

11/BG

A/PV.1413
53-55

US 913
25 Sept 1966
10³ am
(Mr. Martin, Canada)

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

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

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

Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, May I first of all, in the name of the Soviet delegation, congratulate you on the occasion of your election to the high post of President of the General Assembly and, from the bottom of our hearts, wish you full success in the discharge of your tasks.

The Charter of the United Nations begins by declaring the determination of the peoples "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind." This lofty goal has united States situated in different continents and belonging to different social systems. It embodies the reason for existence of the United Nations. It gives a correct criterion for estimating the activities of the United Nations in each given period of time.

Already at the time when the United Nations Charter was being worked out, when the curtain had not yet fallen on the final act in the heroic struggle of the peoples against the fascist aggressors, ushering in their life in conditions of peace, even at that time hardly anyone imagined that it would be sufficient for the majority of States to subscribe to the just principles of good neighbourliness, peaceful co-operation and equality of all nations, in order to eliminate all the dangers lying in store for the world.

To establish the ideals of peace, freedom and independence of peoples in international relations time and purposeful actions are necessary on the part of the peace-loving forces. This was true of the past, it is true today. Yet the opportunities for such actions have now greatly increased. The fatalistic notion that the forces of aggression cannot be stopped in our time, as well, is as flimsy as the light-weight illusions of those who hope that the international horizon will clear up by itself.

When violence is plotted against the people, those who mastermind it always cover up their intentions by peaceful phrases and false assurances; they try to divide the ranks of enemies of aggression by all kinds of manoeuvres, to paralyse the activities of international organizations which are called upon to stand guard over peace. This is why the quicker the danger is detected and its consequences weighed and the firmer and the more unanimously it is rebuffed, the more reliably universal peace will be safeguarded.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

It is proceeding from this and guided by the goals proclaimed in the United Nations Charter, that the Soviet Government pronounces itself in favour of putting in the focus of activities of the present Twenty-First Session of the General Assembly questions, the solution of which would protect the peoples from encroachments upon their sovereignty and independence and would paralyse the aggressive forces. It cannot be claimed that the United Nations has undertaken no efforts until now in this direction. Quite good decisions in defence of the rights of the peoples have been adopted, and on more than one occasion.

But what often follows these decisions? Unfortunately it happens -- and not infrequently -- that the moment a country or a group of countries overtly or covertly takes a position of resisting the implementation of decisions which meet the interests of peace and protect the just rights of peoples, such decisions remain on paper and it turns out that the United Nations is idling.

Let us take up the question of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. You may ask any delegation in this hall and the chances are that you will not hear a single statement casting doubt on the validity of this principle. But this is in words, and what happens in reality? The policy of interference in other peoples' affairs is not on the decline; on the contrary, in certain cases it acquires even more impudent and dangerous forms.

The intervention of more than 300,000 American soldiers and officers in South Viet-Nam, the barbaric bombing of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, the military interference in the affairs of Cambodia and Laos -- all this is aggression. A Power which possesses a great military force and modern weapons has attacked a nation which has no wish to bow down to new oppressors after attaining its independence in a difficult battle. The world at large has denounced the crimes perpetrated by the American military in Viet-Nam.

The right of the Viet-Nameese people to enjoy peace, freedom and national unity was solemnly reaffirmed twelve years ago by the Geneva Agreements. If the United States had not acted counter to the Geneva Agreements, if it had not interfered in the internal affairs of the Viet-Nameese people, if it had not frustrated the holding of nation-wide elections in Viet-Nam, there would be no war in that country today. The Viet-Nameese people would have long ago taken care of their internal affairs and found their settlement.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

Every State, wherever it is located, somehow or other, is affected by the consequences of aggression in the Indo-China region. Indeed, all international questions are now viewed through the prism of the events in Viet-Nam. Dispatches from the front have not only occupied the front pages of the Press, they make people evrywhere fear lest another generation would have to don trench-coats.

There is a torrent of words flowing from Washington designed to prove that the United States allegedly is looking for a peaceful way out of the obtaining situation, as if it had found itself in Viet-Nam almost against its will and is sending into battle new divisions, plane squadrons and warships. However, the indisputable fact is that each so-called "peaceful offensive" of Washington is followed by a further escalation of aggressive actions.

