

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**1694th
PLENARY MEETING**

Monday, 14 October 1968,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

General debate (*continued*)

Speech by Mr. Nwako (Botswana)	1
Speech by Mr. Hoiyoake (New Zealand)	3
Speech by Mr. Bachev (Bulgaria)	8

President: Mr. Emilio ARENALES (Guatemala).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Ould Daddah (Mauritania), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. NWAKO (Botswana): My delegation wishes to take this opportunity to congratulate the President on his appointment to this high office during the twenty-third session of the General Assembly.

2. It would be redundant to recite the compliments he has rightly received with regard to his distinguished legal and political career. Suffice it to say that we concur with them and hope that, under his guidance, this present session will move towards resolving some of those international problems which have been hardened by the perennial character they have already acquired.

3. My delegation wishes also to extend its warmest congratulations to the distinguished President of the last session, His Excellency Mr. Corneliu Manescu, for the able and impartial manner in which he conducted the business of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, which was, to say the least, characterized by a variety of extremely grave and contentious issues.

4. May I address myself to the Secretary-General in no less complimentary terms for the way in which he has continued to discharge his onerous task. It has not been easy for him to decide on courses of action acceptable to all the delegations of this body, but his sincerity, integrity and wise judgement have confirmed the respect of my delegation for him.

5. Lastly, I wish to congratulate Swaziland on its attainment of independence and on becoming a Member of the United Nations. It is a special joy to Botswana that Swaziland has come into this community of nations and we look forward to its contribution to the varied problems which confront this Organization.

6. Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland have had a long history of association with common problems and aspirations under British protection. These three States occupy a unique position, both geographically and politically, in southern Africa and, by virtue of this fact, they have a claim to practical and intimate experience of the complex race relations and the resultant attitudes peculiar to that part of the world, which is one of the points of focus of international attention. The fact of geographical placement is absolute and we do not regret it, but the international community will do well to appreciate the problems which affect each of us, problems which derive from our situation at the southern tip of Africa.

7. Continual reassessment of the United Nations in terms of the principles and aims embodied in the Charter is vital to its continued existence, because from time to time the fulfilment of its aims is curtailed and even violated in various places for various reasons. The constant reiteration of the principles of justice, human rights, the dignity of man and respect for the integrity of autonomous States prods the conscience of the world. In this process of reassessment, my delegation wishes the undisputed place of the smaller nations to be recognized. It is they who can still keep the conscience of the world community alive.

8. Nowadays the greater Powers are, as they say, obliged to negotiate from positions of strength; hence the emphasis on "might". Perhaps it is pertinent to sound a word of warning that "power corrupteth" and especially when political action is not necessarily guided by moral principles. There is a growing sense of doubt when problems of right and wrong remain unresolved.

9. My country is one of the smaller States whose contribution to the continued existence of this body is to keep this conscience of the world community alive. For this reason, we believe in peaceful negotiation as envisaged in the United Nations Charter, and my Government will at all times support every effort that seeks to resolve disputes through peaceful negotiation and constructive dialogue. With this attitude, we do not shy away from contentious problems and issues, because we maintain that as long as there is a willingness to talk, peaceful solutions can be reached in some of the most difficult circumstances. It is therefore alarming to note that important moral issues have been omitted from the agenda; in fact, it fills us with apprehension. We ask ourselves: Does not the United Nations provide the opportunity for self-searching and recrimination because in any case we have an excess of condemnations and counter-condemnations which are not essentially synthetic processes? Does not the exclusion of Czechoslovakia and Viet-Nam from the agenda substantiate the apprehension of my delegation? Could it be possible that close scrutiny of the motives involved would reveal

something that was undesirable and vacillation over moral issues?

10. The cosmopolitan community here present seeks through various ways to find and maintain unity in a common humanitarian conscience to which all Members subscribe. This conscience transcends physical and political boundaries as well as geographical or political pockets in which there is no exercise or limited exercise of the inalienable rights of the individual to freedom and self-determination. Because of that, some countries in southern Africa are the focus of world attention, for reasons well known to this body.

11. The views of my Government regarding the South African policy of *apartheid* are well known, as they have been clearly enunciated on various occasions in the past when it has been necessary to do so. But are there no other areas, in the rest of the world, which need to come under scrutiny for a similar contagion? In some areas the denial of the full expression of the individual's rights is manifested in more subtle ways and is not openly publicized. However, the sin of commission remains a sin whether publicly known or not; whether statutory or not.

12. My delegation notes with concern a tendency to churn out recommendations and resolutions the implementation of which is doubtful. The futility of such decisions cannot be over-emphasized for they rather produce the opposite effect to the one intended. This sterility of resolutions and the expense in time and energy expended in debate proposing and adopting these resolutions undermine the respectability and authority not only of particular committees, but also of the whole decision-making machinery of this Organization. South West Africa (Namibia) is a case in point. My Government wishes to repeat its contention that the solution of the South West African (Namibian) issue must essentially be undertaken by a tripartite body representative of the United Nations, the Government of the Republic of South Africa, as the *de facto* administering authority, together with the people of South West Africa as a whole.

13. My delegation further asserts that it is futile to engineer impracticable recommendations which are provocative of the type of resistance South Africa has shown, and in order to resolve the stalemate that now exists would urge that the Secretary-General engage actively in a dialogue with the South African Government regarding the ultimate self-determination of the peoples of South West Africa, for it is our understanding that South Africa does not dispute the international status of South West Africa, and that its administration of that territory is on an interim basis. Furthermore, it is urged that, whilst the self-determination of South West Africa is under review, the South African Government should refrain from implementing its policy regarding the separate development of its inhabitants, as the international community on whose behalf the South African Government is administering the Territory has already made its pronouncements against the policy of *apartheid*.

14. Regarding Southern Rhodesia, my Government condemns the unilateral declaration of independence, as it has always done in the past. In accordance with my Govern-

ment's policy, we do not desire to invoke the use of military force because we maintain that the concerted use of the intensified mandatory economic sanctions in the spirit intended would still bring down the Smith régime. The hopes of my delegation have been raised by the resumption of talks between the United Kingdom Prime Minister and Ian Smith—although here I may be a little out of date—and we hope that there will be no abdication of the well-known six principles; we hope that, even if the mandatory sanctions did not succeed, the United Kingdom will still hold itself responsible for the overthrow of the rebel régime in Southern Rhodesia and the establishment of conditions for progress towards majority rule and self-determination.

