

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1443rd MEETING: 22 AUGUST 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1443)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 21 August 1968 from the representatives of Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8758)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-THIRD MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 22 August 1968, at 9 p.m.

President: Mr. João Augusto DE ARAUJO CASTRO
(Brazil).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Algeria, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Hungary, India, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1443)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Letter dated 21 August 1968 from the representatives of Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8758).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 21 August 1968 from the representatives of Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8758)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken yesterday and this morning, I propose now, if there is no objection, to invite the representatives of Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria to take seats at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. Muzik (Czechoslovakia) and Mr. M. Tarabanov (Bulgaria) took places at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: In addition, I should like to inform the members of the Security Council that I received a letter this morning from the Deputy Permanent Representative of Poland which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request that I be invited in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter to participate in the deliberations of the Security Council, convened on the request of six Member States as contained in document S/8758 of 21 August 1968.

"(Signed) Leszek KASPRZYK
"Minister Plenipotentiary
Deputy Permanent Representative
to the United Nations"

3. In the light of this request, I would propose, if I hear no objection, to invite the representative of Poland to take a seat at the Council table in order to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of this item.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. L. Kasprzyk (Poland) took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the question before it. The first speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Czechoslovakia, on whom I now call.

5. Mr. MUZIK (Czechoslovakia): Mr. President, I have the honour to inform you, as well as the other members of the Security Council, that the situation in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has been deteriorating as a result of the occupation by foreign armed forces. This morning, we received from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs—I underline: from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs—of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic the following press cable about the situation in the country.

"Today no newspapers have been issued with the exception of special issues of *Svobodné Slovo* and *Zemedelské noviny* which have been distributed free of charge and the public has been informed only by the free radio stations of the local committees of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia in Prague, Plzen, Budejovice, Hradec Králové, Ustí nad Labem. In addition to the clandestine stations, the positions of which are secret, on the air is from time to time also the occupation radio station Vltava. Dubcek, Kriegel, Spacek, Smrkovský continue to be interned. President Svoboda surrounded on the castle. Destinies of Minister Pavel, Prime Minister Cerník and other ministers unknown. Yesterday seventeen members of the Government met under the chairmanship of Machacová-Dostálová. The Government issued an appeal to the nation and the requirement that the interned functionaries be released, that the occupation armies be withdrawn and that the activities of constitutional officials be enabled. Yesterday evening President Svoboda spoke in the official radio station. He condemned the occupation as an act of force and made an appeal to maintain fidelity to the principles of the action programme. He had talks with the Government and advised that he would meet with it also today and probably also personally with Prime Minister Cerník. Today, the Extraordinary Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is to be convened. Today at 9 a.m. the National Assembly will meet with the free members of the Government. The occupation units

promised to enable the access to the building of the National Assembly for this purpose. Transportation paralysed in Prague. Regional functionaries negotiate with the commanding officers of the occupation units and they attained yesterday in Plzen, Budejovice and other places that the units have been withdrawn from the centres of the towns. In spite of our efforts we have not so far succeeded in establishing any official contact with the representative of the occupation armies. The statement of the military commander in Prague and the Central Bohemian region has been distributed among the population under which the commander of the occupation armies overtakes *de facto* the rights of the Government. Allegedly a fraction collaborationist Central Committee is being formed. Persons mentioned in this connexion are Bilak, Kolder, Indra and Barbírek. A majority of the population backs the Dubcek leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, President Svoboda and the Cerník Government."

6. I should like to add that we received this cable at 9 a.m. today. Since that time we have had no other report through this channel on the situation in Czechoslovakia. In spite of this situation, it seems that the occupation forces have not succeeded in imposing on the Czechoslovak people representatives whom it did not elect. The Permanent Mission has received a message that, last night, a majority of members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia met in Czechoslovakia, fully supported the position of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia of 21 August—about which I had the honour to inform you yesterday—and decided to stay in meeting uninterruptedly.

7. Another message states:

"An extraordinary Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is meeting in Czechoslovakia. The Congress has given an ultimatum to the Soviet and other occupation forces to withdraw from the country and to release all the Party and Government officials. If this requirement is not fulfilled a general strike will be declared in the whole of Czechoslovakia starting Friday noon."

8. In connexion with the deliberations of the Security Council concerning the situation in Czechoslovakia, I should like to stress the following points.

9. First, the occupation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic by the Foreign armed forces is completely illegal.

10. Second, only the legally elected constitutional representatives are the true representatives of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and its people, and consequently must be enabled to exercise freely their constitutional functions, without illegal interference by the occupation forces.

11. Third, all the acts of the foreign occupation forces in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic are illegal.

12. Fourth, complete and immediate termination of the occupation, the withdrawal of all occupation forces from the territory of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the

full restitution of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic are imperative.

13. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Dr. Jirí Hájek, is on his way to New York to attend the session of the Security Council. We hope that he will have ample opportunity to explain the position of our country in full detail.

14. In conclusion, I should like to make one thing crystal-clear, namely, that the cause of socialism is the only cause we stand for, and we would be the last ones who would like to see more damage done to this cause than has already been done. The ideas of socialism are sacred not only to us, but to all progressive mankind.

15. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): The delegation of Senegal has not yet spoken in this poignant debate because it was anxious to be fully and objectively informed of the facts involved, and to analyse them thoroughly so as to then assess them better.

16. Having heard the various arguments presented, I should like to set forth the views of the Government of Senegal on this matter, fairly and dispassionately as I have always done here in this chamber.

17. The Government of Senegal has closely followed the development of the political events which have occurred recently in Czechoslovakia. My Government took note of the reply of the Czechoslovak Communist Party to the Warsaw letter confirming the Czechoslovak leaders' desire to remain true to the Communist ideal.

18. Following the conferences of Bratislava and Cierna, the general feeling, as far as we could observe, was that the Czechoslovak authorities had no intention of reconsidering the question of co-operation within the socialist bloc. In view of these facts, and of the statements of the constitutional leaders of Czechoslovakia, it does not appear that the constitutional Czechoslovak leaders did request armed intervention, as has been stated here.

19. The Government of Senegal shares the strong feelings raised throughout the world by the military intervention of the Soviet Union and other members of the Warsaw Treaty. My Government regrets and condemns this intervention which, despite the existence of the Warsaw Treaty, constitutes an interference in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia, which was not threatened by any aggression from outside. This military intervention jeopardizes the policy of *détente* which seemed to have been initiated in the world and of which we saw signs in the draft Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This military intervention creates a new area of tension and deals a severe blow to the concept of peaceful coexistence. It seriously undermines the fundamental principles of the self-determination of peoples and of non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States, thereby violating the most sacred principles of human rights.

20. In the light of these considerations, my Government fully associates itself with all initiatives and measures aimed at obtaining the condemnation of this armed intervention

by the Security Council and the immediate withdrawal of the foreign forces from Czechoslovak territory.

21. It is in this spirit that Senegal is acting as co-sponsor of the draft resolution submitted [S/8761], in the hope that the voice of reason will ultimately be heard and that coexistence and co-operation will be restored in that area, so that the policy of *détente* may be resumed to the greatest benefit of the entire world.

22. The Council must take action, without further delay, and adopt the draft resolution before it, with the understanding that we shall continue to hold this important question before us and shall keep ourselves available to the Council for any further action which may contribute to a return to legality in Czechoslovakia.

23. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary): Because of subversive actions of external imperialist forces, led by the most reactionary and aggressive elements of the United States and by their revanchist ally in Europe, the Bonn régime, acting in concert with counter-revolutionary forces within Czechoslovakia, a situation has developed which has seriously endangered not only the lawful order and the achievements of socialism in Czechoslovakia, but also, because of efforts at adulteration of the *status quo*, has very seriously threatened the peace and security of the socialist and non-socialist European States, indeed the peace and stability of the whole world. This problem, which is the basic question of European security, in our view, would be a more suitable one for discussion in the Security Council than the one we now have before us.

24. It is quite understandable that the United States would like to distract the attention of the Council from the real dangers in Europe resulting from the presence there of the aggressive NATO alliance. It is timely to note here that the United States, though it is thousands of miles from Europe, as it is thousands of miles from Viet-Nam, plays the role of the gendarme of the world, a role for which they have invented a more convenient expression—"the United States of the global war", or "world-wide commitment", as they impudently state.

25. The aims for which the United States maintains military bases in Europe and sends nuclear bombers through the air-space of many European countries are clearly not in the interests of the nations of our continent. They serve only to maintain tension and they show the arrogance of power.

26. In this respect, a special relationship has developed between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany with the aim of changing the European *status quo*. The revanchist policy of West Germany is based upon this partnership. It is this which enables them not to recognize the present day realities, the existence of the two German States, and this is why the Federal Republic of Germany can wage campaigns for the alteration of existing State boundaries and for the possession of nuclear weapons.

27. Now these circles have made every effort to conceal their real intentions with regard to recent developments in Czechoslovakia, thereby, allaying the alertness of the

progressive forces; they could not help enjoying themselves over the increasing activities of counter-revolutionary forces in that country and giving them advice. What were the main points they tried to stress through their sinister allies in Czechoslovakia? One, that Czechoslovakia should get rid not only of the mistakes committed by the previous leadership, but of socialism as well; two, that Czechoslovakia should get out of the Warsaw Pact and three, that the Communist Party allegedly proved unable to lead the country, and therefore should step aside in favour of other parties.

28. As the Minister of Justice of the Federal Republic of Germany put it in an interview given to *Der Spiegel*, to the Social Democrats:

"The counter-revolutionary forces took the advice they were given. They attacked the Communist Party, the army, the security forces and the people working in them. They attacked the Warsaw Pact, the forces of defence of socialists in Czechoslovakia. Thus there was a danger which must be stopped."

29. The Western Powers are making a big noise here about subjugation, aggression, cheats and puppets. What is particularly distasteful in this respect is the role played by the United States. Is it not rather grotesque that the country which made itself infamous all over the world by armed invasions, military interventions and open aggressions now tries to play the role of the champion of freedom and socialism? Has a country which continues the barbarous bombardment of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, killing innocent civilians by the thousands, which uses the most inhuman weapons of war, napalm, anti-personnel weapons and even chemical weapons, which made forty armed aggressions in Latin America using United States marines, which crushed without hesitation the progressive forces in Guatemala, which committed a naked invasion against Cuba have any right to raise its voice concerning questions of the proper conduct of international policy and principles of international law? The United States always tries to play the innocent, but later we discover the role the United States is playing through its various agencies—especially the C.I.A.—in other countries, which can be termed anything but helping to strengthen the independence of the countries concerned.

30. Suffice it to note one of the recent examples in this respect namely, the disclosure of the former Minister of the Interior of Bolivia who himself had to be an agent of the C.I.A. It is the United States which supports explicitly or implicitly the most reactionary Powers in the world, the stubborn colonialists, Salazar in Portugal; the illegal racist régime of Ian Smith in Rhodesia.

31. But beyond that they are creating crises, like the one caused by their spy ship *Pueblo* and even more serious ones directly affecting our continent. By lending their support to the revanchist circles in the German Federal Republic they breach the Potsdam Treaty; they tolerate the activities of the neo-nazis, the von Papens, the Sudetan Germans, who wish to reoccupy lands that are now parts of sovereign socialist States.

32. In his statement yesterday the representative of the United States made reference to the counter revolution in Hungary in 1956. Let me remind Ambassador Ball of the role the Western Governments played in the counter-revolution. I quote from the Hungarian White Book published in 1957 on the counter-revolutionary conspiracy of the Hungarian Government.

“Foreign and domestic reaction very carefully prepared the counter-revolution over a long period, both on the political and the organizational levels. The preparations were carried on without interruption from 1951 onwards, after the adoption, that year, of the infamous Mutual Security Act, which appropriated one hundred million United States dollars for espionage purposes. They were still further stepped up in 1956, when the 100 million dollars were increased to 125 million.

