

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records

**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1467th
MEETING**

Tuesday, 29 November 1966,
at 3.20 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 98:

*Elimination of foreign military bases in the
countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America
(continued)*

General debate (continued) 241

Chairman: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 98

Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries
of Asia, Africa and Latin America (continued)
(A/6399, A/C.1/L.369, A/C.1/L.385, A/C.1/L.386)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the Summit Conference of Independent African States, held at Addis Ababa in May 1963, when the Organization of African Unity was born, had resolved to bring about the end of military occupation of the African continent and the elimination of military bases and nuclear tests. The African people had thus proclaimed their genuine and legitimate desire to spare their continent from the hazards and humiliation of military occupation.

2. Guided by the principles and decisions of the Organization of African Unity, and consistent with his country's policy of non-alignment, his delegation firmly believed that the question under discussion and the Soviet draft resolution (A/C.1/L.369) merited serious consideration. In no circumstances could it be claimed that foreign military bases were in the best interests of world peace or of the people in whose territories the bases were stationed. The sooner the bases were eliminated, the better off the whole world would be. It would therefore be most regrettable if the question were thrown into oblivion on the ground that it was polemical. Countries which had refused to be drawn into military alliances and declared themselves against the occupation of their territory by foreign forces should unequivocally declare their opposition to military bases and express their strong and unambiguous demand that the bases must go. In so doing, they would only be reiterating the stand taken in the Declaration adopted by the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo in October 1964.

3. Many representatives had already thoroughly discussed military bases stationed in Africa, Asia and Latin America. He therefore wished to emphasize the data provided by the Soviet representative on the

air base that South Africa was establishing in the Caprivi Strip in South West Africa, between Zambia, Botswana and Angola, and on the military operations Portugal was undertaking in the territories it subjugated.

4. Were the military bases stationed in the heart of Africa in the best interests of the Africans? Were they set up to defend freedom and democracy? Was it not senseless to believe that bases in Portuguese-occupied territories contributed to Portugal's defence? The answer to those questions lay in the tragic lessons of history. All nations which had been forced to struggle for freedom were aware that military bases in colonial territories were used to stifle national liberation movements and thereby retard the decolonization process, in direct contravention of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)). It could not in all honesty be said that military bases in dependent territories fulfilled the noble mission of protecting the independence of the territories. It was indeed strange to assert that the presence of foreign troops in a country guaranteed that country's security. Was that precarious sense of security really intended for the people of the recipient country?

5. Common sense demanded that the Committee ponder a simple question: what would happen when the interests of the receiving State conflicted with the interests of the foreign Power that had established the military base? What freedom of action would the receiving State be allowed when its Government decided to take measures offensive to certain foreign monopolists belonging to the State that had installed a base? To phrase the question otherwise, who would protect the protected from the protectors?

6. Some maintained that military bases had been established in the interests of collective security and with the consent of the receiving States. Recent events had nevertheless shown how difficult, if not impossible, it was for countries with foreign military bases on their soil to demand and realize their evacuation. Was the maintenance of military bases despite implicit and explicit protests by a receiving State compatible with the principle of respect for national sovereignty? Did it not in fact violate a State's territorial integrity? Was not forced establishment of a foreign base aggression against the State in whose territory the base was located? Did that not violate General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States?

7. Foreign military bases not only threatened to exercise pressure to influence the political, economic and social orientation of a country, but also to draw it

into a war not of its own choosing. If aggressive actions were mounted against another State from a certain base, the attacked country or its allies would consider themselves justified in taking retaliatory measures against the country on whose soil the base was located. The United Kingdom representative had said that there was a confrontation between the major military alliances; it was urgent for other countries, in the interests of their own survival, not to allow themselves to become pawns in the confrontation.

8. The Committee had been deliberating disarmament matters for one and a half months. All members were agreed that general and complete disarmament was one of the fundamental challenges facing mankind. They were also agreed that, unless something was done to halt the arms race, a point of no return would sooner or later be reached. The time was ripe for members to demonstrate their sincere desire to relax international tension and pave the way to general and complete disarmament. His own delegation would support the call for the dismantling of foreign military bases in Africa, Asia and Latin America. By so doing, it was convinced that it was acting in the interest of the peoples of the three continents and struggling for the survival of small countries as free and sovereign nations and for the right of their peoples to decide their own destinies without the perpetual fear stemming from the presence of foreign military bases on their continents.

9. Mr. NIMMANHEMINDA (Thailand) noted that for the first time the question of military bases had been brought up before the Committee as a problem *per se*. Earlier documents had referred to foreign military bases in colonial territories, but now it was a question of foreign military bases in independent States. He could not understand why the problem raised in the Soviet explanatory memorandum had been limited to bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and could only conclude that a double standard had been established between those regions, on the one hand, and the rest of the world—Europe and North American in particular—on the other. The explanatory memorandum offered many arguments in support of the elimination of bases. While he did not wish to question the intention, he believed agreement should be reached on the meaning and scope of the term "military bases" and on the question of the admissibility or inadmissibility of such bases on foreign soil.