15. We regret to observe that elements of racial segregation are already creeping into Southern Rhodesian legislation; if not halted, this may result in the free world witnessing the further complication of racial politics in Southern Africa.

16. My country has had long economic ties with Southern Rhodesia. The present situation affects our development programme adversely. Similarly, we have had to contend with a number of embarrassing situations stemming from the political turmoil in Southern Rhodesia. We are therefore anxious for the speedy solution of that impasse.

17. One outcome of the political instability in southern Africa is the continuing problem of refugees, and Botswana has had to act as the country of first asylum for refugees from States neighbouring it. At the twenty-second session of the General Assembly [1579th meeting], I made a statement on the refugees with a view to drawing the attention of the world community to the problems which, of necessity, derive from our receiving the refugees—those who are in transit and those who through circumstances beyond their control are compelled to stay. We are currently giving refuge to an alarming influx of Angolans who have fled from Portuguese oppression. Needless to say, our social amenities are being strained to the limit and we cannot adequately cope with the demands which such numbers impose. However, my Government is at present engaged in contingency planning aimed at the resettlement of these refugees.

18. Our refugee policy has continued to be humanitarian, and as supporters of the 1951 Convention relating to the status of refugees, we have passed legislation which basically accords with the spirit and import of the Convention. Therefore, I wish to refute very strongly the false allegations that my Government collaborates with the South African Government or Southern Rhodesia by deporting genuine refugees to those countries. There is not one such case on record. With the consent of my Government, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has sent a *chargé de mission* to investigate the welfare and assist in the placement of refugees.

19. My Government regrets the human suffering and loss of life that has come with the Nigerian civil war. Speculation has naturally centred around the right of Biafra to self-determination, and its extermination by the forces of Federal Nigeria. We feel that the attainment of independence is only the prerequisite for any State's realizing itself

through nationhood and solidarity. Whilst my Government would not support tribal secessionist movements, it deplores the extermination of a people. Now that the civil war is virtually over, it is hoped that the Federal Government will earnestly engage in the task of reconstruction and rehabilitation of the war-torn areas of Nigeria, and endeavour to bring about measures that will ensure reconciliation and lasting peace in a unified Nigeria.

20. There has been no material change in my Government's stand with respect to the Middle East situation. We note with concern, however, that tension still exists and attitudes have hardened largely due to the complete absence of dialogue between the belligerent parties. We regret that the Secretary-General's attempts at negotiation through Ambassador Gunnar Jarring have been to no avail. We urge that every facility be given to him in his peace-keeping mission.

21. An outstanding and rewarding task of the United Nations has been to secure self-determination and independence for the people under foreign rule. The USSR has been most vocal in denunciation of imperialist Powers and has decried any measures to impede the progress of decolonization. These very champions of the cause of the underdog not so long ago horrified the whole world by their armed occupation of Czechoslovakia, an act which is a flagrant breach of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State and a glaring example of the worst type of imperialism. It is not only heinous in this instance, but also a travesty of faith vis-a-vis those who have signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*see resolution 2373 (XXII)*]. The USSR forces have remained in Czechoslovakia in defiance of world opinion, and we join in the call on the USSR to withdraw its forces from Czechoslovakian soil.

22. Regarding the Viet-Nam war, the position of my Government remains unchanged, and it is encouraging to know that attempts are being made to find a peaceful settlement in the Paris talks.

23. As we are all aware, this year has been declared the International Year for Human Rights and it is hoped that significant and commemorative activities have been undertaken or will be undertaken to make this year a historical landmark in the affairs of man, and that special efforts will be made, not only to alleviate human suffering, but also to eradicate it wherever it exists.

24. As regards economic and social conditions, my delegation recalls that, often in his statements to the nations of the world, the Secretary-General, U Thant, has emphasized the importance of the need to bridge the widening gap between the rich and the poor nations, and that the attainment of this objective would contribute to the establishment of peace and security in the world. My delegation holds the view that, whilst it is essential for the developing nations to intensify their own efforts in the execution of their development programmes, it would assist considerably if the developed nations would more readily make available aid which is so vital for the implementation of such development programmes. On the contrary, it is disquieting to note that, whilst the gap between the rich and the poor nations continues to widen, the sources of aid become drier and drier.

25. As a developing country, our basic needs are needs of an infrastructural nature which are not shared by our immediate neighbours, namely, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. Whereas Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland would be regarded as belonging to a common geographic region with generally similar needs, for purposes of aid which they would share under a regional basis, this concept does not operate in their favour because of the wide distances which separate them from each other.

26. We welcome the news that co-operative efforts among the developing countries during the past year have brought about close regional ties, especially in Africa where the previous trend has tended to be one of disintegration. We urge that effective measures be taken to intensify concerted action by the United Nations through its specialized agencies concerned with the training of national personnel for the purpose of economic and social development.

27. We would further urge that effective mobilization, channelling and utilization of available human resources be undertaken at national level. In this regard, my Government particularly welcomes and supports the Economic and Social Council's recommendation that the United Nations Development Programme should continue to support education and training projects, stress manpower requirements for development projects and consider pre-investment training of the personnel required.

28. In Botswana, the World Food Programme has been increasingly associated with community development involving a variety of projects. Appraisal of these projects indicates that food aid under the programme has been a welcome supplement. The programme has encouraged collective efforts of the people to meet the needs of their own communities.

29. In conclusion, there continue to be persistent areas of tension and conflict which call for settlement, with the best intentions of Member States, in accordance with the spirit of the Charter. In the economic and social sphere, observable progress is made through the endeavours of the organs and agencies of this Organization to alleviate and relieve human suffering and to improve standards of living. Much too often, the prospect for peaceful human existence is bleak, but hope remains, held out by the ideals expressed in the Charter which recognizes the sovereign equality of autonomous States, also affording the continual expression of the rights and dignity of man.

30. Mr. HOLYOAKE (New Zealand): On behalf of the Government of New Zealand and the New Zealand delegation, I should first of all like to extend to the President our sincere congratulations on his election to the high office of President of this Assembly. I want to say that we admire the contributions that he has already made to the United Nations in a number of capacities. We salute his dedication to its principles and purposes, and we are fully confident that his conduct of the proceedings of the twenty-third session will enhance his own prestige and that of his own country and, above all, that of the United Nations.