“Radio Free Europe, which played a major role in the work of preparing, organizing and directing the counter-revolution in 1956, was established and supported by American funds, and the notorious balloon campaign and the various counter-revolutionary *émigré* organizations were organized, aided and supported by such funds. . .

“In the summer of 1956 Miklós Kállay, former Horthyite Hungarian Prime Minister, embarked on a tour of South America. Before audiences consisting largely of fascist rabble who had sought refuge there to escape being called to account for war crimes, he declared:

‘Hungarian liberation may take place in the near future; it is possible that we are on the threshold of that liberation. The time is near when the Hungarians may again take their fate into their own hands, and I believe we may soon be able to go home.’ ”

This was said in the summer of 1956. The document continues:

“Naturally the counter-revolution could not be prepared by propaganda means alone. There was need for wide-spread and ramified organizing activity and military preparations, and, as part of this, most thorough intelligence work, even the organization of armed units. The testimony of disillusioned *émigrés*, of spies and diversionists captured before and after the counter-revolution, and the documents found on them also throw light on all the preparatory tasks that were carried out.

“The *émigré* organizations maintained close contact with the imperialist intelligence organs. Sándor Visnyei, a spy arrested by the Hungarian security authorities on 9 December 1956, testified:

‘The Hungarian department of the United States controlled West German Gehlen Intelligence organization . . . played a considerable role in preparing the 1956 October events. . .

‘Even in the period preceding the events, all the persons employed by the Hungarian department regularly visited the Hungarian refugee camps in West Germany and Austria, and the other organs operating

under the guise of charitable institutions. They carried on a campaign of propaganda and agitation among the Hungarian refugees and called upon them to overthrow the Hungarian people’s democratic régime. Simultaneously they recruited agents from among them, who were given a short course of training and sent to Hungary to incite the people against the Hungarian people’s democratic régime.’

“The same kind of activities could be observed on the part of the other Hungarian *émigré* organizations. . . The *Berliner Zeitung* in its 21 November 1956 issue carries very important information on the West German preparations. Here is an excerpt from the article:

‘Following October 20 armed Hungarian groups appeared in Munich and at fair fields around Munich from Regensburg, Stuttgart and other West German towns. In conversations with inhabitants of Munich these Horthyites admitted that they were preparing to return to Hungary as the “lords of the country” ’.

“The *New York Herald Tribune* on 25 October 1956, printed a remarkable statement made by Christian Ravndal, ex-minister of the United States in Budapest. Mr. Ravndal, speaking of the uprising said that only the timing had caused any surprise. Western observers had counted on an anti-Russian uprising, but it had been precipitated earlier than had been anticipated. They had expected something of the kind around the end of the year.

“The documents listed in this white book show that the Western imperialists did not ‘wait’ for the counter-revolution; they actually furnished funds for it, organized it and incited it. The real sense of the words of the one-time U.S. minister to Budapest is, consequently, that, originally, the outbreak of the counter-revolution was planned for the end of 1956 but that the situation made it possible to have it explode even earlier.

“Radio Free Europe assumed the actual role of directing the counter-revolution, both from a military and political point of view. October 22, the eve of the outbreak of the counter-revolution, this station practically doubled the time of its Hungarian-language broadcasts—increasing it to twenty hours a day. From that point onwards the radio broadcast political and military instructions daily, hour by hour. The armed counter-revolutionary gangs executed these military orders with precision.

“In *Newsweek* of 1 November 1956, there was an article which read: ‘As a Hungarian rebel put it: “The Hungarian uprising was entirely the making of the people in Hungary, but it was the radio link with the West which had told them which way to go, what to hope for, what to demand.” ’ ”

33. The Hungarian White Book continues:

“The leaders of the counter-revolution were confronted on several occasions with the problem of keeping the counter-revolutionary gangs under arms and maintaining

their fitness for battle. Radio Free Europe issued instructions in this respect on countless occasions, broadcasting, for example, on October 28:

"The announcement which has just been issued by the Ministry of Defence in Budapest states that the centres of resistance in Budapest have begun, under agreed terms, to hand over their arms to Hungarian troops coming to relieve Soviet army units. This part of the communiqué is false and untruthful. It is impossible that the Budapest resistance . . . would have laid down its arms before the routed Red soldiery. . . . This piece of news is improbable also because although the fight for freedom has won a military victory, it is still far from having achieved its political aims . . . if it were to surrender its arms, that would be tantamount to the continuation of despotism and the maintenance of the nation's misfortune."

34. Concerning the extent of support of the counter-revolution from abroad, a border guard, Karoly Brencsák, stationed at the Pornoapati outpost, testified about the incoming groups:

"An armed group of about 130 men crossed the border on October 29. They said they were Hungarians who had fled to the West earlier and wanted to go to Budapest to fight against the Soviet troops. They told the two sentries on border duty to turn over the weapons of their station by 10 p.m. or they would attack the outpost. The group was armed with pistols and sub-machine guns."

"The Foreign Ministry of the Hungarian People's Republic was compelled to send a note to the British Legation in Budapest requesting that Colonel Cowley leave the country. The note read, in part:

'Colonel James N. Cowley, Military Attaché of the British Legation in Budapest, during the events which took place in the last months of 1956, maintained active and direct contact with several leaders of the armed counter-revolutionary forces and a number of persons who participated in the counter-revolution. In the course of his activities—among others—he supported with military and military-political advice the organizers of acts aimed at overthrowing the state order of the Hungarian People's Republic, and the reactionary forces attacking the interests of the Hungarian people. . . . After the counter-revolution was crushed, Colonel Cowley provided advice to his above-mentioned contacts to conceal their arms and equipment. . . .'

35. I think that those quotations are enough, although I have a lot of others. But, finally let me add in regard to that problem, that at that time—on 2 November—in order to help the Hungarian people, the United States Government was generous enough to pledge \$20 million to Hungary to overcome forthcoming economic difficulties. The Hungarian people were never given this money because the United States Government did not want to help our people. They were interested in keeping the counter-revolutionary forces only.

36. As to the draft resolution before us, allow me to make just a few remarks. The problem of strengthening socialist

development in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is not the business of the United Nations Security Council. It is the concern primarily of the people of Czechoslovakia and the fraternal socialist States. The submission of this draft resolution serves only the interests of those who wish to make political capital out of the situation. What other aim can one expect from the members of the aggressive NATO? The draft resolution would seem to us rather as sheer propaganda exercise, mainly for home consumption. It certainly does not serve either the interests of the Czechoslovakian people or the cause of peace and security.

37. The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of Poland.

38. Mr. KASPRZYK (Poland): At the outset I should like to express to you, Mr. President, and to the members of this Council my gratitude for enabling me to present the views of my country on the matter under consideration. It should be obvious by now that the discussion initiated in this Council by the group of NATO countries was motivated by the desire displayed by some of them to bring back the infamous spirit of the cold war. Under the pressure of world public opinion because of their shameful policy in Viet-Nam, the Middle East, Southern Rhodesia, Namibia, and so on, they jumped at the opportunity to divert the attention of the world from the real causes of tension. Representatives of some of those countries, using cold war vocabulary, worn-out clichés, myths which have been exploded long ago and unjustified accusations, have launched a slanderous campaign against a group of socialist countries.

39. We would not allow ourselves to be drawn into an exchange of epithets and empty oratory. The peaceful policy of my Government has always been, and still is, directed at the relaxation of tensions and the liquidation of inflammatory situations which might lead to a new war. Peaceful initiatives from Poland in the field of disarmament, its participation in the international commissions in Korea and Viet-Nam, as well as its policy of friendship and co-operation with all peace-loving countries of the world are well known, and I do not have to elaborate on them in front of this distinguished forum.

40. But it is obvious that we could not remain passive when the maintenance of the existing *status quo* in our part of Europe was threatened, for such a threat is directly endangering for not only one country, but all the commonwealth of socialist countries and consequently the peace of the world. We are convinced that the endangering of the socialist system in the fraternal Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, with which we are linked by traditional friendship, constitutes a definite threat to the collective security of all socialist countries, and that is why it was impossible for the members of the Warsaw Pact treaty to remain indifferent.

41. The action undertaken by our countries in answer to the appeal made by many patriots—leaders of party and state organs of the socialist republic of Czechoslovakia—constitutes nothing more than help and assistance for the cause of socialism in this country. This action resulted from the obligations which the socialist countries have mutually

undertaken and it is not directed against the fraternal Czech and Slovak people, and under no circumstances does it pose a danger to any other country. Quite the contrary. The sole purpose of this action is to remove any threat to the security in that region and at the same time it is aimed at the strengthening of the world peace.

42. It is not purely by chance that the action of member States of the Warsaw Pact treaty, aimed at eliminating the dangerous situation in that region and at preventing old, out of style right wing as well as West German revanchist forces from making a breach within the socialist countries, was met with the most ferocious action on the part of countries forming the NATO bloc, for it is the NATO countries that sensed this particular opportunity to weaken the Warsaw treaty and it is their representatives who are trying here at this forum to discredit the action undertaken by some socialist countries. It should be clear to everybody that the display of hatred towards the socialist countries presented here by some representatives, and especially by the representative of the United States, will not serve the cause of better relations between the East and the West. It will poison the atmosphere of international relations and impair the work of the United Nations.

43. The nonchalant remark of Ambassador Ball that "Hitler's oppression, savage though it was, lasted for the comparatively brief span of seven years" [1441st meeting, para. 148] is taken much more seriously by those who were victims of this savageness. Our country lost 6 million citizens martyred by the German fascists, and 38 per cent of our national wealth was destroyed. That is why our nation is particularly sensitive to the threat to peace in the world, and especially in our geographical region where the German revanchists have embarked on a path which may again lead to total catastrophe to mankind.

44. The Polish People's Republic is therefore determined, together with the other socialist countries, to defend the interests of all Warsaw Treaty countries, including Czechoslovakia, and to prevent tearing away this country from the community of the socialist States.

45. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Bulgaria on whom I now call.

46. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I should like at the outset to express my desire to speak tomorrow rather than today, if possible. I have certain reasons for making this request. I still need some time for preparation.

47. The PRESIDENT: In reply to the question submitted by the representative of Bulgaria I can just say that the Chair cannot commit the Council to anything. I am in the hands of the Council. It will be up to the Council to decide whether it will come to a vote today. As a matter of fact, I cannot foretell the decision which the Council will take on this matter of procedure, so my reaction is to leave this question up to the judgement of the representative of Bulgaria who is free to proceed if he so wishes.

48. I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

49. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I am somewhat surprised by your reaction. Why can we not consider the request of the Bulgarian representative and give him the opportunity of speaking tomorrow, if he has justified reasons for wishing to do so? Why is the initiative of the Anglo-American group, supported by some of its partisans, arbitrarily allowed to postpone the meeting of the Security Council from 5 o'clock to the later hour of 9 o'clock? And why, then, may we not at the same time consider the wholly logical and justified wish expressed by the Algerian representative at this morning's meeting?

50. I myself have also addressed a request to you, indicating that I would prefer to speak tomorrow, and I have well-justified reasons and grounds for doing this. Why cannot this request be considered? Why are the wishes and reasons of others considered, while the wishes of those representatives whom I have mentioned are ignored and not even considered? This is a most undesirable and, I might say, unusual practice in the work of the Security Council. What is all this hurry? As a Russian proverb goes, haste is useful only under one circumstance, but in the present case haste is pointless. And it would be reasonable and logical to grant the wishes of those who would prefer to speak tomorrow. It would hardly make much difference, especially considering that it is very late now. Nothing serious will happen in the next ten or eleven hours, and the discussions can be continued; especially since I intend to resume it tomorrow. If you have no speakers on the list, it would be perfectly reasonable to postpone the meeting until tomorrow and resume the discussion then, all the more so since the representatives who spoke at this morning's meeting, especially those of the United States and the United Kingdom, had, as usual, such a lot of invented, slanderous, hostile things to say about the socialist countries that an appropriately circumstantiated reply is necessary, and this will take time.

