is not inhibited by the lack of a legal definition; it hears a political debate, it takes political and legal decisions and it comes to its decisions in the light of its consideration.

227. One argument which rather appealed to me today was the suggestion that we would facilitate discussion in the Legal Committee if we first of all had a political discussion. But those of us who have had some experience of the work of the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, would, I think, query that argument. That Committee has made substantial progress in helping to define certain prin-

ciples set out in the Charter. It has made progress on those very principles which have not been the subject of political debate and of political resolutions. I would therefore query very profoundly the thesis that a political debate in this Assembly and a political resolution would help in the formulation of a legal definition. I think that all our experience is to the contrary; it might hinder this task. I speak of this with a certain seriousness, because all Members are most concerned about the proper definition of the principles which lie behind our Charter. The Committee on friendly relations has been making progress in the matter of these principles, and we should not, I think, make the work of the legal bodies more difficult.

228. It seems logical, therefore, that the task of proceeding with a definition of aggression should be taken up by that legal body or bodies which previously had attempted the task. I refer to the work done earlier by the International Law Commission, and I refer particularly to the work done by the Sixth Committee of previous Assemblies. I refer also to work in related fields by the Committee on friendly relations.

229. I think that if we want to make progress towards what is the objective of the draft resolution submitted by the USSR, towards a precise definition of aggression, then we must build on the work already done and we should, as recommended by the General Committee, ask that this be taken up by the Sixth Committee. I therefore recommend to the General Assembly the endorsement of the recommendation of the General Committee that this item should be referred to the Sixth Committee.

230. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (translated from French): I apologize for having to speak again on this difficult question. My delegation's only wish was to show a spirit of co-operation and try to do useful work.

231. We have heard a number of statements dealing with the merits of the arguments we attempted to bring forward in submitting our amendment to the recommendation of the General Committee [A/6840/Add.1, paragraph 3 (g)]. I must confess that we, for our part, were somewhat surprised at the tone taken by some speakers, howbeit distinguished, in discussing the merits of our argument, if not its good faith and intentions. The basis of those discussions centred on one word: "definition". In submitting our amendment, we were careful to state that this item was political and legal: legal because it concerned the definition of aggression, political because the process of definition should be speeded up and because that definition is not an abstract notion.

232. That definition forms part of a particular context. How can we label that context? Is it not political? A while ago, I said that my argument was hardly brilliant since it was based on obvious facts. I now have the impression that those facts are being denied so that the item may be referred to the Sixth Committee. Algeria agrees that this matter should be discussed in the Sixth Committee. The question has already been discussed by jurists. Unfortunately, those jurists, however well qualified, brilliant and outstanding they may be, will be quite unable to arrive at acceptable decisions unless a preliminary

debate, which must inevitably be political in nature, is held.

233. In point of fact, one word has been stressed as the reason for the strong recommendations made to refer the item to the Sixth Committee. Out of all the terms used in the proposal, the word "definition" has been singled out. For our part, we believe that the word "expediting" and the phrase "present international situation" should also as far as possible be considered. We believe those to be the three basic terms in the wording which the Assembly has just adopted. To single out one or the other is to attempt to create a stalemate. To consider them as a whole is, we believe, to accomplish useful work. What has been said has impressed us here and there, not by the pertinence of its argument, but by the impertinence of its tone. There is no question of defining aggression by means of majorities. Over the past twenty years, the United Nations has suffered too much as a result of decisions taken by certain majorities. For that matter, we know that those majority groups hardly exist any longer, given the balances—or rather, the imbalances—which exist in this Assembly. I know that, because of their training or their profession, some representatives have a kind of unswerving devotion to the law, and particularly to international law; but we are aware, and so must these eminent persons, that international law is basically no more than the resultant of a certain number of events and political relationships?

234. In the same spirit as that which moved us in the past, and as a result of the brilliant statement by the French representative, I should like to introduce a change in the amendment I submitted a while ago to the General Committee's recommendation. As changed, paragraph 3 (a) of that amendment would read as follows:

"[The General Committee] decided, by a vote of 13 to 5, with 5 abstentions, to recommend that the item be referred to the plenary Assembly and, in the light of the discussions and the results obtained, to consider that same question in the Sixth Committee."