10. The question of military bases could not be separated from the problem of the use of force in international relations, nor from that of general and complete disarmament. So long as general and complete disarmament could not be ensured, the problem of military bases must be examined in the light of their *raison d'être* and their use, rather than their location. Military bases anywhere constituted a danger to international peace and security when set up for a purpose at variance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations; but they were permissible, and even a necessity, when used for operations undertaken by virtue of, or in defence of, the United Nations Charter and the rule of law.

11. The Thai delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2105 (XX). It would

also support any proposal to invite States with military bases in foreign territories anywhere—not only in Asia, Africa and Latin America—to eliminate bases used for purposes not authorized by the Charter or established without the consent of the receiving State. In so far as independent States were concerned, under Article 2 of the Charter, which enunciated the principle of the sovereign equality of States, States might enter into agreements on any matter with other States so long as the purposes and application of such agreements were not contrary to or inconsistent with international law and the United Nations Charter. The fundamental issue therefore lay in the intended use of military bases in foreign countries. In fact, it was the aggressive designs of some supposedly peace-loving countries and their, or their proxies', illegal use of force which were responsible for the threat to world peace and security today. The force they used to pursue their aggressive policy took the form not only of regular armed forces, but also of irregular or volunteer forces organized for incursion into the territory of other States to foment subversive activities. It was that kind of bases and staging areas which should be eliminated immediately, inasmuch as their purposes and use had never been, and never could be, legal.

12. The question of Viet-Nam appeared to be the central issue in the Soviet explanatory memorandum. There were two opposing views about the nature and origin of the Viet-Nameese tragedy. For his part, he was convinced that it was a case of aggression by North Viet-Nam, supported by Communist China and other communist countries, against the territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of Viet-Nam. The latter therefore had the right to defend itself and was entitled, under international law and under the United Nations Charter, to resort to collective defence measures. It was in the exercise of its rights, and after the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Viet-Nam had proved itself incapable of stopping the aggression, that the Republic of Viet-Nam had called upon friendly nations for military and economic aid. No fewer than thirty countries had responded to its appeal. It was obvious to any objective mind that the argument linking the problem of military bases to the situation in Viet-Nam was nothing but malicious propaganda typical of the cold war.

13. With regard to Thailand's role in the defence of the Republic of Viet-Nam, his country had never concealed its sympathy for the people of South Viet-Nam in the just struggle they were waging to defend their national independence. In fact, Thailand had officially informed the President of the Security Council in May 1966 that units of its armed forces would be sent to the Republic of Viet-Nam, at the request of the latter's Government, to assist in defending its territory against the armed aggression organized, directed and supported from outside. Thailand had acted in exercise of the natural right of collective self-defence and in conformity with the spirit and provisions of the Charter. The real issue, however, was not only the independence of the Republic of Viet-Nam, but the destiny and security of other peoples of South-East Asia as well. Thailand itself had long been the target of threats, subversive

activities and even armed intervention by Communist China and North Viet-Nam, which were in turn supported by other community countries. He proposed to describe those activities in more detail during the debate on agenda item 96.

14. In a situation which directly threatened its own security, Thailand could not but exercise its inherent right of individual and collective self-defence. There were no foreign military bases in Thailand. Some friendly countries were using Thai facilities for the express purpose of defending Thailand and taking part in the collective defence effort in conformity with the Charter. It was absurd to claim, as the Hungarian representative had done at the 1465th meeting, that Thai territory had been attacked by United States aircraft; no such incident had taken place.

15. "Armed intervention" and "gross violence against peoples fighting for their freedom and independence" —to borrow the terms used in the Soviet explanatory memorandum (A/6399)—did in fact exist in South-East Asia today, but they were perpetrated by those whom the Soviet Union was supporting. As co-Chairman of the 1954 Geneva Conference on the Problem of restoring Peace in Indo-China, the Soviet Union had an obligation to try to end the conflict instead of supporting the aggressors and adding fuel to the fire.

16. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) said that the item placed before the Committee on the initiative of the Soviet delegation was of great interest to all States which wished to establish an international order conforming to the principles of the United Nations as embodied in the Charter. The proliferation of military bases in foreign territory tended to create international conflicts and tensions. The bases were the points from which the attack would be launched in the event of a world conflagration, but they were, above all, a permanent threat to the peoples which had recently achieved independence and to those struggling for emancipation. To understand the danger they constituted, it was enough to mention that the United States, the most aggressive imperialist Power, which was constantly flouting international rules and which had the least respect for the sovereign rights of nations, had a large number of military bases scattered throughout the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, besides the bases now under construction in South Viet-Nam and in other parts of South-East Asia. Those bases were a constant source of threats, provocations and subversive activities against the self-determination, independence and sovereignty of the peoples of the regions. The history of every base established by the United States imperialists illustrated the policy of exploitation, intervention and blackmail which characterized United States relations with nations achieving independence. Originally almost all the bases had been set up under agreements or treaties imposed by force, sometimes while the country concerned was under military occupation. Their establishment was therefore based on pseudo-judicial instruments which were vitiated at the outset and therefore had no validity whatever. In many cases the bases had been imposed on the country before, or at the start of, its political independence and then used to hinder its complete emancipation.