51. On the strength of all these considerations I suggest that it would be reasonable and, I might say, courteous, also in conformity with the established practice in the work of the Security Council, to consider the request of the representative of Bulgaria and grant it.

52. The PRESIDENT: In reply to the point raised by the representative of the Soviet Union, I should state very clearly that I resent any insinuations to the effect that the President has taken less than a fair attitude towards any delegation or group of delegations.

53. Since it has been stated that the meeting of the Security Council was delayed from 5 o'clock to 9 o'clock, and later to 10 o'clock; there is no mystery about that. I should state very clearly that a substantial number of delegations—a majority of delegations, ten delegations—approached me to signify their request to have the meeting convened at 9 o'clock. And I consulted the other five delegations on that.

54. The President is only the presiding officer of the Council and should obey the feelings of the Security Council. That is the only pressure I can accept—the pressure of the majority of the Council—because it is a decision of

the Council and I am only its presiding officer. Because of that, because of these formal requests and the informal consultations that are usual, and after due consultation, the meeting was delayed until 9 o'clock.

55. As the situation now stands I am entirely in the hands of the Council. If the Council feels that it should adjourn until tomorrow, or if the representative of the Soviet Union wishes to make a special motion to that effect, I shall be glad to consider it. And, of course, I have no objection to the representative of Bulgaria speaking tomorrow. I only said that, as the President, I cannot commit myself because I cannot tell for sure that there will be a meeting tomorrow. That depends on the Council's decision. I am only the presiding officer of the Council.

56. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I do not accept your objections to what I have said. I was perfectly justified in saying that the meeting was postponed from 5 to 9 o'clock mainly at the insistence of the United States and the United Kingdom delegations. And with the support of those who signed the letter addressed to you as President, asking for a discussion of this question in the Security Council—a discussion which is wholly illegitimate, that is, this question has no relation whatever to the Security Council—with the support of those who joined the British and American delegates in presenting the draft resolution, a majority was, of course, obtained. We know that majority, we have known it ever since the establishment of the United Nations Organization and the Security Council. Yet you and many of those who have spoken here are champions of democracy. Why can't democratic principles be applied in this case? When some ask that the meeting be postponed for a few hours for some personal reasons of their own, then why not on the very same basis and for the same reasons, show courtesy and politeness to others who, under the present concrete conditions, happen to be in a minority? But as there are no objections to the Bulgarian delegate's request nor, it appears, to my reasoning that, in accord with democratic principles, when the wishes of some are taken into account, the request of others should be considered on the same basis, then perhaps we may manage without formalities, without any specially introduced proposals, without any special vote, but simply according to what is commonly known as a consensus. Since there are no objections, the meeting of the Council can end on this.

57. The PRESIDENT: I can assure the representative of the Soviet Union that I will always meet him half way on the question of the application of democratic principles. I think it falls upon the President to put the question before the Security Council, for the representative of the Soviet Union has clearly indicated that he would prefer that this meeting be adjourned and that we meet tomorrow, in which case the representative of Bulgaria would have the opportunity to address the Council. No formal motion was advanced by the representative of the Soviet Union, but I think I would like the advice of the members of the Security Council. Of course, if there is no objection I shall be very glad to comply with his request. I should just like to put the question to the Security Council and ask for the comments of members.

58. Mr. BALL (United States of America): The representative of the Soviet Union does us all a very great disservice because he indicates such a low opinion of our sophistication, of our understanding of what is really happening tonight.

59. What we are witnessing is a shameless and shoddy and desperate effort on the part of the representative of the Soviet Union, of the representative of Hungary, of the representative of Bulgaria, to delay and frustrate the proceedings of this Council at a very critical moment in its history.

60. The representative of Senegal, who spoke a few moments ago, made clear, I am certain, what is the general sentiment of the Council: that we should vote promptly and tonight on the draft resolution now before us. But let me assure the representative of Bulgaria and the representative of the Soviet Union, if they have any deep concern about it, that they will have ample opportunity to speak tomorrow, for even after this Council has tonight adopted the draft resolution that is now before us we will not have finished with them.

61. It was very heartening, it was very moving to all of us, that a brave, decent, honest man came here this evening to explain to the Council, in clear, straightforward and unmistakable terms, the position of his Government, the legitimate Government of Czechoslovakia. It is heartening also that we heard the news that another brave, decent and honest man, a man well known and respected by the members of this Council, was on his way to New York and would speak to the Council tomorrow. And I know he will be granted the opportunity to speak. It will be a privilege for all of us to greet the Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia, Jirí Hájek, when he comes before this body tomorrow.

62. The question we face tonight, however, is how will we greet him, how should we greet him—with the word that we have embroiled ourselves in sterile debate without result, or with the word that we have acted tonight incisively and effectively?

63. There are times when human institutions, like human beings, face not only crises but challenges, moments when the world takes their measure and passes judgement on their quality. This is an evening, tonight, in the life of the Security Council when the whole world is making a hard appraisal as to whether this institution, which we have developed and nourished for almost a quarter of a century, is capable of facing up to a major and tragic and dangerous event that has torn the fabric of world confidence and brutally halted progress towards a more secure peace.

64. In times like these, institutions, because they are the creation of human beings, are subject to temptation—not merely the temptation of corruption from venality, but the temptation to falter and to fail from lack of faith in themselves and from cynicism in their own high purposes. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the course of the day we have heard the counsel of those who would have us delay, proceed cautiously, await the movement of events—we have just been listening to it—counsel given, I may say,

by the two guilty Governments represented in this body who are responsible for the tragic acts we are now considering.

65. But tonight I am happy to say—and I say this with feeling and with assurance—that this Council cannot be so easily seduced or diverted, for the great majority of the nations represented here recognize that what we have just been listening to is not a counsel of prudence, but a counsel of deception, advice given not in goodwill but for an evil purpose. Events we are told are evolving, and the situation may change, but in what way? Tonight we know that the Soviet Union is trying by *force majeure* to create a new Government in Czechoslovakia, to replace the Government it has sought to destroy. There is little doubt that it will, at least on paper, at least on the surface, achieve its purpose, since it has put the principal members of the legitimate Government in jail, or at least under house arrest. In every society, if the search is continued long enough, there can be found not one but a handful of Judas Iscariots, a handful of quislings, a handful of craven and contemptible men prepared to sell out their country for their own selfish even though transient gain.

66. It is to the credit of the people of Czechoslovakia that the Soviet Union has not found this an easy task. Last night the representative of the Soviet Union read to us a long, amateurish, puerile declaration. Obviously it was a document made in Moscow. But the Soviet Union could affix no names to it, no names at all, because the Soviet effort to find traitors has not yet borne fruit. It was a document in search of authors. Yet the portents are clear enough.

67. The suggestion of the Hungarian representative that there would be news of a changed situation, the suggestion that he gave to us earlier today, when put together with reports from the Prague radio have made clear that an *Ersatz* government of political hacks, of soiled second-raters, was at long last being put together.

68. What relevance does all this have to our proceedings here? How should it affect the speed with which we get on with our business? The answer, I think, was very clearly disclosed in the shamefully revealing statements of the representatives of the two Powers sitting at this table whose Governments participated in the rape of Czechoslovakia. What they are quite obviously hoping is that this body will delay its action, that they can frustrate its action long enough for a new synthetic Government to send a message or a representative to the Council to ask that the Council not consider the question now before us.

69. What a shoddy performance. Yet it carries a message for us sitting here tonight. We all know that the Council will measure up to its responsibilities and that it will never permit itself to be victimized by a trick of this kind which can only delay and confuse its proceedings. We all recognize the special urgency about getting on with our business.

70. The brutal assault on Czechoslovakia occurred the night before last and the Security Council, charged with the very special mandate that it has to protect the security of the world and to protect world peace, has not yet spoken. Every effort has been made by the Soviet representative to

delay and impede our proceedings by long, meandering, diffuse, polemical and irrelevant statements, and I am sure we will have much more of the same tonight as we already have. In fact, I would not be at all surprised if in the course of this evening the representative of the Soviet Union read to us excerpts from the Moscow telephone directory. And quite likely, if he reads enough of them they will include the names of some who are included in a new Czech Government.

71. We have had enough of discussion. Rarely has infamy been as clearly disclosed as the infamy of the Soviet Union and its puppets in this unconscionable violation of every decent standard of international conduct. Rarely has any defence been more empty, more frenetic, more futile, or more downright insulting than the embarrassing defence undertaken by the Soviet representative.

72. What we are told, in effect, is that the other States of the Warsaw Pact are servile colonial possessions of the Soviet Union and that it has the right, which no one can challenge, to manipulate, direct and interfere in the internal affairs of its colonies with complete impunity. What we are told is that if the Security Council or any of its members or any of the nations or peoples deeply concerned for the protection of the principles of human rights, of sovereign independence, of territorial integrity, seek in any way to deter or deflect the Soviet Union from working its selfish will with these colonial possessions, that body or those missions or those peoples will be made to regret it. What we are told with the inimitable elegance and sensitivity of the Soviet representative's phraseology is that if this body should, and I quote him: "stick its nose into the affairs of the Soviet's Eastern European colonial empire it would lose its nose".¹ These are harsh, ominous, rude, vulgar words, words recalling earlier and more primitive chapters in the long history of human society, words freighted with menace which I know we have all been shocked to hear in the proceedings of this Council.

73. I know that almost all of the representatives of the Governments assembled around this table share my own Government's deep desire that the United Nations should register and register tonight, in clear and unmistakable terms its categorical rejection of the brutal abuse to which the Government and people of Czechoslovakia have been subjected and are being subjected by their arrogant neighbours, that this Council should make clear to the Soviet Union in unequivocal terms that it finds the colonialist presumption of the Soviet Union abhorrent. I do not use the word "imperialist" because the currency of that word has been debased by the Soviet representative.

74. We are at a point where we ought to stop talking; we ought to vote; we ought to declare ourselves; we ought to "come clean" with humanity. We have been faced with a problem; we have discussed it. The evidence has been put before us in clear and unmistakable terms. We have heard tonight something which I think should have shamed people who are capable of shame and who have been guilty of the outrage that has been committed against Czechoslovakia.

¹ Quotation from the interpretation.

75. We have heard the testimony of the Acting Permanent Representative of Czechoslovakia, we have heard what he has said. I think that the time has come when we have to face reality and, more than that, we have to face our own consciences, we have to face our own responsibilities. I propose that we put to the vote the draft resolution which is before this body. I am confident what the outcome of that vote will be.

76. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

77. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I think the loss of equanimity, the irritation and the tone in which the American representative delivered his speech, with its trite anti-Soviet and anti-socialist tirades, speaks for itself. Mr. Ball's nerves are going to pieces. This is a visible proof that American imperialism has lost its bet on counter-revolution in Czechoslovakia, and therefore this state of affairs is driving Mr. Ball wild and he can not hide his condition. In speaking here, in the Security Council, he has used just such a tone and such gestures as though he were speaking at a meeting of bank directors who are his subordinates. Mr. Ball, this is not your office. Therefore, that tone won't do here. It is about time that, in your new capacity, you get out of the habit of dictating and giving orders. I'm giving you useful advice.