What does the statement made here in the General Assembly yesterday on behalf of the United States Government mean? It means that the United States Government defends its aggressive course in the Viet-Nam question, and that there are still no signs testifying to the seriousness of Washington's intention to seek for a settlement of this problem and to stop the aggression against the Viet-Nameese people.

Where is the solution of the Viet-Nam problem to be found? There does exist a programme for a settlement in Viet-Nam which accords with the standards of international law and the interests of peace. This programme has been put forth by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam. It is simple and logical: unconditional cessation of the bombing of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, withdrawal of all armed forces of the United States and their allies from South Viet-Nam, removal of foreign armaments, the granting to the Viet-Nameese people of a chance to settle their internal problems themselves. The aggressor has come to Viet-Nam, the aggressor should leave.

It is the duty of every State, every Government which recognizes its responsibility to the peoples, to declare its support to the heroic Viet-Nameese people from this rostrum, to denounce American aggression, to demand its unconditional termination in the North and South of Viet-Nam, to demand the withdrawal of all armed forces of the United States and their allies from Viet-Nam.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

The Soviet Union and other socialist States, all the forces of peace are on the side of the Viet-Nameese people and their just cause. We have rendered and will render all necessary assistance to the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam to fight off aggression. Those who carry the responsibility for the Viet-Nam war should duly weigh the significance of the warning issued by the socialist States meeting in conference at Bucharest, and draw the appropriate conclusions.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

The policy of aggression today finds its most concentrated expression in Viet-Nam. However, Viet-Nam is not the only region of this sort. We have already mentioned Laos and Cambodia. Nor can the intervention in the Dominican Republic be forgotten, as well as threats, intrigues and subversive activities against the people of several other countries.

The continuing provocations of the United States against the Republic of Cuba constitute a grave danger for peace. The Soviet Union has warned and is warning those who are hatching aggressive designs against Cuba. Cuba has true and reliable friends who are vigilantly watching the schemings of the enemies of the Cuban revolution and are ready to offer the Cuban people necessary support in their struggle for freedom and independence.

Acts of interference in the internal affairs of independent States, wherever they are committed, pose a threat to the peace and security of all nations. The Soviet Union is a great Power and a permanent member of the Security Council, and we carry no small share of responsibility for maintaining universal peace.

While strictly adhering to the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, the Soviet Union resolutely raises its voice against those who disregard the sovereign rights of peoples and attempt to promote club-rule and violence in international relations. Together with other States that advocate peace we are utilizing every opportunity to counter all manifestations of the policy of intervention in the internal affairs of peoples.

The front line of the struggle against violations of sovereignty of States runs everywhere. This struggle is proceeding in all continents, in different spheres of international communication, in the most varied forms. In this struggle the United Nations is called upon to play an active role.

A year ago the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty. The States Members of the United Nations acted on the assumption that this important document could and should serve as a beneficial instrument for invigorating international relations, that States which had voted for the Declaration would strictly comply with it. However, due to the fact that this is not happening in reality -- thus causing justified alarm -- the USSR delegation, on the instructions of the Soviet Government, is submitting to the twenty-first session of the General Assembly

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

as an important and urgent question an item on "The progress of implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty".

Consideration of this question will give the United Nations an opportunity to unmask before the eyes of mankind the violators of the Declaration. The United Nations must clearly declare that by flouting the sovereignty of independent States the violators of the Declaration are assuming a grave responsibility for the consequences.

It has been stated time and again here at the General Assembly that it was necessary to make its work more effective and fruitful. Here is an opportunity to do so that can and must be seized.

We believe that the question on "The strict compliance with the prohibition of threat or use of force in international relations and the right of peoples to self-determination", proposed by Czechoslovakia, is also highly topical. The Soviet Government fully supports the initiative of the Government of Czechoslovakia that has proposed this important question for consideration by the General Assembly.

If we analyse the trends in the international situation in the post-war period, especially in recent years, we cannot but come to the conclusion that military bases established in foreign territories by certain Powers belonging to Western military blocs serve as a major instrument of aggressive policy. Many of those bases are a legacy of colonialism. There are other bases which those Powers have built in the territory of the weak by simply imposing on them fettering agreements.