17. It was obvious that at the present time foreign military bases actually served as an instrument of imperialist penetration and neo-colonialist enslavement and that the recently liberated countries were resolutely struggling for the dismantling of the bases which still existed in dependent territories. That was why the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America had called, in many international documents, including the Declaration adopted by the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo in October 1964, and the resolutions of the Summit Conference of Independent African States, held at Addis Ababa in May 1963, for elimination of the military bases the imperialists had established in their territory. Moreover, the representatives of the popular national liberation movements had adopted a resolution to that effect at the First Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, held at Havana in January 1966.

18. The Viet-Nam conflict was the most eloquent example of the threat foreign military bases posed to the peace and independence of peoples. In their war of criminal aggression, which included bombing attacks on the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and genocide against the South Viet-Nameese population —destruction of their crops and annihilation of civilians by the use of toxic gases, napalm and other chemical and bacteriological weapons—the United States imperialists were using not only the troops who were militarily occupying the southern part of Viet-Nam but the many military bases established south of the 17th parallel and in other countries of South-East Asia, as well as in such Pacific colonial territories as Guam, Laos and Cambodia were also victims of the activity of United States military bases in the region, and so was the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, against which the United States had recently launched an attack beyond the 38th parallel. The United States plan was to transform South Viet-Nam and South Korean into bases for aggression and provocation against the security of the socialist States and the independent Asian countries. The events now going on in the Far East should provide a lesson for the rest of the world.

19. Another tragic and striking example was that of Puerto Rico, whose territory, kept under United States colonial domination by force, constituted, for practical purposes, the world's largest nuclear military base. United States military bases occupied 13 per cent of the best land on that small and densely populated island. There were dozens of small bases and nine large bases, which cost the United States Government \$75 million a year to maintain. Two of them were nuclear bases: the giant air base of Ramey Field and the base known as Roosevelt Roads, which was used for storing guided missiles and training the forces to use them. Puerto Rican intellectuals of every political tendency had protested against the situation in a document, known as the "Documento del exterminio", published in the San Juan newspaper *El Mundo* on 16 September 1961 and again on 25 February 1963. The conversion of Puerto Rico into a huge United States nuclear fortress constituted a threat to all Latin American peoples, who owed it to themselves, as a matter of solidarity, to struggle for the dis-

mantling of all those bases and for the island's immediate independence.

20. He could not but mention the naval base of Guantánamo, imposed on Cuba by force at a time when it had not yet achieved independence. The United States representative had told the Committee, at the 1456th meeting that all the military bases established by his Government abroad were the result of agreements negotiated with the host countries and that the activities carried out at those installations were known to the countries concerned. That statement was untrue in the case of the Guantánamo base, which was juridically invalid, morally unjust and politically intolerable by reason of its perpetual nature and its ridiculous rent of \$2,000 a year. The Guantánamo base was a result of the Platt Amendment adopted by the Congress of the United States, which had given the United States the right to intervene in Cuba and which had been forced upon the Cuban Constituent Assembly as an annex to the first Cuban Republican Constitution at a time when Cuba had been occupied by United States troops, whose withdrawal had been made contingent on unconditional acceptance of that shameful clause.

21. The leading authorities in the field of international law held that the existence of the Guantánamo naval base was completely illegal and contrary to all rules of law. Thus, Judge Fernando Alvarez Tabfo of the Cuban Supreme Court had stated in a recent study (a) that the perpetual lease on the land and the territorial sea had no legal force by virtue of the fact that it was defective in its essential elements, inasmuch as the Cuban Government had had no authority to cede a portion of the national territory in perpetuity, the purpose and the basis of the lease had therefore been unlawful, and the Government's consent had been gained by means of irresistible and unjust moral coercion; (b) that the lease had by its very nature been a temporary one and the thing leased had been intended to serve a specified purpose, so that Cuba was entitled to cancel the agreement in view of the time that had passed since its conclusion and the new use being made of the base, which was prejudicial to the principles of sovereignty and self-determination; (c) that the basis for the lease no longer existed inasmuch as the naval base was being used to threaten the security and independence of the Republic of Cuba, so that the latter was entitled to demand application of the rebus sic stantibus clause; and (d) that a treaty which was unconstitutional and had no legal force did not confer rights or impose obligations.

22. In the eight years during which the Revolutionary Government had held power in Cuba, the Guantánamo base had become a source of aggression, harassment and subversion. The territory of the base had been transformed into a refuge for the henchmen of the tyrant Batista and into a den of spies, saboteurs, terrorists and counter-revolutionaries, to say nothing of the subversive operations carried on from the base by the United States Central Intelligence Agency. All of that constituted intolerable interference in Cuba's internal affairs and showed that the United States was determined to destroy the Cuban revolution by the most ignoble means. Those circumstances were also at variance with the provisions of the so-called agree-

ment under which the base had been established. The acts of aggression committed by the United States forces had resulted in the serious injury or death of Cuban soldiers. Those activities, which were denied by the United States Government, clearly showed that the Pentagon was planning new aggression against Cuba but that the firm attitude of the Revolutionary Government was preventing it from putting its plans into effect. The United States representative would find it difficult to give any evidence of Cuban attacks on the area of the United States base. Neither pressure nor aggression of any kind would make the Cuban people go back on their irrevocable decision to create the first socialist society in the Americas and to defend their national independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty, whatever the cost.