78. We can see right away who it is who does not like the idea that the Council should, at such a late hour, calmly postpone the meeting until morning: it is the representative of the United States, who is not used to considering the opinions, wishes and just and legitimate requests of others. He is used to commanding, to ordering, and he ended his speech with an order: "put the draft I've introduced to a vote, and let's have no talk about it." But as I said before, things can only be put that way at bank directors' and boards' meetings—not in the Security Council. You have no right to forbid anyone who wants to have his say from doing so. And you have no right to disregard requests and legitimate wishes. While speaking on a particularly uncontroversial procedural matter, you have given vent to a whole dunghill of insinuations, in your prepared speech. You have unloaded the substance of everything you had accumulated. I stress it again: you just can't wait. That's understandable. In words you have often spoken here of democracy and freedom. You have even spoken as a defender of socialism. True, later on when confronted by concrete facts, you drew back and admitted that you are not a defender of socialism and communism. But then, nobody expected you to be.

79. You have praised some communists here. Ah yes, it is a sad fate for a communist to be praised by imperialists. Such a communist is not to be envied. This reminds us of the history of the social democratic movement in Germany, when one of the outstanding fighters for the cause of the working class, of socialism and the ideas of socialism, the Marxist Bebel, a future member of the German Reichstag, uttered the famous phrase: "Bebel, you old fool, if a bourgeois praises you, it means you've done something stupid." Paraphrasing this famous historical phrase, one may bluntly say: communist, socialist, true patriot of your homeland, if an imperialist praises you it means you've

done something stupid—that's how you can tell. The substance of your praise is this: it is hypocritical, insidious, having specific ends of its own, and is intended to lull and lower the political vigilance of communists, praising them so that you can then seize them by the throat and strangle them. These are the imperialists' aims, and they are well-known.

80. You have unveiled a rather interesting secret to the Security Council, Mr. Ball. You have announced that you're expecting somebody tomorrow, some guest. Where did you get this news? Was it reported to you, or are you organizing the guest's arrival yourself? And you have even decided in advance that he will speak in the Security Council. Who is he? On whose behalf? Whom is he going to represent? You have already decided that beforehand. It's a very interesting communication, an interesting announcement. And, undoubtedly, it will be taken into consideration. You know everything in advance.

81. You spoke of the guilt of Governments, but who is guiltiest of acts of aggression, intervention, occupation, violence? Read the statements in your own newspapers and you'll find the answer when, in the course of the electoral campaign, the Viet-Nam problem is touched on. The whole world knows who is to blame for the aggravation of the international situation, for tension, for the slaughter and death of millions of innocent people—children, women, old men—for depriving them of shelter, food, means of livelihood, for destruction of their homes. There's where the shame lies, that's who is "guilty", and none of your efforts to shift the blame from a sick head to a healthy one will succeed here.

82. Even in speaking on a purely procedural question, on the most innocuous request of the representative of Bulgaria that he be given the opportunity to speak tomorrow, you all but pounded your fist on the table, demanding that this be refused. Why? On what grounds? In speaking about this absolutely innocuous question, you referred to "Judases". But Mr. Ball, the whole world knows very well the enormous experience of your secret service agencies in the selection, training and creation of "Judases". On this score, we may therefore fittingly recall a Russian proverb which says: "Though anybody else's cow may low, yours should keep quiet."²

83. Only a few days ago the pages of *The New York Times* carried lengthy columns with the confessions of one of these "Judases" in Bolivia, who had been a "Judas" and worked for your secret service agencies for a long time, but then, apparently, pangs of conscience made him think it over and he revealed everything: how he had been a "Judas", how he became one and how your "Judas" organizers and creators directed him, trained and taught him how to betray the interests of his own people. Therefore it would be better if you left such a touchy subject alone in your statements.

84. Still, while we are on the subject of whose stitches are showing, well, your statement today, with its tone, its demands, and its loss of balance speaks for itself. In fact, it

² "People who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones."

is in your aims concerning Czechoslovakia that the stitching is showing. Hiding behind hypocritical phrases about democracy and freedom, the reaction was preparing a counter-revolutionary coup in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic at the commands and with the sympathy of your country, under active propaganda, under incitement, at your directives, and with broadcasts through your radio and through your propaganda organs giving instructions as to how to proceed. It is perfectly obvious that your whole endeavour to discuss this question here in the Security Council is stitched together with basting thread: it gives you away from head to foot, and your impatience today speaks for itself.

85. You don't use the words "imperialism" and "imperialist", but that's natural. These words grate on your ears, but there's no getting away from them.

86. Mr. President, I have been forced to react to all these insinuations and falsehoods of the previous speaker, although I admit that everything he said has no bearing on what is going on here in the work of the Security Council. We are calmly discussing the legitimate, logical request of one of the participants in the discussion that he kindly be given the opportunity to speak tomorrow. Is there really anything so extraordinary about this? Why has it worked the American delegate up to such a frenzy, to the point of raising his voice and ordering us: "vote, and let's have no more talk about it!"? Let's think over the situation which is arising, and perhaps we may grant the request of the Bulgarian representative just the same, despite all the impatience of the representative of the United States.

87. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Bulgaria.

88. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Since I do not even represent a minority here, but am alone, and since I have been allowed to participate in the debate, I should like to ask you, Mr. President, whether I might be authorized to speak tomorrow. I heard the representative of the United States say that he did not agree to this request. But I do not think he possesses the entire authority of the Security Council. Therefore, I ask you once again, Mr. President, to consult the Council, if you can, and ask it whether I may speak tomorrow.

89. The PRESIDENT: In reply to the question that has been asked by the representative of Bulgaria, I would say that if the Council decides to meet tomorrow and if the representative of Bulgaria inscribes his name on the list to speak tomorrow, I shall be only too glad to allow him to do so tomorrow. To make the situation quite clear, I would point out that as far as the conduct of our business is concerned and the future course of our actions, it will be a matter for the Council to decide. Therefore to that extent I commit myself to give the representative of Bulgaria the floor tomorrow, subject to the decision of the Council to meet tomorrow.

90. I now call upon the representative of the United States in exercise of his right of reply.

91. Mr. BALL (United States of America): I should like to exercise my right of reply very briefly indeed.

92. Obviously, the representative of the Soviet Union did not listen to the Acting Permanent Representative of Czechoslovakia, who spoke earlier this evening; otherwise he would not have been at all confused as to where I obtained the information that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is on his way to New York to attend this session of the Security Council. All I was reporting was what I heard this evening. I can very well understand why the representative of the Soviet Union did not listen to the Acting Permanent Representative. It was because the Acting Permanent Representative spoke the truth—the truth which was obviously very unpalatable indeed to the representative of the Soviet Union.

93. I would also like to correct one misapprehension, or one mis-statement. When the representative of Bulgaria requested tonight the opportunity to speak tomorrow, I tried to give him some comfort by indicating that I was quite confident that we would have further business with the Security Council tomorrow, that it would have other matters to consider in connexion with this whole tragic incident. But what I did not do, what I would like the representative of the Soviet Union to understand, is that I did not bang my fist, as he said, nor did I even bang my shoe—if I may make reference to the departed.

94. The question arose a moment ago in the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union as to how he, as a communist, would react to a compliment from a capitalist. I can only say to him that I think he misunderstands my view of him. I am quite prepared to extend to him a very enthusiastic compliment tonight: never have I heard such an impossible, tawdry case stated with such diligence, if not with effectiveness.

95. I am a little astonished, I may say, at the manner in which the Soviet representative has insulted two Heads of State—Heads of two socialist States at that. One is President Ceausescu of Romania—he is the head of a State allied with the Soviet Union in the Warsaw Pact; the other is President Tito, who certainly is not a newcomer to communism. Yet the Soviet representative has told us that any communist whose views parallel those of the imperialists—to use his all purpose word—is a fool and should hide his head in shame. It is quite apparent, if the representative of the Soviet Union has been reading the newspapers in the last few days, that these two Heads of State have expressed views which are closely parallel to the views expressed by the representatives of the capitalist Powers around this table, views which deplore and condemn the rape of Czechoslovakia which has been committed by the Soviet Union and its puppet States.

96. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I thought it might be helpful to report to the Council that tomorrow has almost come. I would wish further to be helpful by saying, for my part, that I greatly look forward to listening to the Ambassador of Bulgaria and I trust that we shall all agree that he may speak later tomorrow. We shall wish, I am sure, to give him every facility to do so when he is ready.

97. I would also go further to say what I believe is the general wish of the members of this Council, all of whom have an equal right to express their opinion. It is, I believe,

and has been the wish for many hours past of the majority of the members of this Council that we should proceed to vote on the important resolution which is before us and that we should do so without delay.

98. I, therefore, greatly hope that we need not spend longer in exchanges between ourselves, but that we should proceed now to vote on the draft resolution and that we should also agree that the discussion of this matter which is a continuing danger, a continuing problem, should continue tomorrow, when we shall have the opportunity of hearing the representative of Bulgaria whenever he wishes.

99. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Hungary who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

100. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary): The representative of the United States this evening mentioned several times the expression "shameless", but I have to say that he succeeded shamelessly in distorting my statement this morning. This morning I made two short interventions that will appear in the verbatim record of this morning's meeting of the Council and in neither of those statements did I say or imply what he mentioned in connexion with the changes in Czechoslovakia and the establishment of a new Government and so on.

101. The PRESIDENT: I shall state the procedural situation as I see it. The representative of the Soviet Union has suggested that we adjourn the meeting and continue our deliberations tomorrow. I understand that objections have been raised to that by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom. I wonder whether any member of the Council wishes to state his views on this matter.

102. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Even in his reply the representative of the United States betrays himself, his methods and his way of thinking. I was still speaking specifically about the term of his, which he used in his first statement today, concerning "Judases". In his second statement he used the term so familiar to him, puppet States. When it comes to the creation of puppet States, the United States is no less a great master than it is in the creation and training of Judases who betray the interests of their peoples, their countries, and their convictions, going over to serve American imperialism. That is why this kind of terminology is on his mind and tongue, and he does not consider it dishonourable or shameful to use such terms where they are absolutely out of place. But as the representative of monopoly capital he cannot conceive of any other relations between a large Power and a small one, other than through the intermediary of "Judases" and puppet States.

103. As for that modest and innocuous question, as I have already called it, which arose some time ago, of whether we may accede to the request of the Bulgarian representative and give him the opportunity to speak in the morning, after a good night's rest, I am beginning to get the impression that both the American and the British representatives who spoke after him, do not object to his speaking tomorrow morning.

104. But there is one thing I do not understand. Why is the representative of the United States in such a hurry to

vote? Why is it necessary to give the Bulgarian representative the floor only after the vote? On what grounds? It is absolutely illogical, incomprehensible, unmotivated. He has asked the Security Council and the Council's President to allow him to participate in the discussion of the question which was dragged here into the Security Council by the Anglo-Americans. As a representative of a Member State of the United Nations Organization, he has a right, in conformity with the rules of procedure of the Security Council and with the Charter of our distinguished Organization, to express himself on the question under discussion before the vote on the proposal introduced in the course of the debate. Such is the more than twenty-year practice in the work of the Security Council. Why, then, do the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom want to break this practice and deprive the representative of a Member State of the United Nations—invited to take a seat at the Security Council table—of the right, in conformity with the Charter and the rules of procedure, to express the views and position of that State on the question under discussion? Can he be deprived of this right by the arbitrary and willful action of an Englishman and an American? On what grounds?

105. It would therefore be logical to grant his request, meet him half-way and give him the opportunity to speak at the next meeting. And after that, to vote on the proposal which the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States have in mind.

106. I should like to request, Mr. President, that you consider all the circumstances, consider the lateness of the hour and, taking into consideration the request of the Bulgarian representative, ask the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States whether they might perhaps restrain their impatience, their wishes and their eagerness to impose their will upon an official representative of a Member State of the United Nations having the same right as they have themselves, to express the opinion and viewpoint of his Government on the question under discussion at this table in the meeting of the Security Council, naturally, without the right to take part in the vote, in conformity with the rules of procedure of the Security Council.