First of all this concerns the United States, which has established hundreds of military bases and strongpoints beyond its borders, and is stationing permanently in the territories of other States about a million American soldiers and officers, nuclear and rocket facilities, airplanes and other types of armaments.

A great number of facts could be quoted showing how foreign bases of certain Western Powers were used as springboards for aggression, for coercing States on whose territory they were situated and even neighbouring countries to make political and economic concessions to the detriment of their own people. The logic is simple: if you do not give in to political argument, another more effective argument is at hand, i.e., bombers, marines, aircraft carriers.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

Why do certain circles in the United States cling to bases, for example in South Viet-Nam and around it, when these bases are situated tens of thousands of miles from New York and San Francisco? Have they brought the people there culture, progress and well-being? No, they have not. If anyone were to try and portray in sculpture the consequences of the existence of foreign military bases, he would have to create a monument to violence, destruction and death. The military bases that serve the aims of aggression may be located not thousands but hundreds of miles from the United States -- for example in Latin America -- but their objective generally is the same.

A number of countries would like to free themselves from such bases and fettering agreements that imposed those bases upon them. However, they are as yet not in a position to do so, and their demands go unheeded. They are in need of support, and not in the least on the part of the United Nations.

Is this problem too great for the United Nations to shoulder and should the twenty-first session of the General Assembly deal with it? After all, those who possess those bases are firmly rooted, as they say, and it is not easy to extract them.

No one claims that the removal of such military bases is an easy affair. However, even an easy task cannot be accomplished if no effort is made. Even if these bases are not removed all at once, and even if it happens first in some regions, in some States, it is necessary to push in that direction, if the United Nations really intends to display concern for an international détente and for conditions under which every State will feel itself secure.

Naturally, there is no question of a purely formal decrease of the number of bases and other military installations abroad, which is sometimes carried out by certain Western Powers for the sake of publicity and for reasons of economy. Instead of, say, fifteen bases in a certain region, ten bases are left, but the remaining ten are reinforced and equipped with more powerful weapons, and as a result the sum total of foreign troops and armaments situated beyond their national borders increases instead of decreasing. A real elimination of bases is necessary, not a semblance.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

Perhaps not all States represented here will react in the same way to our proposal. We hope that the majority will regard it with understanding. What we are promoting here is not our narrow interests. The Soviet Union is a Power which has at its disposal all that it needs to defend its security against, among other things, threats which are posed by the foreign bases of certain participants in Western military blocs. We are guided by broader interests, the interests of universal peace.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

The decision to eliminate American military bases in foreign territories would not, in our opinion, prejudice the interests of the security of the United States. If the United States agreed to the elimination of their military bases in foreign territories, such actions would certainly never be written down as any loss, or any negative aspect, of American policy. What would be the starting point of the elimination of foreign military bases serving aggressive goals? It is possible and feasible to begin solving this problem with Asia, Africa and Latin America. This might prove easier.

The Organization of African Unity has issued a demand for the elimination of foreign military bases in Africa. The first Cairo Conference of Non-Aligned States pronounced its firm judgement on this question. Many States have striven to settle this question at previous sessions of the United Nations General Assembly and at the meetings of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. All this gives the Soviet Government grounds to expect a positive attitude at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly towards the consideration of this question, which we offer as an important and urgent item: "The elimination of foreign military bases in countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America". The adoption of a clear-cut decision on this question would mean a considerable step towards the strengthening of the independence of emerging States and their protection from foreign interference, and towards an international détente.

In our age the task of consolidating peace, of countering aggression, and the policy of interference in the internal affairs of States, is inseparably bound up with the struggle against the nuclear danger. This problem, which is one of the gravest in the history of mankind, has been facing the United Nations from the very inception of this Organization. At the very first session of the General Assembly, in 1946, the Soviet Government drew the attention of Governments and peoples to the dangerous situation which had appeared with the emergence of nuclear weapons, and submitted its draft International Convention on the Prohibition of Production and Use of Weapons based on the Utilization of Atomic Energy for the Purpose of Mass Destruction. From that moment on the United Nations has been dealing with the problem of nuclear weapons without respite.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

An opinion is sometimes voiced that the elimination of the nuclear menace is a matter of primary concern to those States which possess nuclear weapons. These States do, indeed, carry special responsibility, if only due to the fact that they possess nuclear weapons and are better aware of their destructive capabilities than anyone else. However, it cannot be denied that much depends on the United Nations as a whole.