31. I take this opportunity, too, of paying a tribute to the last President, Mr. Manescu, the Foreign Minister of Romania. The wisdom and dignity with which he guided

the Assembly's twenty-second session won the respect of us all, and of all those interested in the United Nations throughout the world.

32. I also extend our congratulations to the Government and the People of Swaziland as they enter the community of sovereign nations and take their place as an equal partner in this Organization. New Zealand was glad to be one of the sponsors of the resolution admitting Swaziland to membership, and we look forward to that country's participation in the work of the United Nations.

33. Since I last addressed this Assembly, which was in 1962, many things have changed in the international scene and in the functioning of the United Nations itself. Our Organization has grown from 108 Members to 125. Its budget has expanded from \$82 million to \$140 million. New agencies have been created and whole new fields of activity have opened up. This growth has reflected new attitudes, new interests, new ambitions and, I think, also new priorities. But, in looking at what has changed, we sometimes, I think, lose sight of what remains the same as it was in 1962 and the years before. In 1945 the need for collective security was paramount, and I believe it also is today.

34. The United Nations has always occupied a central place in New Zealand's foreign policy, and it will continue to do so, for the United Nations has a vital role to play in all areas of major human concern: peace and security, economic development, decolonization and the promotion and protection of human rights. We have all come to realize, perhaps even more clearly than those who laid down the objectives of our Organization in San Francisco in 1945, that there is no State, be it large or small, that can tackle those tasks alone.

35. The work of this Organization in the field of economic development has expanded rapidly. This is as it should be. One of the purposes set forth in the Charter is to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom and to achieve international co-operation in solving economic problems. Never have those problems been greater; never has the need for solving them been more insistent than it is today.

36. New Zealand has always felt that economic and social progress is the essential foundation of international peace and security. For about twenty years we have been contributing—quite substantially for a smaller country—to the programmes set up, both within the United Nations system and outside it, to assist the developing countries in their efforts to achieve such progress. We have also been one of the foremost advocates of a collective approach to the challenge of a hungry world. We in New Zealand are convinced that one of the best methods of helping to meet that challenge is by organizing more sensibly the distribution of the world's food resources.

37. However, we appreciate that aid alone cannot solve the problem. To achieve real and sustained economic growth, developing countries must be able to earn—and I stress the word "earn"—increasing amounts of foreign exchange. To do that, they must be able to sell more to the industrialized nations. We know from our own experience that this is no easy task.

38. For many years, New Zealand, along with other countries which produce agricultural products, has faced serious difficulty in gaining access to the markets of the industrialized countries. No matter how efficient our methods or how competitive our prices, we are often denied a fair chance—and sometimes any chance—of selling our products. Nor is this problem diminishing. On the contrary, a number of important trading countries have recently increased their restrictions on agricultural imports and have stimulated their own sometimes uneconomic and subsidized production to the point where it threatens markets throughout the world.

39. This is a problem which demands the attention of the international community. It is not only a problem for those countries like New Zealand which export temperate-climate food-stuffs. It is a problem for all who have an interest in expanding world trade—and I should think that would be the case with all nations. It is a challenge to countries which, although they are Members of the United Nations and major beneficiaries of the present international order, nevertheless are reluctant to accept the fact of interdependence amongst members of the world community.

40. I should not leave the topic of economic development without recalling the great satisfaction with which my Government has observed the spread of United Nations activity and expertise into our immediate neighbourhood—that is, in the South Pacific. This is a very welcome trend. The United Nations Development Programme and the technical services of the agencies are increasingly involved in South Pacific projects. Some of these have been regional in character and have called for the joint participation of the United Nations and the South Pacific Commission and of the other countries in the area. Others have been directed to the needs of particular islands in the area. New Zealand still administers two quite small island Territories: Niue and the Tokelau. We have been especially gratified that international assistance has been made available to those and other non-self-governing Territories in the South Pacific. We strongly believe that development assistance can do much to hasten the progress of colonial Territories towards self-determination and, if the people concerned choose it, independence.

41. The United Nations has achieved much in the transformation of dependent Territories. New Zealand played a leading part in drafting the provisions of the Charter on this subject. We brought to self-determination the two main Territories for which we were responsible: Western Samoa and the Cook Islands. We voted for the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. We have welcomed the contribution made by this Organization not only to our task but also to the whole process of decolonization.

42. Only a few Territories have yet to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. Each of these, we recognize, presents special difficulties. They are not the same difficulties and they should not be confused. There is no immutable law—indeed, there is not even an adequate rule of thumb—for their solution. We have to keep in mind that we are dealing with people, not with things. At one extreme, there are the dependent Territories in southern Africa, mentioned by the previous speaker. At the other

extreme, there are Territories where the obstacle in the way of progress to self-determination lies in such factors as very small size, isolation, lack of resources and very limited scope for development.

43. It is in the latter category that the two remaining New Zealand Territories fall. The special problems of these Territories cannot simply be ignored or impatiently dismissed as evasions of a colonial administration determined to hang on as long as possible. My Government, in considering the pace at which further political advances are to be made, has been and will continue to be guided by the wishes of the people of the Territories—in this case Niue and the Tokelaus. We have repeatedly made it clear that it is for them to make the fundamental decisions concerning their future at a time that they themselves select. Surely that is the essence of self-determination.

44. In this International Year for Human Rights the Assembly will, of course, review the progress achieved in the twenty years since the adoption of the Universal Declaration. The rights of the individual have long been recognized, and respected, in New Zealand. A few weeks ago we celebrated the seventy-fifth anniversary of the introduction of female suffrage. My Government has played a full part in the celebration of the Year in New Zealand. We have become party to two additional conventions, and others are at present under consideration. Non-governmental organizations in New Zealand, with assistance from the Government, have undertaken a substantial programme of activities over the year. Nineteen sixty-eight has seen a great deal of progress within many Member nations.

45. But there are a number of countries for which this year has been a much less happy one, reminding us that in drawing up standards of human rights the United Nations has really only made a beginning.