107. The PRESIDENT: I should like to make the situation perfectly clear. There is no doubt in my mind—or in the mind of anyone, I hope—as to the right that the representative of Bulgaria has, since he was invited to participate in the discussion of this item. He is entitled to express the opinions and the views of his Government. I am prepared to give him the floor now, if he so wishes, and I am prepared alternatively to give him the floor tomorrow, if there is a meeting tomorrow and subject to the decision of the Council as to the order of business today.

108. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): If I am allowed as a second-rate representative of a second-rate Power—at least in the lexicon of one of our colleagues—to intervene in the dialogue of a very entertaining character between two first-rate Powers, may I recall that when we adjourned at lunchtime yesterday—that was the day when we started our discussion—the question of procrastination was very much in our minds and was indeed the subject of exchange

between representatives of the Council, an unheated and deliberate exchange, and the reasons for and against procrastination were clearly stated. The reason against procrastination, I think, was better stated than I was able to state it myself by the representative of Senegal at the opening of the discussion this evening; he and I share the view that when the fate of a small country, because of the intervention of a powerful country in its internal affairs and development is at stake, it is a matter which the Council must take up with utmost seriousness and that it must consider the question in its fullness. We have so done and have before us a draft resolution. There is no motion before the Council at the present moment under rule 33, but there is a request for a vote on the part of several delegates, with which I wish to associate myself, to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution tabled in the name of eight delegations. That is what you wished to consult us about, Mr. President, and I am happy to express the opinion of the Canadian delegation that we should cease to procrastinate and should proceed to the vote at the earliest moment. The question of right of speech, as you say Sir, is not in question. The Council remains seized of the question, whatever we do with this draft resolution, and the representative, our colleague from Bulgaria, with whom we have been happy to work in the past and whom we are always happy to hear from—now and in the future—is already granted that whenever he speaks it will be today.

109. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, since you have, by mistake, given me the floor, I shall try to take advantage of it.

110. The representative of Canada has spoken of procrastination. But, Mr. President, who was responsible for today's procrastination? Not we, not I, nor anybody else. Your distinguished colleagues, an Englishman and an American, and you along with them, insisted that the meeting should start at 9 o'clock instead of 5 o'clock. So whom should we blame for procrastination? If you were in such a hurry to vote today at all costs, then why did you lose four good evening hours? Your logic is incomprehensible. What were your criteria? If you had not been so busy with procrastinating, we would already be asleep by now, having finished our work and we would have voted, as you wished. So please do not blame anybody but yourselves for procrastination. You have wasted four hours, and now you are in a hurry to vote. But since you have already been busy procrastinating and have lost four hours after 9 o'clock and have dragged it out until today, have a little patience and hear the Bulgarian representative in the morning at 10 o'clock when your minds will be fresh, when you will not be in a mood of procrastination but in one of good sense.

111. Mr. President, it has become an established practice that we usually do not even discuss the next meeting, but agree on it behind the scenes, so to speak. Perhaps we can decide to do it that way: not continuing the discussion, but reaching an agreement, behind the scenes, that the Bulgarian representative be given the opportunity to speak in the morning, in about ten hours. Really, nothing extraordinary will happen before then.

112. The PRESIDENT: Well, I think that one thing on which we should agree, if we cannot agree on anything else, is perhaps not to use the expressions "today" or "tomorrow" as that merely leads to confusion. I would suggest instead "this meeting" and "next meeting" as we are in the early hours of the 23rd of August. I think we might agree on that tentatively at this stage.

113. The representative of Poland has asked for the floor.

114. Mr. KASPRZYK (Poland): In exercise of my right of reply, Mr. President, let me say some words in connexion with remarks of the representative of the United States which concerned some socialist countries, among them my own country. In spite of the fact that Mr. Ball is representing a great Power here, he has no right to offend any Member State by calling it in cold war language a "puppet State". I categorically protest against that and want to stress that it is beneath our dignity to exchange such epithets before this forum.

115. The PRESIDENT: At the moment I have no speakers on my list. Two representatives had indicated their intention to address the Council after the vote is taken. This is the situation as it stands now. The representative of the Soviet Union maintains a suggestion that the Council should adjourn and meet say ten hours from now. To this course objections have been raised by several delegations. The President is entirely in the hands of the Council. He would like to have opinions which would permit him to form a view, a judgement, on the intentions of the Council.

116. Are there any other opinions? If there is no consensus on the course we should take, the President will have no alternative but to decide this question by vote.

117. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, as I have understood the statements of the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States, they have no objections in principle to the representative of Bulgaria speaking at the next morning meeting. I requested that you ask them whether they might perhaps go half-way in meeting this modest, justified and logical request of the representative of Bulgaria, and not insist on a vote on the proposal they introduced. Otherwise, after the Bulgarian representative, who is already entered on the list, other representatives may ask for the floor, and they have a basis for doing so. And the meeting will turn into a night watch. Therefore, it would be wiser to appeal to the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States not to insist on an immediate and quick vote because, evidently, all things considered, unless they insist on it, the meeting will be prolonged for several more hours and we shall have gone no further anyway. It would be logical to take a practical approach to this matter and come to an agreement without any voting, without inflaming passions, but simply on the basis of common sense and logic.

118. The PRESIDENT: I repeat that there is no question concerning the right of the representative of Bulgaria to address the Council, and I am prepared to give him the floor either now or tomorrow, subject to a decision by the Council on the course of business at this meeting.

119. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I think the position is perfectly clear that it has been the intention for many hours past of a majority of the members of this Council that we should proceed to a vote at this meeting.

120. Many of us have felt from the beginning that this was a matter of the greatest urgency. Nothing that has since happened has altered that view. We, I believe, the majority of the Council, are strongly of the opinion that we should not be diverted or prevented from declaring our conclusion at this meeting of the Council, and I have no reason to believe that that view has been changed.

121. As to the request of the Ambassador of Bulgaria, we are prepared to hear him now; we have been prepared to hear him before; we shall be prepared to hear him in the future. It is for him to decide. But the Council's view—I am sure I know that a majority have been of this view—is that we should not be prevented or delayed from coming to a conclusion at this meeting of the Council, and as for myself I am prepared to stay here until that conclusion is reached.

122. The PRESIDENT: Is there any other member wishing to address the Council?

123. It is obvious from the remarks that have just been made by the representative of the United Kingdom that he does not agree with the suggestion that has been advanced by the representative of the Soviet Union. If the representative of the Soviet Union wishes to formalize any proposal for adjournment, I shall be very glad to put it to the Council.

124. The situation being so, I think the President has to put the question to the decision of the Council.

125. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, it is quite obvious from all this that the modest, justified and logical request of the representative of Bulgaria has come up against the stone wall of Anglo-American opposition and objection. The representative of the United Kingdom has declared that he has the majority in his pocket, as they say, and he is counting on the proposal's obtaining a majority. Let us not insist on a vote. Let us get on with our work. I am prepared to work even until morning. I do not insist on consecutive translation.

126. The PRESIDENT: As I told the Council, I have no other speakers on my list, and two delegations have signified their intention of speaking after the vote.

127. The representative of the Soviet Union has not formalized his proposal—I understand there are objections to that—but if he insists on his proposal I shall put it to the vote and submit it to the Council. Otherwise, I think that the normal procedure to take, since there are no more speakers, would be to proceed to a vote on the draft resolution.

128. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, should your words be understood to mean that there is no intention to give the floor to the representative of Bulgaria? You see, as

I have understood him, he asked to participate in the discussion before there is a vote, but asked that his appearance be postponed until tomorrow. It is up to him to decide what to do, but under the present circumstances such a remark as you have just made seems to deprive him of the possibility of speaking before the vote. I just wanted to make clear how matters stand.

129. The PRESIDENT: I repeat that I have no doubt—and no one has any doubt I hope—on the question of the representative of Bulgaria being entitled to address the Council. I am prepared to give him the floor right away, and I told him I would be prepared to give him the floor tomorrow, subject to the decision of the Council on the course of business at this meeting.

130. The situation is quite clear to me. The representative of the Soviet Union has suggested that we adjourn the meeting and that we meet tomorrow, that we allow the representative of Bulgaria to speak and that we proceed to the vote. To such course objections have been raised, and as objections have been raised, I cannot take the decision for the Security Council. I am prepared, however, to put the matter to the decision of the Security Council, and to put to the decision of the Security Council the request that has been made by the representative of Bulgaria.

131. I call on the representative of Bulgaria.

132. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, you made a mistake in saying you had no speaker inscribed. I was and remain inscribed, and consider myself so. I merely asked you, whether it would be possible for me to speak at our meeting tomorrow, if there is a meeting. You have not answered this question. That is why I thought it would be necessary to tell you that I am still inscribed.

133. The PRESIDENT: I have the name of the representative of Bulgaria on my list. I am prepared to give him the floor right away if he so wishes.

134. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): Mr. President, the point of order that is under discussion can of course be continued until the next meeting. You have clearly stated the position in regard to the request of the representative of Bulgaria to speak either at this meeting, the next meeting, or any other meeting. There is the question of the absence of any motion under rule 33, to which reference has been made, and in the absence of any motion under rule 33 I move that we proceed to the vote on the draft resolution contained in document S/8761 of 22 August.

135. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Canada has formally moved that we proceed to the vote on the draft resolution that has been tabled. Are there any comments on this suggestion?

136. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I regard this action of the representative of Canada as an attempt to deprive the Bulgarian representative of the possibility of speaking. Why? On what grounds? The Bulgarian representative was invited by the Security Council at his request; he entered

his name to speak before the vote, but by some accident it turns out that he is not on the list. There are no grounds for depriving him of the right to speak, and it would be logical to give him the possibility.

137. I should like to ask the representative of Canada not to insist on his proposal and to give the Bulgarian representative the opportunity to have his say.

138. The PRESIDENT: I can assure the representative of the Soviet Union that the request of the representative of Bulgaria has not been forgotten. I am prepared to recognize him at any time, even now, and I have on several occasions offered him the floor.

139. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): I don't know, Mr. President, perhaps I don't understand the rules of procedure, but I still consider myself inscribed on the list of speakers, and I asked whether it was not possible for me to be permitted to speak, as you put it, at the next meeting of the Security Council, if there is one, and before the vote. If you could assure me that I would have the floor before the vote if there is a meeting of the Security Council tomorrow—and I believe you asked the Security Council this question because I asked you to do so—, then I would speak tomorrow. But, of course, I should like to speak before the vote.

140. The exercise of wit by certain representatives here who spoke of tomorrow or today in order to sidestep a certain decision are gratuitous. I simply asked you to allow me to speak. I am inscribed on the list, and I wanted to speak before the vote because I should like to express my views on the question on the agenda of the Security Council.

141. Mr. BALL (United States of America): The hour is late, and I must say, speaking for my Government, that I can express a sentiment which I am certain is shared around this table. It is a matter of grave concern to find this solemn body turned into a circus by the most absurd, ridiculous proposals obviously intended to obstruct the exercise by this body of the expression of its opinion, which is long overdue, on a crisis which is confronting the world, which is resulting in bloodshed, which is resulting in the destruction of legitimate Government, which is threatening the peace of the world. To have us at this point consume hours—literally hours—on this kind of grotesque procedural nonsense is I think an affront to all of us. We are all accomplices in undermining the dignity of the United Nations and the dignity of the Security Council.

142. There is a motion before you, Mr. President, that we proceed to a vote forthwith. If you need a further motion, I certainly shall make it. But I feel that we do ourselves a disservice, we do the United Nations a disservice, and we do the cause of world peace and security a disservice by continuing this absolute farce, which is intended only to deflect us from doing our duty.

143. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I would like to

ask the American representative to arm himself with patience. He has said far too many gross and indecent slanderous things in his morning statement and in the retorts afterwards which call for an answer, and it would be wrong and incomprehensible for the Soviet representative not to reply to these insinuations and inventions.

144. What emerges in the course of the discussion of this matter in the Security Council? Those who show an interest in aggravating the events in Czechoslovakia in line with their own pre-arranged and previously worked out plans have been unmasked. The government circles of the Western Powers, including the United States and the United Kingdom, have so far stubbornly asserted their supposed absolute non-participation in the events in Czechoslovakia, and their determination not to interfere in the development of these events in any way.

145. From the very start of the development of the events in Czechoslovakia, a very distinctive feature could be observed in the attitude of those countries to those events, namely: the assignment of roles between the official representatives and the government bodies, on one hand, and on the other the organs of mass media and propaganda. The former stubbornly endeavoured to dissociate themselves from any indication of their participation in the incitement of anti-socialist elements in Czechoslovakia, and avoided in every possible way commenting on these events. The latter, including the propaganda organs, assumed all the functions of developing a broad anti-communist and anti-Soviet campaign, employing for this purpose, the whole available arsenal of misinformation, slander and falsification, highlighting and interpreting the events in Czechoslovakia along an absolutely specific line convenient to the imperialist Powers and the representatives of counter-revolution in this country. Now the official bodies of the United States and of the United Kingdom Governments and their representatives in the Security Council, lowering their masks, have become openly involved in this anti-communist, anti-Soviet campaign.

146. In this regard we can not overlook the assertions of the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon, that the British Government has, so he says, made no announcements concerning the events in Czechoslovakia, and has supposedly maintained effective neutrality. But did and do matters really stand this way? The leading organs of the British press have been employed to express the British point of view, reflecting the opinions of the ruling circles of this country concerning the events in Czechoslovakia.

147. A few examples will suffice. The main organ of the British monopolies, actually the semi-official mouthpiece of Government circles, the newspaper *The Observer* on 12 August of this year advised the Czechs and the Slovaks to break with Moscow. This is a reflection of the real intentions of the British ruling circles concerning the events in Czechoslovakia. That notorious slanderer of communism, the "professional" anti-Soviet Victor Zorza of the British newspaper *The Guardian* just recently, on 14 August, hopefully announced that "every communist reform movement is inevitably accompanied by creeping capitalism". That is the crux of the meaning and aim of the British ruling circles' attitude to the events in Czechoslovakia.

Under the guise of praise for some so-called reformers, it is really designed first to push Czechoslovakia off the socialist road and onto that of "creeping capitalism", and then onto that of genuine capitalism.

148. Other statements may be quoted from equally "reliable" organs of British monopoly capital. On 12 August, the London newspaper *The Daily Telegraph*, criticizing Dubcek for not having dared to disband the people's militia of Czechoslovakia, gave the following advice: "The militia is in fact the old guard of hard-core communists. The strength of this militia, on which data have never been published, consists of some 100,000 people." It is not hard to understand that what the owners of this organ of British monopoly capital are thinking is that there are 100,000 workers with arms in their hands in Czechoslovakia, standing guard over socialist achievements. This figure has frightened the owners of that organ. And both the wish and advice were expressed plainly and frankly. The advice was to disband this militia.

149. That is how matters stand on the alleged neutrality and non-interference of Great Britain regarding the events in Czechoslovakia. We cannot fail to draw attention to another highly indicative phenomenon. The anti-socialist elements in Czechoslovakia have engaged in a course of creating a series of so-called clubs under quite innocent names. However, among them a so-called "231 Club" was established. This club created a broad network of district committees of its own. All of a sudden, branches of this club appeared even in the United States and in Canada. These clubs and their branches recruited Czechoslovak immigrants from among political criminals, renegades, traitors to their homeland and similar rabble. Branches of the club began actively to raise money for a club fund. Recently the newspaper *Rudé Právo* published an open letter addressed to Sram, the secretary of the 231 Club in southern Czechoslovakia. The author of the letter, A. Czerný, unmaskes the secretary as a speculator and a traitor. Sram, who has now seized the post of secretary in the club's regional organization, was, according to the letter which has been confirmed by documents and by extracts from Sram's own autobiography, the owner of a large private firm. After the liberation of Czechoslovakia and the establishment of the socialist system there, he turned his hand to managerial work and was sentenced several times for speculation. Then he became a paid agent of the American secret service as a Judas, according to Mr. Ball's formula and his own confession, giving secret data to the American secret service. A member of the 231 Club, Fratišek Poul, maintained constant contact with the editor of the immigrant magazine *Steletsetvy* in Austria, and with an agent of the CIA secret service administration headquarters, Pecháček, as well as with staff members of Radio Free Europe, which let it be clearly understood that it was prepared to aid the club in every way possible provided that it did not become a branch of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

150. A third active member of the club, Jaromír Nebeský of Prague, established contact with a representative of the American "Pan American" company, which was willing to be generous and promised to grant the club \$10,000. At the beginning of May a paid agent of the Central Intelligence

Agency, Stanislav Jancík, arrived in Prague from the United States on a visit. He ostentatiously joined the 231 Club and offered it "disinterested financial aid" in dollars.

151. These are the kind of reformers who have appeared in Czechoslovakia, the kind of Judases the American secret service has created in that country; and official America, through its secret service, is betting on them. It is easy to see how, when these Judases failed to produce results, this caused confusion both in the American secret service and the American ruling circles. That is why the American representative speaks so heatedly and impatiently here in defense of reformer Judases. "Reformers" is a camouflage, it is a word which has been assigned a very specific meaning. What it really means is: traitors to the Czechoslovak people.

152. The British also quickly grasped the true nature of the members of the 231 Club. The general of bourgeois Czechoslovakia, Palecek, maintained a steady friendship with the British Ambassador in Prague, Parker. Hrubý, a well-known leader of the 231 Club, is the son of a former minister of the protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia. The terrorist Kešel, and a certain Slavík, whose father is now the head of the reactionary organization "The Council of Free Czechoslovakia in the United States", penetrated the club's leadership. These are the people through whom the official and unofficial American agencies operate in Czechoslovakia. These are the ones on whom they are betting. One of the club's leaders, Strasek, without concealing his hatred of the Communist Party, called for the removal of Czechoslovak workers from power in the country, while another member of this club, Siska, went so far as to demand complete liquidation of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

153. That is the truth of the matter regarding the supposed impartiality, neutrality and non-intervention of Britain and America in the events in Czechoslovakia. And who are the heads of this club? That old fascist, Brodský; the former bourgeois general Palecek, and Rambousek, who were all tried as espionage agents of the imperialist secret service, Ceck, and others. All of them are die-hard, malicious enemies of socialism. The make-up of this club, what a motley crew of dyed-in-the-wool reaction it represents is evidenced by the statements of some justly rehabilitated political leaders. These leaders have written that among the club's members are collaborationists who worked with fascist troops during the occupation period in Czechoslovakia; there are thieves and murderers who were and are enemies of the Czechoslovak people and of all honest people.

154. Moreover, one of these leaders, the diehard fascist Brodský, who obtained the post of secretary-general of the club, during one of its general assemblies, burning with hatred and malice towards the socialist system in Czechoslovakia and towards communism, declared: "We'll tear the Communists limb from limb". And it is just these leaders who are so dear to America and Britain and their representatives here in the Security Council. That's precisely why they defend these leaders so passionately.

155. At yesterday's and today's meetings of the Security Council, the American representative, Mr. Ball, shed croco-

dile tears and dramatically described the establishment of a curfew on Prague, the capital of Czechoslovakia. He conjured up the possibility that, as a result, unfortunate incidents might occur. We need hardly wonder that somebody in the Central Intelligence Agency might indeed like to provoke unfortunate incidents in Czechoslovakia, cause bloodshed and disorder, to which the Czechoslovak reaction and counter-revolution are being incited by American propaganda and the statements of the official American representatives here in the Security Council. However, calm reigns in Czechoslovakia and its capital. The overwhelming majority of the people, in response to the call of the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, is maintaining calm and is filled with a deep sense of political responsibility in the face of the anxious situation created by external and internal reaction.

156. Of course, those political circles in the United States and in NATO who are putting their bets on the explosion of fratricidal strife in Czechoslovakia, do not like all this. Still, are there no limits to the cynicism and hypocrisy of these representatives of the NATO countries?

157. Mr. Ball was distressed at the possibility of individual unfortunate incidents. Yet the American representative has not said a single word of regret about those thousands and tens of thousands of deaths constantly inflicted upon the Viet-Nameese people as a result of the continuing American aggression in Viet-Nam. Every day blood flows in the cities and villages of Viet-Nam from American bombs, rockets, napalm, and from American shooting and chemical weapons, and hundreds of Viet-Nameese citizens who are in no way responsible perish, including women, old men and children. For years now the blood of the Viet-Nameese has flowed over the fields of that country. This blood drips from the hands of the American murdering aggressors who are hopelessly trying to crush the legitimate aspirations of the people of Viet-Nam to uphold their freedom and independence against the gross and repulsive aggression unleashed by the United States of America.

158. Knowing the invincible might of the Soviet Union and the community of socialist countries, imperialism no longer dares risk a frontal attack on the socialist community, for that would be tantamount to suicide. But in the offices of certain United States Government departments so-called alternatives are being worked out all the more persistently, designed to undermine the socialist system of the socialist countries, and to create a rift within the socialist community.

159. The imperialist circles of the United States stubbornly continue to follow a course which, with the aid of ideological and political methods combined with secret subversive measures, is designed to shatter socialist society, undermine the unity of the socialist system, and thereby weaken its ability to resist direct aggression.

160. It is well known, and it has been reported in the press, that CIA plans do exist, containing detailed outlines of subversive activities against individual Warsaw Treaty countries. These plans provide mainly for the so-called liberation of East Germany and Czechoslovakia. These plans confirm that ideological and clandestine espionage

and subversive tactics are an inseparable, inherent part of the preparations and implementation of aggressive adventures against the socialist countries. The enormous subversive espionage machinery of the United States, supplied with thousands of millions of dollars, is actively working toward this end and intensifying its recruitment of "Judases"—to use Mr. Ball's terminology. These plans provide for encouragement of opposition movements and even uprisings against the present Governments of the socialist countries. They provide for penetration of opposition forces within the Communist parties of the socialist countries, their security agencies, their military and counter-intelligence organizations, and the other State institutions of the socialist countries.

161. This dangerous policy of subversive propaganda, ideological sabotage and military preparations by the NATO bloc, which is the tool of the aggressive designs of United States imperialism and of the insane revanchist plans of West Germany, require the utmost and keenest vigilance, unity and readiness on the part of the peoples of the socialist countries, of the entire socialist community, to repel decisively any aggressive surprise attack on socialist positions. And that is precisely why the NATO countries have become alarmed—and why the United States and the United Kingdom, in particular, established this aggressive military bloc, when they saw that their bet on the restoration of capitalism, on the return in Czechoslovakia to the systems so much to the liking of the imperialist Powers. Not only were measures of ideological subversion adopted for this purpose, but also of practical action. In July of this year it became known, as the press had already reported, that the Czechoslovak security agencies had discovered a clandestine cache of weapons of foreign origin on Czechoslovak territory, not far from the borders of West Germany along part of the road between the cities of Cieb and Karlovy Vary. The bullets, automatic weapons and other arms removed from this cache all bore the mark "Made in U.S.A.". These arms were deposited from West Germany for partisans of the restoration of the old order in Czechoslovakia, for the purpose of arming "Judases"—to use Mr. Ball's terminology—with these American weapons.