23. It was not surprising that the United States representative was still grievously distressed over the decisions taken by the First Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, held at Havana in January 1966—the first Tricontinental Conference—since none of those decisions had been favourable to the imperialist policy based on exploitation, oppression, plunder, aggression, interference, subversion, blackmail, racial discrimination, famine, ignorance, poor sanitary conditions and the lack of culture, the effects of which were felt by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The very fact that the United States was hostile to the Tricontinental Conference had confirmed his Government's belief that the decisions of the Conference were effective and that his Government had been right in giving them full support.

24. The United States representative had referred, at the 1465th meeting, to secret bases used for subversive activities. The reactionaries were wrong in believing that revolutions could be exported or imported at will and preferred to remain ignorant of the fact that every people made its own revolution; however, their dream had always been shattered and had at times been transformed into a nightmare, as, for example, when the unarmed population had stood up to well armed, well trained United States troops in Panama in January 1964 and in the Dominican Republic in April 1965.

25. So far, the discussion had been concerned with the official bases maintained by the Pentagon, but a great deal could also be said about the secret bases, particularly those maintained by the United States Central Intelligence Agency in Florida and certain Central American countries, including the bases which had been used for the invasion of Cuba in April 1961. Since the beginning of the current session, Cuba had been subjected to two air attacks by pirate aircraft sent from the north by a counter-revolutionary organization which had its headquarters in Miami. To his knowledge, the organization in question had not even been reproached for those criminal acts by the United States authorities, although the United States representative might wish to correct him on that point.

26. Finally, the United States representative had referred (1465th meeting) to the so-called crisis of October 1962. Instead of once again stating the Cuban Government's well known position with regard

to those events, their cause and the course they had taken, he would refer the members of the Committee to the statement which the Cuban Minister for External Relations had made in the general debate in the General Assembly (1446th plenary meeting).

27. Mr. SCHUURMANS (Belgium) said that, although he had not intended to speak, he felt obliged to set the record straight, inasmuch as certain delegations had seen fit to refer to what they called "the Belgian military bases in Africa". As the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo had pointed out (1466th meeting), under agreements concluded between Belgium and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the installations at Kamina, Kitona and Banana had been transferred to the Congo, which exercised full sovereignty over them.

28. Moreover, every State was entitled to decide for itself, without seeking advice from anyone, whether to maintain or permit the maintenance on its territory of military bases which would be used by foreign forces. To accept the injunctions contained in the Soviet draft resolution would mean infringing the provisions of the United Nations Charter, which guaranteed respect for the sovereignty of States and their right to provide, as they saw fit, for their individual or collective defence.

29. Mr. TRIVEDI (India), recalling that the United Nations had concerned itself with the question of foreign military bases since its inception, said that the problem of bases had continued to be an important element in the consideration of disarmament issues. Many delegations had emphasized not only how dangerous it would be for the existing situation to continue but also the benefits to be derived from speedy action to correct that situation. His delegation therefore supported the initiative taken by the USSR.

30. India had consistently declared its opposition to foreign military bases, for it was convinced that the real way to achieve international security was through disarmament. The dismantling of existing bases, a decision not to establish new ones and the withdrawal of foreign troops would be an important step in the process of arms limitation which the international community wished to initiate as part of a programme of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Such measures would also help to reduce international tension and strengthen mutual trust. As a non-aligned country, India felt that the existence of military blocs and great-Power alliances had intensified the cold war and heightened international tension, and, in conformity with the Declaration adopted at the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo in October 1964, it refused to take part in such alliances. As had been stated at the First Conference, held at Belgrade in September 1961, the military blocs were growing into more and more powerful military, economic and political groupings, which, by the logic and nature of their mutual relations, necessarily provoked periodical aggravations of international relations. An effective way to reverse that unwholesome trend was to begin the dismantling of foreign military bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops.

31. Military bases in colonial territories represented the most objectionable feature of that undesirable process of development, for they had been established without the consent of the people of the territories. They served warlike purposes, and, in particular, they were used to thwart the desire of the colonial peoples for freedom and independence. The General Assembly had accordingly, in resolution 2105 (XX), demanded the dismantling of military bases in colonial territories.

32. Those who cited security requirements as justification for foreign bases failed to take account of the armed pressure which those bases exerted on the colonial peoples struggling for their freedom, of the requirements of genuine security based on arms control and limitation, or of the benefits to be derived from reducing tension and strengthening mutual trust through the elimination of the bases.

33. The problem of eliminating foreign bases was an important aspect of disarmament. As such, it could be solved in only one way, i.e., through the removal of the bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops, as outlined in the declarations made at Belgrade in September 1961 and at Cairo in October 1964 by the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries. That was the solution which led to freedom and world peace.

34. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that the small countries, particularly those of Africa, Asia and Latin America, would prefer not to take part in the conflicts of ideas which sometimes occurred in United Nations debates as a result of the cold war; but however much they might wish to remain aloof from such conflicts, they were compelled to speak out when fundamental principles were at stake.

35. Liberia had no foreign bases in its territory, and certainly the world would be a better place to live in if there were no foreign bases anywhere; but the fact remained that such bases existed. The Liberian Government's views on the question were based on its support of the principles which recognized the rights of peoples, whether sovereign or dependent.