235. I hope that some representatives who wished the matter to be referred only to the Sixth Committee will see fit to reconsider their position, in a spirit of compromise and in order to avoid needless division in this Assembly, and that they will, in so far as they are able, agree to the amendment as it has just been changed.

236. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): We have listened with great interest to the statements made here by a number of delegations in connexion with the discussion of the question of where the item introduced by the Soviet Union on the need to expedite the drafting of a definition of aggression in the light of the present international situation [A/6833] should be considered. We note with satisfaction the profound and interesting statements made by the distinguished representatives of Sudan, Algeria, Czechoslovakia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Syria and other delegations. Naturally, we listened with particular interest to the proposal which was introduced by Mr. Bouattoura,

the distinguished representative of Algeria, and also to the observations and clarifications made by Mr. Berard, the distinguished representative of France. At the same time, we would like to draw the attention of the Assembly to certain statements to which we cannot remain indifferent.

237. First of all, the representative of the United States of America, whom we have just heard, speaking with some pathos, asked what organ of the United Nations was the most competent to consider the question of the definition of aggression as proposed by the Soviet Union. And, of course, on the basis of his interpretation, he gave it as his categorical opinion that the Legal Committee was in fact the most authoritative and most competent organ for these purposes.

238. Naturally, everyone is free to express his own opinions. But in his anxiety to give a verdict, the judge here was obviously too hasty. The Sixth Committee is, of course, competent within its prerogatives. But is the General Assembly, this supreme organ and principal forum, really any less competent to consider questions of any nature, including the question with which we are dealing here? Why did our United States colleague have to deny the competence and authority of the General Assembly? It hardly seems necessary for me to say much on this point because everyone understands what the United States representative is afraid of in the discussion of this question.

239. Furthermore, the United States representative, with the same harsh tone in his voice, asserted that the drafting of a definition of the concept of aggression must needs be the exclusive concern of the Legal Committee. But the observations which he made in support of this assertion could hardly have convinced anyone. On the contrary, we should like to mention here the very interesting and conclusive statements made by the representatives of Algeria and other States and also the observations of the representative of France. For our part, we should like to point out that the Soviet delegation has no objection whatsoever, and never has objected, to the question under discussion being considered by the experts in the Sixth (Legal) Committee. In our statements we have pointed out that at an appropriate stage this question should undoubtedly be considered in the Sixth Committee. In this particular case, however, we are emphasizing that the drafting of a definition of aggression should be expedited and in this we are motivated by the need to consider this question in the light of the present international situation. Does not the present international situation require that the question of the definition of the concept of aggression should be considered without delay? Is it not a fact that everything that is taking place in the world makes it imperative that we should draft a definition of the concept of aggression as quickly as possible?

240. The USSR delegation, as we already said in our earlier statement today, considers that the item entitled "Need to expedite the drafting of a definition of aggression in the light of the present international situation" should most properly and most appropriately be considered in the First (Political) Committee. We have stated our arguments on this point in detail and we are grateful to other representatives who have just spoken in support of the USSR proposal, agreeing

with our reasoning and addition to the arguments in favour of this approach to the question. Nevertheless, taking into account the views of other delegations and in an attempt to resolve the difficulty which has arisen in a spirit of goodwill, the USSR delegation is prepared to agree with the proposal of the representative of Algeria, Mr. Bouattoura, to the effect that the question should first be considered in the plenary meetings of the Assembly, where a general debate should take place, and should then be referred to the Sixth Committee for consideration and for the adoption of a decision. It seems to us that such a compromise solution should satisfy the overwhelming majority of delegations in the Assembly.

241. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call on the representative of Israel, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

242. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel): I wish to make a very brief statement in exercise of my delegation's right of reply, simply in order to keep the record straight.

243. In the course of his remarks the representative of Syria, a country whose record in the pursuit of peace and coexistence in the Middle East is not one to qualify it for a peace prize, since it has made aggression one of the corner-stones of its foreign policy, has tried to throw off the historic responsibility of his Government for the crisis in the Middle East in the early months of this year and to place the blame on Israel.