46. We in New Zealand have been deeply distressed to learn of the loss of innocent life and of the terrible hardship and suffering caused by the violent and bloody struggle in Nigeria. We are aware that praiseworthy and painstaking attempts have been made by the Organization of African Unity and by the Commonwealth Secretary-General to bring about a political settlement. We have been disturbed by the fact that those efforts have so far, unhappily, proved unsuccessful. It is our earnest hope—the hope of all the people of New Zealand—that the United Nations will make every effort to assist in mitigating the desperate tribulations of the people in the areas devastated by the fighting.

47. The work of the United Nations in the areas of economic development, decolonization and human rights is of tremendous significance. Yet, we all looked, and we still look, for much more from this Organization. I think the heart of the matter is how the international community deals with the great issues of war and peace. This is the central purpose of the Charter. Those who met in San Francisco hoped to create an organization that would prevent aggression and would establish and maintain international peace and security in every part of the world. That was seen as the first and essential function of the United Nations. Basic rules of conduct were laid down and machinery was set up to ensure the observance of those rules of conduct.

48. The system of collective security created in 1945 was one in which small countries like New Zealand had a large stake. It was not solely, or even largely, idealism that committed us to the system; it was the stark fact that we did not have the means to defend ourselves and to assure our continued existence on our own. We looked to the organized international community to protect us and, in return, we pledged to help in its efforts to protect others. So it was New Zealand and countries like it that had most to gain, we felt, from the success of the Charter system and most to lose from its failure. For us this remains still true today.

49. We are all painfully aware that the United Nations has not been able to provide the guarantee of international peace and security that it was meant to provide. In many of the sharpest crises that have arisen since the founding of this Organization it has been unable to play the decisive role expected of it. The people of my country ask just how much security we can expect from an Organization which is sometimes paralysed by conflicting national interests. It is no wonder that States have had to find other means within the framework of the Charter—I emphasize, within the framework of the Charter—of working together to protect ourselves.

50. The failures of the United Nations in this crucial area of its work have, we feel, not resulted solely from the breakdown of co-operation among the great Powers which took place at a very early stage in the life of the Organization. There have been other causes, some of them of much more recent origin. This paralysis, or partial paralysis, has taken different forms. But essentially what is involved is a question of political will on the part of its Members. The Secretary-General—to whom I pay my compliments and tribute—has recently drawn a rather sombre picture of the problems confronting the international community. He has concluded that there has been a serious decline in international standards. He has referred to an increasing tendency for States to use force and violence to settle their international disputes.

51. I repeat, the essential purpose of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security and to prevent aggression. Yet, we are very conscious that in one country—in several, but I am thinking of one, South Viet-Nam—a bitter war has been going on for some years because, as we see it, another Power is seeking to impose its will by military force. The international community has done little about it. Here is another case where the Members of the Organization might have shown that concern—a concern which is the lifeblood of the Charter—for the fate of countries suffering from the use of force and violence.

52. In common with some other countries, Viet-Nam has for some years been divided into two parts. The fact of division is regrettable, it is very sad, but it is a fact of life—and it exists in Viet-Nam, in Korea and in Germany. We hope the peoples of these divided States will be able to achieve reunification, by their own decision, by self-determination. But until those decisions can be taken, an attempt by one part to achieve reunification by military force can, in our view, be regarded only as an act of aggression.

53. It is sometimes argued that the conflict in Viet-Nam is merely a civil war. But it is much more than that, much more than an armed insurrection of a purely local movement. It is incontrovertible that the Viet-Cong—dominated, directed, sustained and supplied by North Viet-Nam—has been reinforced by organized military units from the north, to the point where its main organized military forces are in fact predominantly North Viet-Nameese.

54. New Zealand is more than 5,000 miles from Viet-Nam. We were further still from Korea, but we recognized in 1950—as did the great majority of the membership of this Organization—that an armed attack, even across the demarcation line of a politically divided country, Korea, was none the less aggression. We in New Zealand were much farther from Ethiopia, from Czechoslovakia, and from Poland, but we found in the 1930s that attacks on those countries had implications for the security of the world and for our own security far down there in the South Pacific. We have learned by experience that aggression anywhere is a threat to the peace everywhere and, as such, is a matter for general concern. I believe that that is why this Organization exists. That is why New Zealand has responded to the request for military as well as economic assistance from the victim of aggression, the Republic of Viet-Nam.

55. The effort in which we have joined is not an ideological crusade. We have never thought of that. Neither New Zealand, nor any of the other countries which are assisting the Republic of Viet-Nam, seeks to impose a government of any type or brand or ideological kind or any régime on the people of that country. Much less still do we seek to destroy the régime which exists in North Viet-Nam. We do not seek to establish a permanent presence in Viet-Nam. Along with our allies we have committed ourselves to leave as soon as the other side withdraws its forces to the north, as soon as infiltration ceases and the level of violence thus subsides.

56. What we do seek is that the people of South Viet-Nam should be free to choose their own Government and to decide their own political and social system, including their relations with North Viet-Nam, free from the threat of force. If the people of South Viet-Nam were to choose communism we should be surprised: for nowhere—not even in North Viet-Nam—has a people freely shown, by an election offering a genuine choice, that it wants communism. But if the people of South Viet-Nam were so to choose that is their right. If they choose to reject communism and to call, as they have done, for help that is equally their right.

57. Everyone wants to see this tragic conflict in Viet-Nam ended. No one wants to see it more than those who have men fighting and dying in that theatre. My Government has whole-heartedly supported every effort, springing from both within the United Nations Organization and outside it; we have taken part in every possible forum to move the conflict from the battlefield to the conference table. We do not, however, believe that the way to peace is to give in to the aggressor or to call upon one side to make unilateral concessions while leaving the other side free to go on using force to the limit of its capability—a capability which obviously would be greatly increased by the concessions made by the one side. The way to peace is for both sides to

scale down the fighting, to come together at the conference table to work out ways of letting the people of South Viet-Nam decide their own future for themselves.

58. My Government deeply regrets that the North Viet-Nameese have as yet shown no willingness in the course of preliminary talks in Paris to respond positively to the action of the United States in limiting the bombing of North Viet-Nam or to the suggestion it has made for scaling down the hostilities. There can be little progress until there is an acceptance of the need for a matching restraint and a willingness to seek a reasonable compromise. As we see it, the North Viet-Nameese authorities cannot have it both ways. They cannot at the same time call for a cessation of the bombing of North Viet-Nam and refuse to scale down their own military effort in any way whatever. As we see it, they cannot demand in the name of self-determination that allied forces be withdrawn from South Viet-Nam and at the same time refuse to acknowledge the right of the South Viet-Nameese people freely to decide their own future.