The problem of eliminating the nuclear threat can be dealt with in different ways, for example, by registering its existence from time to time in the protocols and resolutions, and then by passing it from one session of the General Assembly to another and from one Committee to another. The Soviet Government cannot countenance such practices. The United Nations should not work only for the sake of building up its archives, turning them into a sort of cemetery for the burial of proposals and plans directed towards the solution of one of the most crucial problems facing mankind. We are now calling for a different approach to this matter. The United Nations has the right to set forth its opinion clearly and firmly on the question of ways to eliminate the nuclear threat, in such a way that those who oppose it would not be in a position to ignore the stand of the United Nations.

Which aspects of the nuclear problem are in the forefront today? This question was answered by the last session of the General Assembly, which gave one of the most prominent places in its agenda to the problem of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. This answer, of course, is valid for the present moment as well.

Last year a good resolution was adopted, which called upon all States to undertake the necessary steps to conclude a treaty that would not contain any loopholes leading to the proliferation of nuclear weapons, directly or indirectly, in any form. There is still no such treaty, however, and the possibility that new States will continue to be added to the five nuclear Powers is increasing and is almost subject to a concrete analysis. It is clear to everyone that if the process of proliferation of nuclear weapons continues it could become irreversible, to say the least. An appropriate international treaty, with definitely outlined obligations of States, could serve as an effective means to combat the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

The reason why it has not been possible to conclude a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is an open secret. Immediately after all States had voted in New York for a good resolution on this question, certain Powers started, in Geneva, to search for the same loopholes for proliferating nuclear weapons, against which the United Nations had pronounced itself in no uncertain terms. It is well known for whom this is being done -- the Federal Republic of Germany -- but this only gives us all a reason to double and triple our concern. They are already conducting preparations in West Germany to equip the army with nuclear rocket weapons. Military personnel reared by Hitler's generals is being trained to handle nuclear weapons and rocketry. A base is being built up in the Federal Republic of Germany for its own atomic industry, research is being carried on, and the production and supply of nuclear materials has been started; and who can fail to know that the leaders of the Federal Republic of Germany are clamouring for participation in the disposal of nuclear weapons within the framework of NATO.

This militaristic obsession is rooted in the ideology, politics, and entire way of thinking of those who predetermined pre-war Germany's objectives of expansion and subjugation of other peoples. What is happening in the Federal Republic today is in many ways reminiscent of the path taken by Germany in the past on more than one occasion. The ruling circles of the Federal Republic of Germany have grasped, like a baton in a relay race, the slogans and precepts, for whose sake first the Prussian junkers and later the Nazi invaders twice plunged Europe into a blood bath before breaking their necks. These slogans are known to all: equal rights in armaments, creation of a military strike force, a new carving-up of European borders.

Those who have been taught nothing by the lessons of history sometimes claim that militarily West Germany is far weaker than the Soviet Union and much weaker than the socialist countries taken together and the peaceful nations as a whole. This is certainly true, and from this rostrum we should not like to describe the consequences for West Germany if the militarist and revanchist craze should turn the heads of its leaders and push them to madness. Another thing is true, also: if the Federal Republic cannot win the war, it can unleash it, if political recklessness drives it over the brink. This is why the question of maintaining European security has today become so urgent.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

History has willed that the state of affairs in Europe affects the interests of all States Members of the United Nations. Even when other centres of international tension appear, Europe still remains the barometer of the world's political weather, and the judgement of Europe on the question of war and peace is in many ways decisive. If any Government or statesman of a country situated thousands of miles from Europe argues that European affairs are distant and do not require concern on its part, the Second World War put an end to this way of thinking. Almost all States, with minor exceptions, however far from Europe they were situated, were involved in the war, directly or indirectly.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

The peoples which fought against fascism performed feats in the Second World War not with the sole aim of winning on the battlefield. The battle was also waged for the future of peace in Europe and against a third world war, and this battle continues.