244. Leaving aside the logical difficulty inherent in his stating that a State is an aggressor and at the same time insisting that the very concept of aggression requires urgent definition, I wish to recall and place on record once more that those charges were brought before the Security Council and were rejected. The charge was then brought before the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly, where it was again rejected. As the representative of Israel stated at the time, the Government of Israel acted in exercise of its inherent right of self-defence, which is fully protected by the Charter.

245. These charges are therefore completely unsubstantiated, and in the view of my delegation it was not in order for the delegation of Syria to raise them in this discussion.

246. In his statement on 25 September, the position of Israel was described by my Foreign Minister as follows:

"Discussion on the Soviet item is . . . to be warmly welcomed. The definition of aggression is for us a matter of deep historic and moral importance. All that the appropriate committee has to do is to enumerate what Israel has suffered from the Arab States in the past two decades. It will then have a complete and detailed draft for a convention on the definition of aggression." [1566th meeting, para. 166.]

247. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call on the representative of Syria, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

248. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (translated from French): I apologize for taking the floor again at this late hour, but the representative of the Israel authorities forces

me to do so. As a matter of fact, he was replying to a statement I had made, but which did not really deal with the matter on which he himself spoke. He made a statement for the record; I myself would also like to make a statement for the record, and I should like to say that history will remember 5 June 1967 as a fateful and memorable date for imperialism, and for those who wanted to further the schemes of imperialism, namely, Israel.

249. The Security Council and the General Assembly have been unable to adopt a resolution because there is no definition of aggression, because the jurists of the Sixth Committee and the members of the International Law Commission who have been trying to work out a definition of aggression have been working in a vacuum.

250. Consequently the statement of the Israel representative bears out the idea I expressed, namely, that a legal body must be briefed on the actual situation before it is entrusted with the task of drawing up a report. Now the actual situation mentioned by the representative who preceded me at this rostrum is based on an historical fact, and statements made for the record cannot wipe out history. History will be the judge. Mankind is suffering because imperialism has done all in its power within the General Assembly to prevent a resolution from being adopted, and because mankind suffers from that state of affairs, its suffering must be alleviated; and you cannot alleviate the suffering of humanity without taking certain necessary measures.

251. I wish to thank Mr. Rosenne very warmly for having enabled me to put forward this argument, and I now urge the General Assembly to adopt the proposal of the representative of Algeria that the matter should be discussed in the General Assembly and referred, if necessary, to the Sixth Committee.

252. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We shall now take a decision on the allocation of the item. The General Assembly has before it the recommendation of the General Committee to refer this matter to the Sixth Committee [A/6840/Add.1, paragraph 3 (a)]. The representative of Algeria has submitted an amendment which would give the following wording to the recommendation:

"[The General Committee] has decided, by a vote of 13 to 5, with 5 abstentions, to recommend that the item be referred to the plenary Assembly and, in the light of the discussions and the results obtained, to consider that same question in the Sixth Committee."

253. In accordance with article 92 of the rules of procedure, I shall ask the General Assembly to vote on the amendment submitted by the representative of Algeria. Before doing so, however, I call on the representative of the United Kingdom to speak on a point of order.

254. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom): I do not wish to discuss the substance of the matter, except to say that my delegation favours reference to the Sixth Committee, and that one might have thought that those who claim to be so keen on acceleration would consider that the best practical way to accelerate the

process would be to get on straight away with the essential task, the complicated and exact job of actual definition, which is clearly a job for the General Committee.

255. I now wish to raise my point of order. The representative of Algeria has, as I understand it, proposed an amendment to a recommendation of the General Committee. I would submit that the recommendations of the General Committee are the property of that Committee; they are completed acts.

256. Now, what the Assembly can do on these recommendations in its full power is to accept the recommendations, or to refuse to accept them, and then the Assembly can make a decision on allocation. The recommendations are recommendations of the General Committee to the General Assembly. If we amend those recommendations we are amending recommendations to ourselves, and then we will have to take a decision on those recommendations. I submit that it is out of order to amend a recommendation made by a Committee. It is perfectly in order to refuse to accept it and to suggest something else.

257. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call on Mr. Narasimhan, Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs, so that he may explain the procedure.

258. Mr. NARASIMHAN (Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs): It is, of course, not open to me to give a ruling on the point raised by the representative of the United Kingdom. I should only like to point out that while it is correct that the General Assembly has before it a recommendation by the General Committee, we have examples of draft resolutions recommended by a Committee—the First, or the Sixth, or any other Committee. It is open to any representative, when such a recommendation comes before the plenary, to propose an amendment to the draft resolution in question. When such an amendment is proposed, the draft resolution is not sent back to the Committee, for the Committee has completed its task. The amendment to the draft resolution is considered in plenary and voted for on its merits. I would see no difference from the point of view of procedure between a recommendation of the General Committee, which is a Committee of twenty-five members of the Assembly, and a recommendation or a draft resolution submitted to the Assembly in plenary by a Committee such as the First Committee, for example, in which all the membership is represented.

259. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call on the representative of Liberia to speak on a point of order.

260. Miss BROOKS (Liberia): I think that this involves some explanation and a point of order. It seems to me that the situation is becoming somewhat confusing. The General Committee has recommended [A/6840/Add.1, para. 3 (a)] that the item should go to the Sixth Committee, and the representative of Algeria also has recommended that it should go to the Sixth Committee. Therefore, I have a feeling that in the voting some delegations might be confused because, in voting against part of the Algerian amendment one would be voting against the recommendation that the General Committee has made.

261. It would seem to me that the representative of Algeria should formulate his amendment in this light—if he desires it to be so—that first the item should go to the First Committee. I am not committing myself on the vote which the Liberian delegation would cast but I think it should be stated plainly that the Algerian delegation desires that the item should go first to the First Committee and then there would be no confusion between the proposal of the General Committee and that of Algeria. But the Algerian representative has included a portion of the recommendation made by the General Committee, and I should like to have some explanation on that.

262. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call once again on Mr. Narasimhan for an explanation of procedure.

263. Mr. NARASIMHAN (Under-Secretary for General Assembly Affairs): As I understand it, the recommendation of the General Committee is that this item should be referred to the Sixth Committee. The amendment to that recommendation proposed by the representative of Algeria is that it should be first discussed in plenary and in the light of the discussion there should be transmitted to the Sixth Committee for further consideration. In other words, it is a question of what the first stage is and what the subsequent stage is.

264. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): In the light of the explanations just given by Mr. Narasimhan, I believe that we may now proceed to the vote.

265. Pursuant to article 92 of the rules of procedure, I shall ask the Assembly to vote on the amendment to the recommendation of the General Committee submitted by the delegation of Algeria [A/6840/Add.1, para. 3 (a)]. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Burma, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, France, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bulgaria.

Against: Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil.

Abstaining: Chad, Chile, Cyprus, Dahomey, Finland, Guatemala, Guyana, Iran, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Laos, Madagascar, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Philippines,

Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Austria.

The amendment was adopted by 49 votes to 37, with 24 abstentions.

266. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): With regard to the second item entitled "Conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons," the General Committee recommends that this item be referred to the First Committee [A/6840/Add.1, para. 3 (b)].

267. Since there are no objections, may I take it that the Assembly adopts the recommendation of the General Committee?

It was so decided.

268. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): In connexion with the item entitled "The situation which has arisen between Guinea and the Ivory Coast in-

volving section 11 of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations," I should like to remind the Assembly that the General Committee has decided to defer a decision [*Ibid.*, para. 4]. May I take it that the Assembly takes note of the General Committee's decision?

It was so decided.

269. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I understand that the General Committee will consider the question of the inscription of that item on the agenda tomorrow. I understand too that the question of the allocation of item 92 may also be considered at that time.

270. The Chairman of the First Committee and the Chairman of the Second Committee will be informed of the decisions adopted by the Assembly this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 7.35 p.m.