59. The allies in South Viet-Nam have repeatedly expressed their willingness to see the United Nations play a substantial role in the restoration of peace. My own Government would welcome any assistance whatever that the United Nations could give towards achieving a negotiated settlement and subsequently in making sure that the settlement is properly carried out. In any intervention, however, the United Nations must be prepared to grapple with all the involved and difficult aspects of this very complex issue. It must also be prepared to uphold the basic principle of self-determination on which this Organization has so long made its stand.

60. In recent years aggression has often taken new and indirect forms, as in Viet-Nam. In other cases we still see it in the classical mould: a vast army crosses a national frontier to impose the will of a great Power on a small nation. It is aggression of this sort, in flagrant and open defiance of international law and morality, that we have recently seen in Czechoslovakia.

61. The invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union and its allies was undertaken suddenly and without warning. Hundreds of thousands of troops were poured in. They remain in occupation, and we are told that some of them will apparently remain indefinitely. It seems to us at our distance—perhaps one might judge just as well at a distance—that the leaders of the brave people of Czechoslovakia have been bullied and coerced until they have had to accept demands that they govern their country as the Soviet Union would wish. The whole episode has been a savage set-back to the hopes for maintaining the ordinary principles of decency in relations between nations.

62. The explanations that were given to the countries around the world for the invasion of Czechoslovakia were, as we all know, utterly fictitious. And then they were rather cynically redrafted to meet the unexpected situation which confronted the aggressors after they entered Czechoslovakia. The Soviet Union has asserted, I think, a dangerous doctrine of an unlimited right to intervene in what it chooses to regard as its sphere of influence. It seems to us that that doctrine is one of naked power, leading to international lawlessness and ultimately to anarchy. We in New Zealand utterly reject it.

63. What surprises me is that the Soviet Union has gone further. It has claimed that the situation in Czechoslovakia is no concern of this Organization. It has directly challenged the Security Council and then this Assembly not to respond to that situation. I believe that we must give an equally blunt reply. The limits to what this Organization could do to deal with the aggression against Czechoslovakia have been made painfully obvious. But those Warsaw Pact members which took part in this affair should not be left under the illusion that the international community is ready to forget or to ignore their actions. No small State with any faith in the idea of collective security can fail to use this forum to give expression to the dismay and anger caused by a big Power crushing a smaller one.

64. So I am bound to report that the people of New Zealand as a whole, so far as I know, felt a sense of horror and outrage as the story of Soviet perfidy in Czechoslovakia unfolded. We knew that what happened in Czechoslovakia placed a heavy strain on the delicate fabric of world peace and world security. We may be remote from those events, but we cannot be indifferent to them. A threat to or a breach of the peace anywhere is of concern to every Member of this Organization. That is why my country feels involved in the tragedy of Czechoslovakia.

65. There is another and perhaps broader aspect of the Czechoslovakian affair that I have found especially disturbing. On 21 August of this year Soviet representatives around the world called on the Foreign Ministers to whom they were accredited to explain what the Soviet troops were doing in Czechoslovakia. I was told, as I presume other Foreign Ministers were told, that the Soviet troops and other Warsaw forces were in Czechoslovakia on the invitation of the Government of that country. What I was told, what others were told, what the Security Council was told and what the world was told, was clearly not true.

66. In international affairs, as in our domestic affairs, truth and trust, we believe, are not one day important and the next day of no concern. Those of us who have to take part in the making of decisions that may vitally affect the future of our countries must have a certain confidence in those with whom we deal. More often than not, we must put our trust in the pledged word of a great Power. This is very important: our lives could depend upon it. The search for a better and a safer world has, we believe, been sadly set back by this brutal violation of that trust.

67. As we see it, if there is one area of international relations in which progress depends entirely on trust, that surely is disarmament—world disarmament. The time is long overdue for a substantial reduction in the hazards created by the existence, the spread, and the continuing refinement of nuclear and other dreadful weapons of war and their means of delivery. Events in Czechoslovakia will certainly have their damaging repercussions here and elsewhere in the discussion on this vital issue. At the same time, the international community cannot give up; it must pursue this objective. One tragedy would have been compounded by another if those events were allowed to block further progress towards disarmament. But I do want to say to the representative of the Soviet Union that his Government has made it difficult for other countries. Did Mr. Gromyko realize our feelings as, with the Czechoslovak tragedy still

unfolding, he advocated new measures of disarmament? Does he realize that we have no choice but to appraise his words with the recent test of Soviet words and Soviet faith still vivid in our minds and our memories?

68. The conclusion of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*see resolution 2373 (XXII)*] was a crucial step in the control of nuclear weapons. What we now all look for is rapid agreement on further and even more significant measures that will check and turn back the dangerous competition among the Powers that now possess nuclear weapons. We hope devoutly that this path has not been blocked by recent events.

69. For some time now, my Government has believed that a comprehensive ban on all nuclear weapon testing is a matter of the greatest urgency. The continued testing in the atmosphere of French nuclear bombs—including this year thermonuclear weapons—remains a cause of serious concern to New Zealand. Our concern with the French testing is a special one because it is undertaken in the South Pacific, relatively close to New Zealand, but very much closer to other territories with which we are closely associated and for which we are responsible in the international sphere. All care must be taken—and, I know, is taken—and as a result the hazards to health may be slight; but they still exist. The other hazards are considerably greater. We object to both French and Chinese testing in the atmosphere because it runs directly counter to every effort the international community has made in recent years to halt the arms race.

70. Much of what I have said today has related to the capacity of the United Nations to meet its prime purpose under the Charter: that is, collective security. I want now to make a brief quotation from what a New Zealand representative said on an earlier occasion:

“The League . . . is drifting. We have witnessed with consternation its ominous failure in recent years to carry out with any degree of effectiveness its main function—namely, the preservation of the peace of the world—and we cannot stand idly by and watch, unmoved or unprotesting, a course which deprives mankind of any real sense of security. Our hopes lie in a return to those principles . . . which alone, in our opinion, offer a sure and certain prospect that the present drift may be arrested.”