The Soviet Union, like other socialist nations, deems it its direct duty to do all it can to save Europe from the danger of destructive wars, to open up vistas of peaceful co-operation among all European countries irrespective of their social systems. The recent conference of members of the Warsaw Treaty, which adopted the Declaration on the Consolidation of Peace and Security in Europe, offered a broad, realistic programme for solving these problems. Among the measures proposed by the socialist countries in order to strengthen European security we should like to emphasize two items: the maintenance of the inviolability of existing European borders and the prevention of access to nuclear weapons for the revenge-seekers. There can be no lasting peace and security in Europe and elsewhere without compliance with these provisions.

The genuine security of the European nations can be assured only if this problem is settled on an all-European basis, on the basis of co-operation between States situated in Eastern as well as Western Europe. A European peace cannot be secure when one military grouping of States in Europe confronts another, when mountains of weapons are piled up and forces are concentrated on both sides. Such a situation contradicts the interests of the peoples of Europe, and not only Europe. Only those forces profit by it that wish to keep Europe in a state of military tension by pursuing aims of their own which are alien to the interests of security of European nations.

The Soviet Union and other socialist States are willing to sit at the negotiating table together with all European States to discuss the pressing problems of European security.

We exclude no European State from these negotiations, including the Federal Republic of Germany, if it expresses readiness to participate.

The Soviet Government is far from being guided by any prejudice in respect of the Federal Republic, with which it would like to develop good relations, or by a desire to put it in an unequal position as compared to other States.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

This fully applies to the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as well. There can be no people and no country which would lose or be deprived of something by concluding a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. All will benefit as the cause of peace will benefit.

Are there any chances of concluding a non-proliferation treaty?

We believe there are, but it is necessary, of course, for the United States -- whose representatives acknowledge that the proliferation of nuclear weapons is fraught with danger for the American people too, and declare that the United States recognizes the responsibility laid upon it by possession of nuclear weapons -- to make its practical actions conform to these declarations. That is the only thing to be done.

As far as the Soviet Government is concerned, its position remains unchanged. We are willing to continue to seek solutions which would allow a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons to be signed. We are listening attentively to all constructive considerations, including the opinions of States which do not possess nuclear weapons.

In our view the negotiations on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons could be completed in a comparatively short period of time. Meanwhile, it is important that no one take steps which might lead, directly or indirectly, to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Taking this into consideration, the Soviet Government submits to the General Assembly an item entitled: "The renunciation by States of actions hampering the attainment of agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons".

We assume that this item proposed by us meets the desires of the majority of the States Members of the United Nations and promotes the development of the decision adopted by the General Assembly at its previous session, and supplements it. The Soviet Government calls on all States represented at the General Assembly to give due consideration to our proposal.

The problem of disarmament in its totality requires close attention on the part of the General Assembly, and the significance of this problem as well has been debated to the maximum extent within these walls. The grave truth lies in the fact that when practically nothing is being done in the field of disarmament, the armaments drive is following an increasingly steep spiral. Not only is the

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

amount of arms in the world increasing year by year, particularly the most destructive nuclear and rocket arms, and not only is the annual absolute sum of this death-dealing potential constantly growing, but the rate of this growth is increasing as well. The armaments drive can be compared to an inverted pyramid with a swiftly expanding base; and the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee, of five years' standing, to a monotonous movement in a closed circle.

The causes of this situation have been disclosed here time and again. There are Powers whose Governments do not want disarmament.

We reject a pessimistic philosophy which assumes that the world is incapable of dealing with the arms race at all. This approach is opportune only to those who seek to camouflage their policy of the arms drive. If there had been no struggle for disarmament, no efforts by many nations which genuinely desire to achieve the solution of this problem and achieve agreement on separate measures as well as on a broad programme of general and complete disarmament, what would have been the situation in the world? It would have been more complex and dangerous.

It may be said with confidence that if all States realized their responsibility to maintain peace, the problem of disarmament would have been solved. The United Nations can and should muster its strength in order to give a new impetus to disarmament negotiations.

The present stagnation in these negotiations makes the idea of convening a world conference on disarmament, with the participation of all countries of the world all the more pressing. No single opportunity should be missed to channel material and human resources, the achievements of science and technology, the genius of scientists, the craftsmanship of engineers and workers to the benefit of man, rather than to the arms race.