162. In quantity and size this weaponry was fully in keeping with the type of arms suitable for the actions of small insurrectionary detachments and groups, and this venture bears the mark of the United States Central Intelligence Agency.

163. In the light of these well-known and irrefutable facts, it will be appropriate here in the Security Council, when discussing the question of the situation in Czechoslovakia, which has been raised by the NATO Powers with clearly provocative intent, to recall again the remarkable words of that outstanding patriot and Communist Julius Fucik, who gave his life in the struggle for the freedom and independence of his country and against fascist aggression and militarism. He wrote and said: "Oh people! I have loved you. Be on your guard!". These words again sound an ardent call to all who hold dear the cause of socialism, the unity of the countries of the socialist community, and the cause of peace. These words are timely now, when Czechoslovakia is undergoing a period of hardship created by the attempts of reaction, aided and abetted by foreign

Powers, to turn back the wheel of history in this country and wrest it from among the fraternal socialist countries.

164. However, the socialist countries have declared repeatedly, and we consider it essential to stress this again most decidedly that nobody will ever be allowed to wrest so much as a single link from the community of socialist States which was and is an indestructible bulwark against all and any imperialist plots, subversion, attacks and provocations. It is the sure safeguard of all nations, not only of the socialist system but also of all the countries of Africa and Asia which have recently freed themselves of the imperialist yoke and are treading the path of self-reliant development and defending their freedom, independence and social progress.

165. The American representative has repeatedly referred in his statements to various reports and declarations allegedly coming from Czechoslovakia. From where did he draw this information of a type clearly slanderous to the people of Czechoslovakia? From where does all this foul counter-revolutionary propaganda and misinformation on the situation in Czechoslovakia creep out, information which he so readily and zealously presents to the Security Council?

166. It is well known that all this is extracted by American propaganda from the filthy source of counter-revolution hiding underground, and is repeated here by the American representative. Some speakers here, and the representative of Canada in particular, have resorted to all kinds of supposedly legal arguments. Attempts have been made to cast doubt on the legality of the measures adopted by the socialist countries to give aid to Czechoslovakia and to ensure the security of the other countries of the socialist community.

167. One need not be an expert on matters of international law to show the complete untenability of these arguments. In the Tass communication it is clearly and accurately stated that the assistance to the Czechoslovak people has been provided in conformity with existing treaty obligations. Is it not well-known that the socialist countries concerned, having been forced by the threat of the creation of an imperialist bloc called NATO to conclude a military treaty, in 1955 signed the Warsaw Treaty? This Treaty provides that:

“The Parties (i.e., these countries) shall likewise take such other concerted action as may be necessary to reinforce their defensive strength, in order to defend the peaceful labour of their peoples, guarantee the inviolability of their frontiers and territories and afford protection against possible aggression.”

168. This is a part of article 5 of the Warsaw Treaty which defines the tasks and purposes of the armed forces and of their Unified Command. It is to “defend the peaceful labour of . . . peoples, guarantee the inviolability of . . . borders and territories . . . afford protection” against the threat of aggression from the imperialist forces and the NATO aggressive military bloc that the socialist countries have come to the assistance of the people of Czechoslovakia.

169. The actions of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are fully in accordance with the right of States to individual and collective self-defence provided for by the treaties of alliance which have been concluded by the fraternal socialist countries. These actions, as has already been stated officially, are not directed against any particular State and do not infringe upon any State's interests. The only interests against which they are in fact directed and upon which they infringe are the interests of the imperialist Powers which have made every effort to wrest Czechoslovakia from the community of socialist States. It is absurd from the legal standpoint and untenable in point of fact to represent the matter in such a way that the aid granted the people of Czechoslovakia by the socialist countries within the context of individual and collective self-defence should appear as alleged interference in this country's internal affairs. Not a single article of the Charter of the United Nations provides any basis for terming the carrying out of individual or collective self-defence as an act of interference.

170. The acts of the socialist countries are directed neither against the political independence nor the territorial inviolability of Czechoslovakia, nor against the interests of its people. Therefore they do not fall within the purview of the prohibitions of Article 2 of the Charter which sets forth the principles in accordance with which all Members of the Organization shall act.

171. These actions in no way violate the principles of non-interference set forth in the Charter and in the well-known United Nations Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty. But if we are to talk about interference in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia, then we should also speak of the outside incitements, the support from abroad which was and is being given to the anti-socialist elements in Czechoslovakia by the imperialist circles of the United States, Great Britain, West Germany and a number of other States which for a long time have been trampling the principles of non-interference underfoot.

172. What has been so ingeniously and speedily accomplished here in the Security Council by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom is an immediate example of the interference of their countries and Governments in affairs which concern only Czechoslovakia and the States allied with it in accordance with the alliance commitment under the Warsaw Treaty. This is precisely a glaring example of interference in the affairs of others under cover of the United Nations, utilizing the Security Council for their own shady imperialist aims. Nobody has asked or is asking them to do this. They are driven to it by hostility and hatred towards the socialist countries, hatred which the official representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom are trying to cover up here in the Security Council by false and hypocritical speeches about freedom. All of this shows that neither the Soviet Union nor the other socialist countries have committed, nor are they committing any violation of international law and, specifically, of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States.

173. Those who have tried and are trying to interfere in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia are the imperialist States, and I have already presented the facts on this. It is they who have interfered and are trying to interfere for the purpose of restoring capitalism in this country. The attempt to involve the Security Council in a discussion of this question and such persistent demands to force acceptance of the resolution on Czechoslovakia, drafted by the Anglo-Americans, are, among other things, the continuation of this policy of interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Mr. Ball stated frankly here that he is an enemy of socialism and communism. But he added that he is a partisan of freedom. It seems to me essential to comment on these statements.

174. Speaking from a position of hatred towards socialism, of support and protection of reactionary forces, the American representative babbled heaven knows what kind of nonsense here about some sort of Soviet tyranny in Czechoslovakia in 1948 and about some mythical murder of Masaryk. He endeavoured to distort the nature of the events in the Hungarian People's Republic in 1956. But the representative of Hungary has already given a sufficiently effective rebuttal and reply here to this slanderous statement of the representative of the United States. It is entirely understandable that these slanderous inventions have, both yesterday and today, been immediately and decisively refuted and unmasked by the representative of the Hungarian People's Republic as slanderous fabrications. The result was inevitable: the man who tried here to play a role for which he was not cut out, the role of "defender" of the peoples of the socialist countries, whereas in fact he is the worst enemy of socialism and communism, fell on his face. He took on a job he does not know. Today too, Mr. Ball tried to appear in the role of a "defender" of the socialist countries. True, as I have already said, he was forced to admit that he is an enemy of socialism and communism. He spoke of freedom. But what is meant by that freedom which is propounded by a representative of monopoly capital? To monopoly capital freedom means freedom for the rich and the super-rich; it is the freedom of bankers and capitalists to sit astride the neck of the working class, of the labouring people. In this case too, when he speaks of freedom in Czechoslovakia he means that freedom under which the owners of American capital, who were driven out by the people's revolution in that country, could, with the support of "Judases", return unopposed, establish their business enterprises and unrestrainedly exploit the Czechoslovak working people as they do in a number of countries where American monopoly capital has succeeded in penetrating.

175. When Mr. Ball speaks of freedom, he evidently has in mind freedom to kill many hundreds of thousands of wholly innocent people in Viet-Nam, freedom for political terrorism which has led to the destruction of many outstanding political leaders of the United States. When he speaks of freedom he apparently means freedom for the racists who have placed over 20 million people with "non-white" skin in a position where they are deprived of all rights, an unbearable position.

176. Our understanding of freedom is different. It consists in helping the Czechoslovak people, the Czechoslovak

workers to defeat the counter-revolutionary plots of external and internal reaction, and thereby clear the way to free socialist development in the future.

177. Obviously it is not fortuitous that the American representative has exerted considerable efforts in trying to give the members of the Council the impression that there is and has been no Western plot against communist power in Czechoslovakia. The enemies of socialism, acting to the detriment of the Czechoslovak and Soviet peoples, have repeatedly engaged and are engaging in efforts to cast shadows of doubt on the fraternal, friendly co-operation between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. Today another enemy of socialism joined this chorus: the American representative to the Security Council, Mr. Ball. He let loose a series of slanderous inventions irrelevant to Soviet-Czechoslovak co-operation and to the aid which the Soviet people are giving the fraternal Czechoslovak people. But Mr. Ball has evidently picked a rather unfortunate subject. Obviously, he is poorly informed on the real nature of the co-operation between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. This collaboration has become an intrinsic part of our achievements, of our successes in the construction of socialism and communism. Insinuations, slander, ridiculous inventions—these are the usual methods of imperialist propaganda and the hirelings of imperialism, who would like to discredit the economic, scientific and technical ties between the socialist countries, to attempt to sow discord among and divide their fraternal peoples. Our country, the land of the Soviets, true to its international duty, is giving the socialist States large-scale economic and technical co-operation for the development of their national economies. We need only mention that, in conformity with the agreements concluded, the Soviet Union assumed an obligation to provide co-operation in the construction, reconstruction and expansion of some 1,400 plants, individual workshops, and other industrial, transport and communications units in fraternal Czechoslovakia. About 900 of these plants and units are already in operation. One example of the fruitful nature of the fraternal ties established among our countries, the countries of the socialist community, is precisely the experience of the economic co-operation between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. The Soviet Union is giving Czechoslovakia its co-operation in setting up the large-scale Eastern-Slovak ironworks complex. Its hot and cold rolling mills, having a total annual average production capacity of 3.7 million tons, were established with Soviet equipment. The large-scale petrochemical plant Slovnaft, the synthetic fibres plant in Humené, the large cement works in Banská-Bystrica, a lead-and-zinc ore processing plant and other industries which play a major role in the Czechoslovak economy were built with the technical collaboration of the Soviet Union. A large part of the equipment installed in these industries was produced in Soviet factories by the hands of Soviet workers, by Soviet engineers and scientists. A modern signalling system and centralization and automation of block systems on the important parts of the railway network were installed with the aid of the Soviet Union. Our country is participating in the construction of the first atomic electric power station. In view of Czechoslovakia's limited raw materials resources and the difficulties of obtaining and paying for raw materials on the capitalist markets, the Soviet Union helps meet Czechoslovak industry's raw material requirements to

a considerable extent. Such supplies, which are delivered on a fixed price basis agreed upon far in advance, guarantee the Czechoslovak enterprises favorable conditions for utilization of their capacities.

178. It should also be mentioned that according to surveys by Czechoslovak economists and the statements of industrial managers, the conditions and prices on which these raw materials are purchased are to Czechoslovakia's advantage. The importance and quantity of Soviet raw materials and consumer goods delivered to Czechoslovakia are impressive. They meet almost all of Czechoslovakia's petroleum requirements; over 80 per cent of its iron ore import requirements; approximately 63 per cent of its synthetic rubber demand; about 42 per cent of its non-ferrous metals needs, and so forth. Over the past decade, the annual imports of grain from the Soviet Union averaged two thirds of the total centralized government grain purchases within Czechoslovakia.

179. We should also mention some data on foreign trade between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, at least for the period 1956-1968, that is, 12 years. During this period Soviet Union deliveries to Czechoslovakia were as follows: grain: 17 million tons; cotton: nearly 700,000 tons; wool: about 70 tons; petroleum: 51 million tons; metal ores: 80 million tons; pig iron: about 2 million tons; sheet metal: about 2.5 million tons; copper: 285,000 tons; aluminium: over 200,000 tons; lead: over 200,000 tons; phosphate concentrate: nearly 3.5 million tons; zinc: 170,000 tons; asbestos: over 200,000 tons; timber: nearly 5 million cu. m.; and almost 1.2 milliard roubles worth of machinery and equipment.