71. That was said by the New Zealand representative in the Assembly of the League of Nations on 29 September 1936. The reason I quote it is this: two years after that, the streets and the squares of Prague rang to the heavy tread of a foreign army. And I remind this Assembly that only two months ago, that ominous sound was heard again in Prague—in the same city. In 1938, the world turned its back on Czechoslovakia and, in so doing, marked the end of the League of Nations—an organization in which men at that time, men of vision, has placed their hopes for peace, not only in their time but also for future generations. Today we—in New Zealand, at least—place those same hopes in this Organization, and we must ensure that it does not go the way of its ill-fated predecessor.

72. Whatever the United Nations has so far accomplished—and this is considerable in many spheres—we have

to face the fact that it is far from attaining its ultimate goal. It is so far from attaining it that the very possibility of its ever doing so is coming into question in many countries around the world. So I say it is the duty of us all not to lose sight of that goal, and to devote our utmost efforts so that we may fulfil the vision of those men who founded this great and, we believe, indispensable Organization in San Francisco in 1945. If it is to remain a vital force in the life of the international community, the United Nations must return to its first principles. Only by doing this can it become that powerful and effective instrument of collective security that its founders intended it to be.

73. I conclude by saying that their vision was not at fault; there was nothing wrong with what they created; there is no possible substitute for it. What has to be done is to make it work—and first to stop the drift. Because the people of New Zealand believe in the Charter and in the United Nations, I can pledge that my Government will renew its efforts to give life and substance to its principles and to its objectives.

74. Mr. BACHEV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): It is with profound regret that we note the attempts made by the representatives of certain Western countries to introduce into the debates of this session a political note which creates and maintains tension throughout the world.

75. The statement made by Mr. Rusk, the United States Secretary of State, [1677th meeting], is a proof of this. The lack of moderation displayed in that statement will not only make the General Assembly's work more difficult, but will also worsen the international climate. Our regret and concern are all the greater because the statement came from the Government of a great country having a major responsibility for the safeguarding of international peace and understanding. The speech by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom [1693rd meeting] which we heard this morning compels me to make the same remarks. But perhaps there is no reason for surprise. Perhaps Mr. Rusk's statement is only the inevitable expression of a policy which breeds uncertainty and danger on all continents.

76. We are thus obliged to point out as we did at the previous session of the General Assembly [1575th meeting], that, because of this policy, the deterioration in the world situation is becoming more marked. Not only has no progress been made towards solving the two open conflicts—the war in Viet-Nam and the crisis in the Middle East—but world tension continues to grow as a result of the worsening of the situation in Europe caused by the policy of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). This policy is a serious blow against the relaxation of tension in the relations between East and West which was becoming increasingly manifest thanks to the sincere efforts of the socialist States and of certain countries of western Europe.

77. To confirm this it is sufficient to examine the decisions and activities of NATO during the past few years. According to official information published by the Pentagon in December 1967, the United States has doubled its stock of nuclear weapons in Europe in six years. Decisions and actions have been taken with a view to setting up nuclear mine zones along the frontiers of the socialist

countries, including those in the Balkans. The implementation of decisions aimed at "strengthening" the northern and southern flanks of the Atlantic bloc and the establishment of independent NATO fleets in the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, is now in progress. A considerable increase in expenditure on the re-equipment of the Atlantic armies with new and more modern material was decided upon at the NATO meeting of December 1967. NATO naval and air forces in the Mediterranean have been reinforced by new units, some of them equipped with nuclear weapons. All these military measures have been taken in accordance with dangerous political and military doctrines and theories and have been accompanied by feverish activity on the part of the NATO general staffs and by continuous military manoeuvres throughout Western Europe.

78. Only a few months ago, the last session of NATO held at Reykjavik¹ openly approved the revanchist policy of the Federal Republic of Germany whose military expenditure already exceeds that of Hitlerite Germany when preparing for the Second World War. For some time, new plans have been drawn up with a view to increasing the military forces of NATO in Europe and accelerating the arms race.

79. The militarist policy of the Atlantic Alliance, and especially that of the ruling circles in Washington and Bonn which are the main promoters of this policy is a permanent source of tension in Europe. It was in the context of this policy that plans regarding Czechoslovakia were prepared with a view to upsetting the balance of forces in Europe and undermining the entire *status quo* in our continent. These were dangerous plans for the peace of Europe, but the action taken by the socialist countries to consolidate the socialist régime in Czechoslovakia caused them to fail.

80. In the presence of this NATO policy, what is the alternative proposed by the socialist States? They are above all determined to co-operate effectively with the countries of western Europe, including the member States of the Atlantic Alliance, not only to solve political problems but also to broaden economic, technical and cultural relations. Instead of the arms race, they propose disarmament; instead of the Western military blocs, a valid system of European collective security; instead of closed economic groups, the harmonious development of trade on an equitable basis. In so far as it depends on them, the socialist countries will not allow themselves to be deflected from this path.

81. Despite the open or covert opposition of NATO, this policy has produced encouraging results during the last few years. Co-operation and relations between the socialist States and a considerable number of European countries such as France, the Nordic countries, Austria, Turkey and others, have expanded and become much more fruitful for the mutual benefit of these countries and in the best interests of Europe. We hope that this positive process can be extended to relations with other western States as well, and we are ready, for our part, to co-operate sincerely in that process. The West must, then, also make a realistic and balanced appraisal of the present state of affairs if it wishes to assist in overcoming the dangers threatening stability,

¹ Meeting of NATO Council, held on 24 and 25 June 1968.

security and peaceful development in Europe. This is the only way to create conditions favourable to a relaxation of tension and to peaceful coexistence.

82. The Soviet Union's new programme for halting the arms race and for disarmament is a concrete expression of the peaceful policy of the socialist countries and of their concern for the security of peoples.

83. This programme follows on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII)*] which represents a considerable step forward, made possible by the efforts carried out over many years in the field of disarmament by the United Nations and by the great majority of member States. It confirms the prevailing view in the United Nations that collateral measures constitute a good method of reaching the final goal of general and complete disarmament.