The United Nations is the child of the struggle of peoples against fascist oppressors. Its objective is to render assistance to all nations which are struggling for their freedom and independence.

With every passing year peoples are gaining new victories in the cause of eliminating the colonial system. At the present moment it is only in the southern part of Africa that colonialism retains a large bridgehead. However,

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

here, as well as in all other Territories whose peoples have not yet attained national liberation, the fight against the colonialists is in full swing. The Soviet people are on the side of those who struggle for liberty and independence in Angola, Mozambique, so-called Portuguese Guinea, South West Africa and Southern Arabia, those who defend their human, civil and political dignity in the struggle against racists in the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia. We are fully convinced that the peoples of the colonies -- all and every one of them -- will gain victory, and that the hour of this final victory is not far off.

The United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the recognition of the legality of the national liberation struggle, the decisions on the necessity to render moral and material support to the national liberation movements in colonial territories, the denunciation of the activity of international capitalist monopolies; the declaration that colonialism and racism are crimes against humanity -- these are real political contributions by the United Nations to the cause of eliminating colonial regimes. However, this is already insufficient.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

It is the belief of the Soviet Government that the direct duty of the General Assembly is to adopt decisions that will help make 1967 the year of the complete and final elimination of colonial regimes. Already in the first days of its work, the current session of the General Assembly is due to consider the question of eliminating foreign racist domination over South West Africa. The Soviet Union is prepared to support the independent African States that sponsored this item. In the struggle against racists and their patrons, truth is on the side of free Africa.

The United Nations must also firmly and resolutely oppose all manifestations of the policy of neo-colonialism, the policy of new enslavement of peoples which have won in a difficult struggle their political independence, but have not yet broken out of the grip of economic dependence. United and resolute actions by all anti-colonialist forces will be the best token of the success of peoples in their further struggle for freedom and independence.

The United Nations faces exciting tasks, so important for peoples in the development of peaceful co-operation between States in the economic, scientific, technological, cultural and other fields. However, everything is not going smoothly here. For example, the first United Nations Conference on Trade and Development elaborated principles of equal trade relations among all States. To a large extent this was the result of co-operation between Socialist and developing countries, which advocate genuine equality and the elimination of all kinds of discrimination in international trade. However, certain Powers retain a long-standing habit of using trade as a method of looting economically less developed countries. Their objective is to undermine attempts to put world trade on a basis of equality. As regards the Soviet Union, it is ready to co-operate with all States in order to achieve the implementation of the decisions adopted by the first Conference, and to move ahead to a broad normalization of world trade.

The United Nations has been discussing social problems for twenty years. Those who demand the implementation of the provisions of the United Nations Charter which proclaims noble principles of equality of nations, large and small, respect for the rights of man, regardless of race, sex, language and religion, have always met with stubborn opposition on the part of the forces of the old world, the world of inequality and the oppression of peoples. Yet, the United Nations has in no way

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

pronounced its final word in these matters. Together with everyone who holds dear the justice and dignity of every human being, in whatever country or continent he may live, we shall work for the adoption by the United Nations of effective decisions on international social problems.

In recent years, mankind has witnessed a completely new trend in the development of civilization, the conquest of outer space and the planets. Our people are proud that they were the first to embark on the path of mastering space.

The prospects of using outer space for the benefit of mankind are already easy to see. Super long-distance communications, space television and a reliable weather service may be mentioned, and that is not all. It is only natural that the question arises of the co-operation of States in the study and peaceful use of outer space. The Soviet Union is willing to undertake such co-operation, and it proceeds from this assumption in the course of present negotiations.

The establishment of principles of international law governing the activities of States in outer space would be a considerable and necessary step in this direction. With this in view, the USSR Government suggested the conclusion of an appropriate international treaty. The Soviet delegation expresses the hope that the General Assembly will pay due attention to this question.

The twenty-first session of the General Assembly heralds the third decade of the existence and activity of the United Nations. The tasks which it faces in the field of maintaining universal peace and developing international co-operation are becoming more complicated and formidable, rather than easier. The fact that United Nations bodies are not always in a position to give direct answers to questions posed by life is not caused only by the complexity of these tasks.