36. Sovereign countries did have the right to establish, by bilateral or multilateral agreements, military bases on the territory of one of the parties. That right, however, carried with it the obligation not to infringe the sovereignty of other countries and not to resort to the threat or the use of force for the suppression of dependent peoples.

37. It was the sovereign right of independent countries in whose territories military bases had been established, either by agreement or in circumstances beyond their control, before they had attained independence, to determine that they no longer desired such bases, and their decisions should be respected.

38. Her delegation would always support the view that military bases should be removed from dependent territories. Colonial administrators did not need military bases to maintain law and order in the territories which they administered.

39. Experience showed that military bases established in dependent territories could be used to frustrate the will of the peoples of those territories

and permitted the use of force in other dependent territories. But that was not all. The sovereign nations in whose territory military bases had been established for collective defence purposes diverted the weapons and military equipment provided for those bases and used them to destroy defenceless dependent peoples. Such practices had to be condemned, however much the small countries might wish to stay out of the cold war. The time had come when it was necessary not only to talk of peace but also to take action which would lead to peace. One of the ways of doing that was to eliminate foreign military bases throughout the world.

40. To that end, she introduced certain amendments (A/C.1/L.386) to the Soviet draft resolution (A/C.1/L.369). The first was the addition of a new first preambular paragraph to the effect that foreign military bases should never be established in the territory of the independent States of Asia, Africa and Latin America against the sincere and freely expressed wishes of the peoples directly concerned. The first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution would be replaced by a paragraph, which would become the second preambular paragraph, expressing the view that when foreign military bases were established contrary to the sincere and freely expressed wishes of the peoples directly concerned, the consequences were likely to be those indicated in the first preambular paragraph of the Soviet Union draft resolution.

41. To bring the rest of the text into harmony with the first preambular paragraph, operative paragraph 1 would be changed to invite States with military bases in the territory of independent States to eliminate them, unless the States in exercise of their sovereign rights wished to retain the bases in their territories. It then became necessary to insert a new operative paragraph 2, stating the principle that military bases should be eliminated from dependent territories.

42. Those amendments sought to eliminate the controversial features of the Soviet draft. She therefore asked the Soviet representative to accept them and urged the Committee to support them.

43. Mr. CHIMIDDORJ (Mongolia) said that the elimination of foreign military bases in Asia, Africa and Latin America was a matter of the greatest importance, for the existence of such bases was a source of international tension and served as an instrument in the policy of aggression and neo-colonialism. Foreign military bases expressed the infringement of sovereignty in its worst guise, and were a form of occupation of the State in which they were established. Such bases had always been established as the result of pressure exerted by the imperialist Powers, and it was in fact by their use that colonial empires had been able to dominate other countries.

44. At the present time foreign military bases were being maintained and expanded primarily for the purpose of suppressing national liberation movements and delaying the process of liquidating the last vestiges of colonialism. The military bases of the imperialist Powers, particularly those of the United States, had become tools of colonialism and the favourite means of intervening in the internal affairs of States which had recently attained independence. In Africa, for

example, neo-colonialism had made use of racism, foreign military bases and direct intervention in the internal affairs of African peoples. The role which certain United Kingdom and Belgian military bases had played in the Congo tragedy was well known. It was also known that the base at Aden and the foreign bases on the African continent were used only for suppressing the legitimate struggle of the peoples for freedom and independence.

45. The United States military bases in Latin American countries were often used for acts of aggression and intervention in those countries designed to change their internal or external policies and to impose on them régimes friendly to the United States imperialists. The most typical example was the series of acts of provocation and subversion carried out against the Republic of Cuba from the United States base at Guantánamo. Nor could the recent events in the Panama Canal Zone and in the Dominican Republic be forgotten; in the latter case, the United States had used its military bases in Puerto Rico for its intervention in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic.

46. A network of United States military bases covered vast areas of Asia and Oceania. The United States policy of intervention in the internal affairs of Latin American countries was being followed by a new policy in Asia—the "Asian doctrine". In accordance with that doctrine the United States aimed at establishing itself in various areas of Asia and the Far East; and for that purpose it had created a far-flung complex of military bases which it was constantly expanding in South-East Asia, the Far East and Oceania. The United States military presence in Asia was a threat not only to peace in that part of the world but to the security of all peoples.

47. The aggressive colonialist policy being carried out by the United States in Viet-Nam clearly showed how that Power, which was a permanent member of the Security Council and therefore bore a heavy responsibility for the maintenance of peace, was in fact engaging in cynical and unrestrained aggression. It was impossible not to mention the war in Viet-Nam, since it involved not only the use of existing military bases but also the construction of new bases and other military installations. Many States strongly condemned the war which the United States was waging in Viet-Nam. However, the statements made by the United States representatives gave the impression that they were inclined to regard the unanimous condemnation of United States aggression and the escalation of the war as a tendency to revert to the "cold war" period. That was not the case, however; furthermore, the conflict which had been going on so long in Asia was a "hot war". In view of those facts, it was impossible to be silent and to refrain from calling upon the United States to put an end immediately to its criminal war in Viet-Nam.