84. The fact that the General Assembly approved the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons by a large majority, and that over eighty member States have already signed it, warrants the hope that the Treaty will come into force in the near future. We must not, however, underestimate the fact that certain circles are continuing their attacks against the Treaty. The Federal Republic of Germany, which is striving to obtain possession of nuclear weapons for its revanchist policy, is renewing its efforts to prevent the Treaty from entering into force. To these attempts by the Federal Republic of Germany must be added those of certain countries of western Europe as well as certain United States politicians. We realize, however, that these efforts must not be confused with the concern of countries wishing to obtain firmer safeguards against nuclear aggression. Complete security can be obtained only by the total prohibition of nuclear weapons and the destruction of stockpiles of such weapons; but under present conditions, the mere fact of limiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons constitutes a guarantee for the security of States. The statements of the three nuclear Powers, approved by the Security Council resolution of 19 June 1968 [*255 (1968)*] constitute a further reassurance in that respect.

85. All these problems show the urgent need to call a halt to the arms race, and this explains the general interest aroused by the Soviet Union's memorandum [*A/7134*] concerning urgent measures to achieve disarmament and stop the arms race. This document takes into account long years of experience in disarmament negotiations and the ideas and suggestions of a great many States. It thus corresponds to the general interest of mankind as well as to the specific interests of the different countries and the various regions. We should like to stress here the special importance of the proposal relating to the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, which is a new step of capital moral and political importance for the strengthening of the security of countries. Among the measures aimed at limiting the nuclear danger, the proposal to create nuclear-free zones including not only vast regions but limited groups of States or even individual countries, takes on a new aspect; formulated in this way, it opens up greater possibilities for setting up zones free of nuclear weapons.

86. Regarding this proposal we should like to state that Bulgaria continues to believe in the feasibility of the idea of

transforming the Balkans into a nuclear-free zone. The implementation of such a proposal would constitute a positive new stage towards understanding and co-operation between the Balkan countries, and would play an important part in lessening tension in Europe and in the neighbouring geographical regions. We therefore declare ourselves ready to contribute to the realization of this idea as well as to other effective measures calculated to strengthen confidence and good-neighbourly relations among the Balkan peoples. The favourable developments in the Balkans during the last few years give us confidence that the countries of south-eastern Europe can successfully handle even more ambitious tasks for the peaceful settlement of relations in this important region of our continent.

87. The signature of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is, alas, the only encouraging factor in the international situation, still darkened by the war in Viet-Nam, a war which the United States never ceases to extend by committing its enormous military potential in that area.

88. The opening at Paris of talks between the representatives of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the United States aroused timid hopes concerning the possibility of a solution to the Viet-Nam conflict. These hopes were, however, soon dispelled by the rigid positions taken by the United States at the Paris meetings. There is nothing new, nothing positive or constructive, in the United States attitude.

89. The representatives of the United States do not cease to repeat that they are ready to negotiate on the peaceful settlement of the Viet-Nam conflict any time, anywhere and without preliminary conditions, and they become indignant when the sincerity of their motives is questioned. It would be appropriate to recall the words of Mr. Goldberg, who proposed in this very Assembly [*see 1412th and 1562nd meetings*] that the Government of the United States professions of good faith should be put to the test. In fact, with the first small test, when the question arose of the pace at which the preliminary talks were to be held, the insincerity of the United States became patent. It was only thanks to the goodwill of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam that the talks did not fail to open, despite the inconsistency of the United States position.

90. In these circumstances, it is obvious that the United States profession of faith would be still less able to stand the test of serious political negotiations. The behaviour of the United States at Paris is sufficient proof of this.

91. The obstinate refusal of the United States to stop all aerial bombing of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam is the principal obstacle to progress in the Paris talks. In this connexion, it would be appropriate to ask the following question: what is the moral, political or even military justification for the refusal of the United States to stop the bombing? It has been unanimously recognized that no such justification exists. According to qualified specialists in the United States, the military value of all the United States bombing operations in the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam is limited. They produce no substantial military effects, merely serving to increase the material damage, the number of casualties and the sufferings of the

Viet-Nameese civilian population. Consequently, it is obvious that this bombing is militarily senseless, politically harmful and morally to be condemned. Why then, does the United States persist in its efforts to justify the need for air raids? It is probably in order to conceal its bad faith and lack of any sincere desire to start serious discussions for the solution of the Viet-Nam conflict. Or, as a United States magazine has just pointed out, the United States Government claims the right to continue the escalation while at the same time expecting international public opinion to credit it with seeking peace in Viet-Nam. And yet, for the United States, there is no other way but negotiation that can lead to a cessation of the war and a solution of the problem. But the course of negotiation requires the total and unconditional cessation of bombing and of all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. This would make it possible to proceed to the discussion of all the questions of concern to the two parties, with a view to reaching a political settlement of the Viet-Nam problem as a whole on the basis of the Geneva Agreements of 1954. If the United States wants such a settlement, it must abandon escalation, take into account the true situation in Viet-Nam and recognize the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam.

92. The aggressive policy of the United States in Asia is also illustrated by acts of provocation against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

93. ~~The main cause of tension in that part of the world is the presence of United States occupation troops on the territory of South Korea, interference in the internal affairs of the Korean people and the obstacles which the United States continues to place in the way of the national reunification of that country.~~

94. Contrary to the policy of the United States, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is strictly observing the Armistice Agreement of 1953 and aspires to the reunification of the country by peaceful means. In its memorandum of 25 July 1968 [A/C.1/970] the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea reiterated its proposals for the organization of free elections in the South and in the North, without outside interference and after the withdrawal of foreign troops.

95. The General Assembly should concern itself with the problem of the immediate withdrawal of United States troops from South Korea rather than with the report of the so-called United Nations Commission, which merely serves the imperialistic aims of the United States in that region. That is why, together with several other countries, Bulgaria requested the inclusion in the agenda of this session of the questions relating to the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations [A/7184 and Add.1 and 2] and the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea [A/7182 and Add.1 to 4].

96. When this question is discussed, it is essential that a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should be invited, as his presence would be a decisive contribution to a just solution.

97. The situation in the Middle East remains critical. The fundamental problems in this region, which are a conse-

quence of Israel's aggression against the Arab countries, are still awaiting a solution.

98. There exists at present two conflicting tendencies concerning the Middle East crisis and the methods of reaching a solution: on the one hand, there is the rigid and intransigent policy of Israel which, taking advantage of its temporary victories, seeks to impose its unfounded claims in the form of an ultimatum; on the other hand, there is the moderate and constructive position of the Arab countries which are the victims of aggression and which declare themselves ready to abide strictly by the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)]. This attitude on the part of the Arab countries has provided a new chance of peace in the Middle East and of reaching a solution of the crisis in the interests of all the countries concerned, on condition, however, that Israel is also ready to show moderation and goodwill.