The United Nations Charter has vested the Security Council with the main responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. However, the Security Council at best only takes note of international crises, and not always that. The responsibility for the abnormal and distorted state of affairs in the Security Council lies with those Powers which are trying to attain their own selfish objectives in the United Nations, objectives which have nothing in common with the cause of consolidating world peace.

Yet, we are far from concluding that the Security Council should be considered as doomed to inactivity. There are sufficient opportunities at the disposal of States represented in the General Assembly to enliven this major United Nations body,

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

increase its role, as well as the role of the United Nations as a whole, to live up to the tasks set by the United Nations Charter.

In order to achieve this it is necessary, first of all, to assure strict compliance by all United Nations Member States with the provisions of the Charter, and to thwart any tendency to violate it, which has happened so often in the past.

The timeliness of this is proved by the fact that, again and again, the tendencies favouring the creation of some armed forces outside the framework of the Security Council, that is, in violation of the United Nations Charter, are played up. Such forces would be at the disposal of a narrow group of States, serve their special interests and have a mandate to perform international police functions. This idea appeals to some circles very much. The Soviet Union, as well as all States which cherish the freedom and independence of peoples, categorically opposes and will oppose any such plan.

The United Nations not only must not allow violations of its own constitution -- the Charter; it is its duty to protect the system of norms of international law on which thrive peaceful relations between nations. The struggle for a consistent observance of the norms of international law by all States, large or small, is acquiring special importance in present-day conditions.

This means that the United Nations must help States to rid international relations of the remnants of the "cold war" and, first of all, free itself from the questions which aggravate the situation, like the so-called Korean question. The only useful decision which the United Nations can adopt on this question is a decision on the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea, the dissolution of the ill-fated United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. The Korean people, provided that they are not disturbed, will find their own peaceful ways to settle their domestic problems -- an appeal that is consistently being voiced by the Government of the Korean People's Democratic Republic.

Instructed by their Governments, the delegations of the Socialist countries have proposed for the consideration of the twenty-first session of the General Assembly the question entitled: "Withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea". We express the hope that the General Assembly will take a decision on this question in line with the interests of the rights of the Korean people and the interests of peace in the Far East.

rh/17

A/PV.1413
81

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

To increase the role of the United Nations in international communication means also to transform it into a truly universal organization. Any political discrimination against States which express willingness to accept the obligations arising out of the United Nations Charter deals a blow in the first instance at the United Nations itself.

At the present moment an application from the German Democratic Republic for membership in the United Nations is under consideration. There is no doubt that the participation in the work of the United Nations of a peaceful German State -- the German Democratic Republic -- which is making a considerable contribution towards European security will enlarge the possibilities of our Organization and raise its prestige. It would be correct to admit to the United Nations simultaneously the other German State also -- the Federal Republic of Germany.

The Soviet Union also favours finally putting an end to the unnatural situation in which the Chinese People's Republic is denied her legitimate rights in the United Nations and its place is occupied by representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, which has been rejected by the Chinese people and is now being kept by a foreign Power. The legitimate rights of the Chinese People's Republic must be restored and the Chiang Kai-shek régime expelled from all United Nations bodies.

We would like to avail ourselves of this opportunity to commend the great positive role played by the United Nations Secretary-General, U Thant, in the activities of the United Nations. If he should express willingness to continue his work as Secretary-General, it would fully meet the desires of the Soviet Government.

States with different social systems are represented in the United Nations. They differ in their ideas as to the prospects of historical development and the ways of solving domestic problems of States. The Soviet people have their own beliefs. We are confident that they are the right ones. They find their expression in the practice of communist construction, in the decisions of the Twenty-Third Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which has, *inter alia*, determined the tasks of our country in the field of foreign policy and in the great social and economic achievements which are of primary importance to Soviet society. We do not impose upon anyone our beliefs or our road. Not a

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

single Soviet missile, not a single gun is aimed at the social systems of other countries and peoples. Their domestic affairs are their own affairs, but let nobody plan to interfere in our affairs or in the affairs of our friends and allies. If all States follow this principle, peace in the world will be secure.