48. Disregarding the Geneva Agreements of 1954, the United States had sent armed forces to South Viet-Nam and had set up a network of military bases designed for acts of aggression against the Viet-Nameese people. The huge military base at Da Nang, for example, had been turned over to the United States for a period of ninety-nine years. As it

developed its military operations in South Viet-Nam and its aggression against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, the United States was involving in its adventure its military bloc allies and the Asian countries in whose territories United States military bases were established. For example, there were at present more than 150 United States bases in Japan which were already being used for transferring armed troops to Viet-Nam, although officially they were not supposed to be used for active military operations without the consent of the Japanese Government. That showed clearly what the so-called mutual security treaty between the two countries signified, and whether its purpose was defence—as claimed—or aggression. The United States had in fact again occupied the Philippines, where there were reported to be about 100,000 United States soldiers, and from which its military aircraft launched raids on the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. As for United States penetration in Thailand, that had reached such proportions that that Asian country had become the main United States air base for its war against Viet-Nam and for its flights over Cambodia and Laos. The zeal with which the representative of Thailand had endeavoured, earlier in the meeting, to prove the contrary had merely confirmed the purposes for which the military bases were being established and used. Similarly, the United States military bases on the island of Taiwan and in South Korea served to maintain puppet régimes which were a threat to the peoples of Asia and the Far East.

49. The United States war of aggression in Viet-Nam once more revealed how important it was to the peoples of South-East Asia and every other continent that foreign military bases should be eliminated. The United States military clique sought refuge in slogans about anti-communism and the maintenance of United States security, but it was perfectly obvious that no country in Asia, Africa or Latin America was threatening or could threaten the security of the United States. Therefore, references to United States defence needs were simply intended to justify that country's interference in the affairs of other States and its policy of suppressing national liberation movements. The ruling circles of some countries in which the United States maintained military bases were inclined to regard such bases as a "guarantee of security", but they must surely realize that the United States was pursuing a completely different purpose, namely, that of perpetuating its presence in those countries and involving them in its military adventures. Certain countries had thus become accessories to the war of aggression in Viet-Nam and it was not impossible that, by offering their territory for use as an imperialist military base, they might come to lose their sovereignty or their independence. In the event of a major armed conflict, military bases located in foreign territory would act both as jumping-off grounds and as targets, and the Governments of States which allowed military bases to be installed in their territory were therefore exposing their countries to grave dangers.

50. Moreover, foreign military bases constituted a form of proliferation of conventional or nuclear armaments. The United States currently had outside its own frontiers 2,200 military bases or other installa-

tions, and regularly maintained beyond its borders nearly 1 million officers and men and a vast quantity of arms and military equipment, including nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles.

51. Those facts showed how vital and urgent it was to solve the problem of the elimination of foreign military bases. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mongolia had stressed in the Assembly's general debate (1430th plenary meeting) that military bases in foreign territory constituted an infringement of the national independence and sovereignty of peoples, and a violation of the rules of international law and of the principles of the United Nations Charter.

52. The Soviet draft resolution was designed to secure first of all the elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In making that proposal, the Soviet delegation had apparently regarded it as a first step, which would be comparatively easy to take, towards a general solution of the problem. That was understandable considering the number of peoples in those three continents who were declaring themselves in favour of the elimination of foreign bases and the creation of nuclear-free zones. That demand had also been reflected in the documents of the 1963 Summit Conference of Independent African States, the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at Cairo, and the Tricontinental Conference at Havana. The implementation of the Soviet draft resolution would help to consolidate the independence and sovereignty of the newly independent States of those continents. Furthermore, the existence of foreign military bases was contrary to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2105 (XX) and of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty (resolution 2131 (XX)).

53. His delegation supported the Soviet draft resolution and was convinced that its implementation would help to eliminate colonialism, to put an end to imperialist interference in other States and to protect the liberty, independence and sovereignty of newly independent States and small countries, and would therefore represent a valuable contribution to the relaxation of international tension and the consolidation of international peace and security.

54. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) said that he wondered whether the very fact that the question of the elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America had been submitted for the General Assembly's consideration by a country not directly concerned did not constitute a violation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty, and also of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter. For where a State freely permitted a military base to be established in its territory, it did so in the exercise of its sovereignty; and its right to do so was incontestable, provided the base was not used in a manner prejudicial to the sovereignty of another State. It was true that the African Heads of State or Government had decided, at the first Summit Conference of Independent African States, "to undertake

to bring about, by means of negotiation, the end of military occupation of the African continent and the elimination of military bases", but the achievement of that objective was up to them, and their decision did not give any State the right to demand, through the United Nations, that the bases existing in Africa should be eliminated. Nor was it clear why the item under discussion restricted the scope of the problem to Africa, Latin America and Asia, when military bases existed elsewhere, especially in Europe. It would have been preferable to put the problem on a universal and legally sound footing, in order to avoid the risk of lapsing into demagoguery and propaganda.