99. In these conditions, we should undertake by stages the joint examination and settlement of the various questions, as proposed by the United Arab Republic. The mission of Mr. Jarring, the Secretary-General's Special Representative, could be very useful in facilitating the application of this method. Unfortunately, Mr. Jarring's attempts to create favourable conditions for the solution of the problem have been greeted with cannon fire by Israel. Mr. Abba Eban's last statement in the General Assembly [1686th meeting] simply provides further proof of Israel's refusal to conform to the Security Council resolution and to pay the slightest attention to proposals likely to facilitate its application. One may ask why this is so. Does not Israel see that this rigid position has no future and that it could lead to a further exacerbation of the Middle East crisis?

100. It is obvious that Israel's intransigence is inspired and supported by its Western protectors. Did not the Israel Minister of Defence declare that the position of the United States was more important to his country than Security Council resolutions? Consequently, a change in Israel's attitude is only likely to occur after there has been a change in the political line of the Western Powers, and provided that these Powers make a sincere attempt to apply the United Nations resolution before it is too late.

101. Once again we are forced to the conclusion, to our great regret, that the process of the national liberation of peoples and the final liquidation of the colonial system has still not been completed. Colonialism continues to dominate vast areas of the African continent and of other parts of the world. As the Secretary-General pointed out in his introduction to the annual report, with particular emphasis on southern Africa, "the collective determination of the United Nations to put an end to colonialism seems to have met a solid wall of defiance in that part of the world." [A/7201/Add.1, para. 148.]

102. South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal have formed a bloc of colonial forces in southern Africa to consolidate, by means of savage terror, the domination and exploitation of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau), Zimbabwe and Namibia. Certain countries, as well as the big Western monopolies, are extending important military, financial and political aid to this infamous alliance. What is the reason for this? There can be

no doubt that the bond lies in the similarity of the political philosophy professed by both sides and in the identity of their material and military interests.

103. The efforts of the forces of imperialism and colonialism to preserve and strengthen their domination must therefore be opposed by collective action on the part of all anti-colonialist forces.

104. The decisions of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held recently at Algiers,² unquestionably represent a significant contribution to the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist struggles and to the unity of the African peoples. These decisions will have the support of all those who love liberty and justice.

105. The completion of the process of decolonization is an urgent problem in the solution of which the United Nations should continue to play a major part and provide increasingly active support. To this end steps should be taken to harness all the means at the Organization's disposal and to ensure the co-operation of all United Nations bodies called upon to serve the principles and purposes of the Organization.

106. In this connexion, we must note the inadequacy of the measures for the application of resolution 2311 (XXII) relating to the role of the specialized agencies in the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly. The discussion on the application of the resolution by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations must therefore lead to the adoption of new decisions and to more effective action.

107. It is the imperative duty of the entire international community to accelerate the process of final decolonization. In order to carry out this vital task, it should redouble its efforts and intensify its action so that the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations and the tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples can be celebrated by decisive progress towards the solution of the principal colonial problems still outstanding.

108. The work of the United Nations on economic and social problems has become of particular importance during the last few years because of the legitimate desire of the developing countries to find in international co-operation support for their own efforts to achieve speedier development. It is therefore natural that the problem of under-development should be at the centre of the activities of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

109. United Nations activities in the economic and social sphere are of no real value except to the extent that they help to reduce the differences between the level of economic development of different countries. It is against this background that the full importance of the second United Nations Development Decade can be seen. The

Bulgarian delegation shares the Secretary-General's view that the achievements of the first Decade provide useful conclusions for the preliminary work in connexion with the second Decade. Therefore, in order to ensure accelerated rates of economic progress for the developing countries, it is essential for the second Decade to provide for steps to safeguard the economic interests of these countries. The elimination of all forms of economic exploitation from relations with these States and the safeguarding of respect for their sovereignty over their natural and human resources must be the basic objectives of all international activity relating to development.

110. Special attention should be paid to the question of methods of arresting the outflow of financial resources from these countries—a problem which, as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development noted at its second session,³ is assuming alarming proportions.

111. The elimination of the economic and social backwardness of the countries of the third world is linked with the over-all problems of the world economy. It is important, therefore, to secure the effective participation of all the countries and regions of the world in a narrower and more equitable international division of labour, and to check the growing tendency towards the fragmentation of the international market.

112. Lastly, steps must be taken to bring about the progressive elimination of discriminatory obstacles and the maximum liberalization of international trade. The application of these principles in international economic relations would facilitate the formulation and implementation of a concrete development programme. In this way, the decade of the seventies could contribute more effectively, not only to the solution of the economic and social difficulties of the contemporary world, but also to the strengthening of peace and co-operation among all countries.

113. For economic and political affairs are interdependent. The consolidation of international peace and security, and economic and social progress, are two aspects of the same process. A world freed from conflict and tension is a world where rapid economic development is assured. The absence of lasting peace and security has always had a negative influence on international economic relations. These are well-known truths, but the problems of international economic co-operation and development cannot be solved if we continue to neglect them.

114. A great many important and serious problems are before our Organization. On their solution depends, in large measure, the consolidation of peace and the strengthening of confidence among peoples.

115. Despite the growing activity and opposition of certain forces which attempt to bar the way to progress, we should like to hope that the twenty-third session of the Assembly will be constructive, that it will be able to eliminate the new obstacles set on the path to peace and

² Fifth session of the Assembly, held from 13 to 16 September 1968.

³ The second session of the Conference was held at New Delhi from 1 February to 29 March 1968.

co-operation between nations and contribute to a just and equitable solution of international problems.

116. In conclusion, allow me to express my warm congratulations to Mr. Arenales on his election to the high office of President and to convey to him the sincere good wishes of the Bulgarian delegation for complete success in his important and difficult task. I should also like to renew the expression of our gratitude to the outgoing President, Comrade Manescu who, backed by the confidence of the

General Assembly, succeeded in carrying out his duties so ably during two busy and difficult sessions.

117. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): May I remind Members of the General Assembly that, in accordance with the decision taken at the 1692nd meeting on 11 October 1968, the list of speakers in the general debate will be closed on Tuesday, 15 October at 5 p.m.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.