The consistent policy of the Soviet Union, directed at ensuring international peace, found vivid expression at the time of the well known Tashkent meeting, which resulted in an end to the dangerous military conflict between two large States of Asia -- India and Pakistan. The Soviet Union sought nothing for itself at the Tashkent meeting. Neither are we seeking any unilateral advantages for ourselves, at this session of the General Assembly, by putting forward a number of topical issues prompted by the interests of preventing acts of aggression and of combating aggressive policies.

The Soviet Union, as well as other socialist States, acts in the United Nations and generally in the international arena with respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all States, and supports peoples fighting for their national freedom. This fundamental basis of our foreign policy is inseparably linked to the socialist social system of our country, which denies the exploitation of man by man, and under which nobody can have vested interests in maintaining international tension or in wars; there also exists a natural need for secure peace since the great plans of communist construction require peaceful conditions for their implementation.

Not only do we proclaim the principles of peaceful and just relations between States, but we employ all our international prestige to protect this just cause and to achieve the assertion of those principles in everyday international relations. Here, also, the nature of our socialist system and the profound humanism of its ideals find their expression.

The Soviet Union rejects a situation in which a small country -- for the sole reason that it is small -- is given an unequal position, a position of subjection and dependence, when the principle of coexistence is taken into account only in relations with some -- mainly bigger -- States and completely disregarded in the case of relations between a great Power and small countries.

The diversity of international developments gives rise to a great variety of questions at sessions of the United Nations General Assembly. We must focus our attention on the problems whose solution is attainable and which will truly contribute to an international detente.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

We are inspired by an awareness of the fact that the majority of the Governments represented here is working to achieve this aim, and therefore it is with considerable confidence that we anticipate the work ahead.

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

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

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

As my delegation pointed out yesterday, the greater a nation's power, the greater is its responsibility for peace. We of the United States will persevere in our efforts for peace in Viet-Nam. We still await a considered reply to our affirmative proposals, and we continue to hope that all Members of this Organization will join in this great endeavour. What counts is not prowess in the art of invective but prowess in the art of peace-making.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

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

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: Before adjourning this meeting, I would like particularly to use this opportunity to thank all the distinguished delegates for responding this morning to my appeal of yesterday; and enabling us to start our meeting on time. From that time until now it was on my mind that I should thank them all.

The plenary meeting is adjourned until 3.00 this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): As the General Assembly convenes in this twenty-first year of the United Nations, we of the United States of America are aware, as indeed every delegation must be, of the great responsibilities which all of us share in the work of this world Organization. No one, I am sure, feels these responsibilities more, or more keenly, than the Secretary-General, U Thant. In the past five years, he has filled his office with distinction and effectiveness. And indeed this is the most difficult office in the world. We know how much selfless dedication and energy have been exacted from him on behalf of the world community, and we can well understand how the burdens of his office led him to his decision not to offer himself for a second term as Secretary-General.

But the United Nations needs him. It needs him as a person. It needs him as a Secretary-General who conceives his office in the full spirit of the Charter as an important organ of the United Nations, endowed with the authority to act with initiative and effectiveness. The Members, in all their diversity and even discord, are united in their confidence in him. His departure at this crucial time in world affairs and in the life of the United Nations would be a serious loss both to the Organization itself and to the cause of peace among nations.

We reiterate our earnest hope that he will heed the unanimous wishes of the membership and permit his tenure of office to be extended. His affirmative decision on this question would give all of us new impetus to deal with the many great problems on our agenda.

The peoples of the world expect the United Nations to resolve these problems. With all their troubles and aspirations, they put great faith in our Organization. They look to us not for pious words but for solid results: agreements reached, wars ended or prevented, treaties written, co-operative programmes launched -- results that will bring humanity a few steps, but giant steps, closer to the purposes of the Charter which are our common commitment.

Realizing this, the United States has considered what it could say in this general debate that would improve the prospects for such fruitful results in the present session. We have concluded that, rather than attempting to review the many questions on the agenda to which we attach importance, we could make a more useful contribution by concentrating on the serious dangers to peace now existing in Asia -- particularly the war in Viet-Nam -- and by treating that subject in a constructive and positive way.

U.S.

Thurs. 20 Sept 1966
10²⁰ AM