55. The Ivory Coast was not itself concerned with the question, since there were no military bases in its territory. Agreements for co-operation had indeed been concluded with France, but they had been concluded in complete freedom, without any pressure and in a spirit of hostility towards no one. It had been argued that events in certain African countries were largely due to the dishonest machinations of imperialism; the analysis would have been fuller and nearer the truth if blame had also been laid at the door of those who, without being unashamed imperialists, behaved in the same way by financing subversive elements against their country of origin, by ill-timed intervention in the domestic affairs of sovereign States and by setting themselves up as public arbiters of morality instead of attempting to practise what they preached. So far as the Ivory Coast was concerned, it intended to continue living in friendship with all those who respected its independence and its political and economic freedom of choice.

56. However, in the existing international situation the presence of foreign military bases installed in certain countries against their will could impede the exercise of the right to self-determination by the peoples of those countries and jeopardize their accession to independence. Although it favoured the elimination of such bases, the Ivory Coast thought that it would be for the competent representatives of those countries, once they had achieved independence, to state whether they wished the bases to be retained or eliminated. He realized, too, that the elimination of foreign bases could contribute to the lessening of international tension throughout the world; it was in that spirit that his delegation had chosen to take part in the discussion and it was from that wider point of view that it had studied draft resolution A/C.1/L.369. Regardless of the Soviet Union's motives, the drafting of the first preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 1 was unacceptable both in form and in content, since it constituted a violation of Article 2 of the Charter, of the right of sovereignty and of the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of States. In the interests of objectivity, his delegation continued to favour a text of more general scope, and considered that the amendments proposed by the delegations of Togo (A/C.1/L.385) and Liberia (A/C.1/L.386) met that requirement.

57. The three texts before the Committee contained enough positive elements to provide a base for agreement, and the three delegations concerned should now be requested to consult together and submit to the Committee a joint text acceptable to all members.

58. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) said that he thought it would have been better not to raise for the time being such a controversial question as the elimination of foreign military bases, a question on which, moreover, the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament had not been able to reach unanimous agreement. The solution of that problem should take into account the existing situation and the need to maintain the balance, however precarious, without which the idea of international security was likely to remain a pious hope.

59. The political, geographical and historical circumstances of some countries could not be ignored and it would be unreasonable to disregard the fact that certain countries had, in the full exercise of their sovereignty and without any constraint, placed at the disposal of other countries installations for the preservation of national or collective security. A country had the right to preserve its recently acquired sovereignty and its territorial integrity. Geographical conditions sometimes made it difficult to safeguard them with means which were limited, if not non-existent. In the present state of affairs, therefore, countries bound by common interests could not be denied the right to unite their efforts to ensure their defence. Foreign military bases could not have the effect of perpetuating tensions if their purpose was purely defensive. The assertion that such installations were used for purposes of direct intervention in the internal affairs of peoples was a generalization which, as such, might easily appear fallacious. While it was true that the General Assembly, in resolution 2105 (XX), requested the colonial Powers to dismantle the military bases installed in colonial territories and to refrain from establishing new ones, and while his delegation could not but subscribe to the spirit of that resolution, it was nevertheless true that those territories remained under the responsibility of the administering countries until they attained independence.

60. The Soviet draft resolution in its present form could not command the support of his delegation. At the political level, it failed to take into account the right of free peoples to conclude agreements which came within the framework of the Charter, in particular Article 51; at the juridical level, a generalization which covered both independent States and dependent territories was not tenable; and from the practical standpoint, it was always difficult to provide for the possible application of obviously complex measures.

61. If it could be proved that the elimination of foreign bases constituted one of the partial and collateral measures which would make it possible to solve the problems posed by general disarmament, his delegation would not hesitate to study any initiative aimed at the objective and realistic consideration of that point. It was to be understood, however, that it should be considered within the context of the right of collective defence, as specified in the Charter, and with respect for the sovereignty of a State in relation to the safeguarding of interests which it deemed vital for its existence as an independent State. It was in that spirit that his delegation would study the amendments to the Soviet draft resolution.

62. Mr. COLERIDGE-TAYLOR (Sierra Leone) noted with satisfaction that one delegation had recognized the dangers inherent in the existence of military bases in foreign countries and had decided to bring the matter before the General Assembly. It was also significant that the matter had been raised by a permanent member of the Security Council; that bore witness to a high sense of responsibility, without which the Council could not effectively discharge its special duty of ensuring universal peace and security. It was in that global context that his delegation approached the question of foreign military bases. Although military bases might constitute a problem in themselves, they were but a reflection of the present troubled times and prevailing tensions. If, therefore, it was desired to establish peace it would surely be more appropriate to seek to eliminate those tensions; viewed from that point of view, foreign military bases were but one aspect of the question of general and complete disarmament, in respect of which the General Assembly had made considerable, if slow, progress.

63. In supporting the general call for the elimination of foreign military bases, Sierra Leone was expressing its desire to see the world achieve general and complete disarmament. The question of foreign military bases was, however, too complex to be settled in such a summary fashion. Foreign military bases could be divided roughly into three categories. Firstly, there were bases established under bilateral or multilateral agreements between sovereign States and retained by mutual agreement. To call for the dismantling of those bases would constitute a violation of the sovereign right of independent States, and there might be economic or strategic reasons why their elimination would not be in the interest of the nation concerned. The only thing which could be done in such circumstances was to urge the State in whose territory the base was established to co-operate in the disarmament effort by taking active steps to dismantle the base. Secondly, there were bases established by agreement but no longer desired by the recipient State. The problem was even more serious when the recipient country was a sovereign State, and it could not be denied that, whatever the justification for such bases, their continued presence in a foreign country against the wishes of its Government and people raised the question of its national integrity and sovereignty even when treaties and strategic considerations were involved. In such circumstances, it was not in the interest of either the parties or universal peace to perpetuate the tensions caused by the existence of the base. Thirdly, there were bases established in dependent territories. Whatever the agreements governing the establishment or maintenance of such bases, it was manifestly unfair that the peoples of such territories were generally not consulted before the bases were built, and even where they were consulted the negotiations were inevitably tainted by the injustice of the master-servant relationship. It was in connexion with that last category of bases that the United Nations had an important responsibility to discharge as the repository of the sacred rights of mankind, as the General Assembly had recognized when, in resolution 2105 (XX), it had requested the colonial Powers to dismantle the military bases

installed in colonial territories and to refrain from establishing new ones. All the colonial Powers therefore had the duty to comply fully with that clear and unequivocal provision.

64. Compelling arguments, both strategic and economic, had been adduced to justify the existence of foreign military bases. It had been alleged, in particular, that the present balance of peace was being maintained partly as a result of the existence of military bases in different parts of the world. Valid though some of those arguments might be, the three categories of bases which he had just mentioned had certain features in common which rendered their continued existence at best undesirable: the presence of foreign military bases contributed to a climate of belligerency which was not in the interest of universal peace; the territory in which a base was installed was by that very fact exposed to the danger of reprisals; the presence of a foreign military base in any area might facilitate direct or indirect intervention in the affairs of the people of that area. Moreover, bases established in colonial territories became the symbol and often the instrument of colonial domination and oppression. Finally, the maintenance of foreign military bases could not be conducive to the achievement of general and complete disarmament. His delegation was in favour of the elimination of foreign military bases in all countries, whatever the area in which they were situated; that latter point had been brought out by the representative of Togo in the amendments which he had submitted (A/C.1/L.385).

65. Mr. VAKIL (Iran), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, noted with regret that certain delegations had seen fit to set themselves up as judges of the sovereign interests of other countries, notably with respect to the participation of Iran in the CENTO regional defence pact. Contrary to what the representative of the United Arab Republic seemed to think, Iran had never found it difficult to justify its peaceful policy, for the CENTO pact was a purely defensive instrument. There were no foreign bases in Iran, and the Iranian Government had no intention of allowing any such bases to be established in the future. He would like, however, to stress that in a region where peace and security were threatened by aggressive designs every country must look to the defence of its independence and its national integrity; Iran was doing so even as it pursued its policy of peace and progress. Iran was today a haven of stability and economic and social progress in the Middle East and its efforts had enabled it to strengthen its co-operative relations with all its neighbours, including the Soviet Union. The expansion of those friendly and peaceful relations with all States throughout the world had not prevented it from maintaining and consolidating its relations with States which had proved their friendship for it in difficult times.

66. The representatives of the United Arab Republic and Syria, who professed their dedication to non-alignment, should be glad to see Iran practising an independent and peaceful policy in present world conditions and systematically pursuing a dynamic and progressive course through the establishment of ties with other countries regardless of their ideologies or political and economic systems. How-

ever, certain grim realities characteristic of the situation in the Middle East made it understandable that Iran's policy of peace and progress should be displeasing to those for whom non-alignment sometimes served as a strange alibi. He felt obliged to point out that, at a time when Iran was reaffirming its determination never to tolerate the presence of foreign bases on its soil, another country, whose representative was calling for the dismantling of all foreign bases, had itself established such a base outside its own borders.

67. Mr. BONDOC (Philippines), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, wished to inform the Committee that the remarks of the Mongolian representative concerning the use of foreign bases in the Philippines were devoid of any foundation and were nothing but a figment of his imagination.

68. Mr. FOSTER (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said the kind of statements which the Committee had just heard from the representatives of Cuba and Mongolia showed how difficult it was to attempt to discuss seriously a proposal whose main objective was to unleash wild propaganda. Several representatives had, it was true, tried to deal with the question seriously, but it could now be asked if the item had any constructive purpose. Those who had frustrated the efforts of the United States Government to have aggression in Viet-Nam considered by the proper United Nations forum

were now using the item as a basis for false charges against the United States. It was hard to believe that there was any other purpose in the minds of those who had requested the inclusion of that item in the agenda and who had drafted the proposal in its original form.

69. Mr. CHIMIDDORJ (Mongolia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, expressed astonishment that the United States representative should seek to represent the truth concerning the aggression in Viet-Nam as "propaganda". If it could be called "propaganda" it was propaganda aimed not at fostering a "cold war" atmosphere but at putting an end to a "hot war" in the interests of world peace. That kind of propaganda was assuredly not contrary to the United Nations Charter.

70. The First Committee would not be the Political and Security Committee if it did not examine items in the context of the international situation as it really was, particularly when a member of the Security Council was guilty of brutal intervention in the affairs of another country. If the United States representative did not like hearing any mention of his country's aggression in Viet-Nam, he should seek to promote the immediate cessation of that aggression. Otherwise, the peoples would not remain passive in the face of flagrant injustice.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.