180. If Czechoslovakia had been obliged to buy all these materials for hard currency on the open market, it would have had to spend about \$3,500 million. Here is a concrete example, here are concrete facts and instances of the mutually beneficial fraternal socialist co-operation between two socialist States.

181. The American representative representing as he does large-scale monopoly capital, cannot get through his head the kind of fraternal relations and co-operation which can exist between a large Power and one which, geographically, may be termed middle-sized. Therefore, for purposes of comparison it may be appropriate to give some data on how American monopolies work, for example in Latin American countries.

182. I take this data from the American press. In order to show the difference between the forms and methods of economic co-operation between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, on one hand, and the United States and the Latin American countries, on the other, we may note that, according to the data published, direct investments by American monopolies in Latin American countries total \$11,400 million. I stress again, this figure is taken from the American press. During the period between 1945 and 1965 these investments have brought the United States monopolies gigantic profits: \$40,000 million!

183. The United States pumps out of Latin America enormous quantities of raw materials—no less than 20

varieties of raw materials essential to the maintenance of war industry production in the United States at a level permitting expansion and aggression.

184. Latin America supplies the United States industry with 99.5 per cent of its total lead requirements; 39 per cent of its iron ore; 44.1 per cent of its copper, and 60.6 per cent of its zinc. In addition, an enormous amount of agricultural produce and raw materials are purchased by the North American monopolies at extremely low prices in Latin America. The pillage of the Latin American continent by the American monopolies has been going on for nearly 150 years, ever since 1823 when the ill-fated Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed claiming "America for the Americans"—this means the American monopolies located north of the Rio Grande.

185. Comparatively recently, a new form of pillage has been practised in Latin America. Again, according to data from the American press, in recent years about 4,000 Latin American technical experts who had a higher education have been lured every year to the United States. Special recruiters employed by the great monopolies constantly visit the most important universities and scientific research centres in Latin America. All this, too, represents both the word and the concept Mr. Ball so dislikes: the word "imperialism". And the facts and figures I have quoted from the American press are the living proof of imperialism in action. These figures are the result of imperialist policies of monopoly capital. And precisely as a result of this policy so many Latin American countries, despite over 100 years of existence as independent, sovereign States, unfortunately belong to this day to the category of the under-developed—or, as they are usually termed—developing countries.

186. Against the background of this exploiting, pillaging policy of the imperialist monopolies, the facts and figures I have cited on the fraternal co-operation between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia shine brilliantly by contrast. Mr. Ball, the representative of United States monopoly capital, just doesn't understand these new, truly fraternal, comradely relations between the countries and peoples of two socialist States. He can't understand them. His mind works differently. He recognizes only cash, maximum profit relationships, the exploitation and pillaging of the weak by the strong. This, as he understands it, is real freedom, freedom for American monopolies.

187. That is precisely the reason, as history shows, why the socialist countries, socialism, communism and the Soviet Union arouse such frenzied hatred in the imperialist rulers of monopoly capital. That is precisely why throughout the many years since the early days of the 1917 October Revolution the main ideological weapons of imperialism in its struggle against the countries of socialism are anti-communist and anti-Soviet.

188. But all the efforts of the enemies of socialism and communism, the enemies of the Soviet Union, the carriers of these anti-communist, anti-Soviet ideas have clamorously failed, both from the ideological and military standpoint. And no one will ever succeed in slandering the Soviet Union and its truly international ties, its friendly and fraternal relations and comradely mutual aid to the peoples of the socialist countries and those of many developing countries.

189. I would not consider my statement complete if I were to fail to react to the remarks of some representatives in the Security Council who have tried to present matters in such a way as to make it appear that the socialist countries are practically to blame for the heightening of tension in the world.

190. This was mentioned by the representative of Brazil in particular, the representative of a country located in the southern part of the American continent and whose people know the imperialist neighbour from the north very well. Nobody knows better than the Latin American peoples how the American monopolies operate, and how they have meddled for centuries in the internal affairs of the South American continent, removing the systems and leaders they find inconvenient and creating all kinds of obstacles to prevent a number of countries from taking the path to genuine democracy, freedom and progress.

191. Incidentally, on this score too we may refer to the American press. A bulletin published by the United States Information Centre in Washington in September 1966 contains the following statement: "The military organizations armed and trained by the United States in Latin America have overthrown the legitimate civilian Governments in a number of countries." This is a report by the American press; it lists a number of countries which I shall not name here.

192. Mr. President, I have already spoken at an earlier meeting about those who are to blame for the tension of the post-war period, those who started the cold war, who gave rise to the policy of blocs and who, in our time, try at every possible opportunity to encourage that policy and heighten international tension. Who are these culprits? Those who are trying today to don the toga as defenders of freedom in Czechoslovakia, although one defender of freedom, West Germany, is still missing among them; its revanchist aspirations are increasingly emerging and becoming obvious. Nobody can or could have any doubts on that score. Everybody knows what a base and repulsive imperialist role the West German revanchists are playing by pointing at Czechoslovakia in order to do again what Hitler did to that country in his day.

193. The assertion that the socialist countries are poisoning the international atmosphere is obviously misplaced. Everybody—the originators of such statements, the participants in this meeting, all those present, and those who are not—they all know that it is American imperialism and not Soviet communism which is poisoning the international situation by its predatory war against the Viet-Nameese people.

194. Refusing to heed the voice of reason, the governing circles of the United States are keeping up their aggressive actions against a Sovereign State, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, escalating the criminal war in that country. It is the United States and the other NATO Powers which, by doing everything in their power to assist this policy of aggression, intervention, and interference in the affairs of other countries, are to blame for the present international situation, since for years they have been engaged in the armaments race, including nuclear armament, and as in the

past, they still refuse to take active steps to put a stop to that race, to accept universal and complete disarmament, and ban the use of atomic weapons.

195. That is what is poisoning the international situation. The shadow of aggression in Viet-Nam and the cloud of the aggression committed on behalf of the imperialist Powers by the Israeli aggressors in the Middle East hang over the whole world and create a state of tension, insecurity and mistrust, and hinder the settlement of international problems, creating obstacles to the rapprochement between East and West of which the representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States and others have spoken so tenderly here. That's what prevents the easing of international tensions and the achievement of an agreement between East and West. That is the position concerning the question of who is really to blame for the tension in international relations.

196. The representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon, spoke at great length here about freedom. But the policy of the United Kingdom and its NATO allies towards the peoples of Africa speaks for itself. Who is it who has so far prevented the liberation of Southern Rhodesia from the tyranny of a racist régime? Everybody knows: it is the policy of the United Kingdom and, of its Government.

197. Why was the protracted twenty-second session of the General Assembly unable to adopt a sufficiently strong resolution on South West Africa or on that country which, in accord with its wishes, is now called Namibia? Precisely because the just and wise proposals and demands of the African countries, and the countries of Asia and Latin America which support them, were backed neither by the United Kingdom nor by the United States, nor indeed by a number of others which are their allies in the military aggressive bloc.

198. It is these Western Powers which support Portugal's bloody colonial wars against Angola, Mozambique, and so-called Portuguese Guinea. These are the freedoms upheld by the United Kingdom and the United States in the south of Africa, which strengthen and encourage racist régimes and prevent the African peoples from freeing their long-suffering continent of the last hotbeds of colonialism, imperialism, oppression and slavery. That is why the words of the United Kingdom representative here ring false when he appears with a hypocritical statement on the question of freedom in Czechoslovakia.

199. A few words now about yesterday's and today's appearances of the representative of the Czechoslovak mission. To what extent did he carry out the instructions of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia? Yesterday he said that he had received these instructions by radio, and that he was not certain whether they were literal, correct or identical, and he did not take part in this morning's meeting at all, despite the President's invitation to do so. Today, after making a few statements, he abandoned the meeting without so much as saying a word to anybody. What a strange attitude! Evidently all is not well here. Much of what he said here had been published earlier in the American press, and even in the United Nations Office of Public Information where, as everybody

knows, the Americans also predominate, so that they are the first to publish such things.

200. From what sources do the American propaganda organs get such information? It is perfectly obvious. From the muddled sources of the Czechoslovak counter-revolution, from clandestine broadcasters. In this connexion, I consider it appropriate to acquaint the members of the Security Council with a communication recently received from Moscow, a Tass communication. It reports numerous meetings, speeches, resolutions and letters of workers in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries evidencing full and widespread approval and support of the measures adopted in defense of the socialist achievements in Czechoslovakia. These measures are encountering solidarity and support from many Communist and workers' parties among the workers and progressive forces.

201. Some statesmen in a number of bourgeois countries are beginning to adopt a realistic position. Of course, the report says, the imperialist circles, having bet on wresting Czechoslovakia from the community of socialist States, can not resign themselves to the collapse of their hopes. And we could see this today, in the American representative's behaviour during the discussion of so innocent a question as whether to give the Bulgarian representative the floor at tomorrow's meeting, or insist that he be given it today or not at all.

202. The imperialist circles continue to create an atmosphere of tension and political hysteria concerning the events in Czechoslovakia. And this is clearly apparent in the speeches of both the United States and the United Kingdom representatives in the Security Council.

203. The above-mentioned report also states that in Europe the ruling circles of Bonn are particularly excited over the situation. They are literally going mad, involuntarily betraying their calculations regarding the activity of the counter-revolutionary forces in Czechoslovakia.

204. On the whole, the situation on 22 August in Czechoslovakia was calm. Nevertheless, anti-Soviet forces in Prague continued their subversive activities, attempting to spread nervousness and insecurity among the population. As before, clandestine radio transmitters are being used and counter-revolutionary leaflets printed for this purpose. And these clandestine radio broadcasts are being accepted here as sources of absolute truth and are being presented as so-called facts to readers and listeners who have been befuddled by monopoly propaganda.

205. In some districts of Prague, inflammatory posters have been pasted up, containing slanderous attacks on prominent Czechoslovak Party and State leaders and on the allied troops. Cars equipped with loudspeakers have appeared on the streets, transmitting the clandestine broadcasts. Clandestine radio stations and illegal publications, together with the propaganda centres of the Western countries, are spreading the basest kind of falsehoods. Some official figures are giving them direct assistance. The American representative has mentioned Hájek here, and has already prepared a seat at the Security Council table for him and expressed willingness to listen to him.

206. At the same time, the Tass communiqué reports that these clandestine radio stations, illegal publications and the propaganda centres of the Western Powers are being given direct assistance in spreading the basest kinds of falsehoods by some official figures. Specifically, the report mentions that O. Sik, I. Hájek, Vlasák and Gasparik, who are in Yugoslavia, will carry on their Government functions outside of Czechoslovak territory, which, by the way, nobody has authorized them to do.

207. All those who cherish the cause of socialism in Czechoslovakia will dismiss the claims of such discredited politicians and those who back them to speak on behalf of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

208. According to information arriving from Czechoslovakia, the soldiers of the allied armies, showing restraint and an awareness of their duty in a complex situation, are helping their class brothers, the workers of Czechoslovakia with honour and dignity to sustain the cause of socialism and to remove the threat to the inviolability and sovereignty of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. On the streets and squares of the cities and villages one can often see the soldiers and officers of the allied armed forces engaged in friendly conversation with the population, answering numerous questions, helping it to evaluate the political situation properly, explaining the lofty aims these troops are fulfilling in giving fraternal, friendly assistance to the Czechoslovak people in the preservation and strengthening of socialism in Czechoslovakia and in strengthening and ensuring the security, independence and sovereignty of a fraternal socialist country.

209. Mr. President, I will not insist on consecutive interpretation, although I have the right to do so.

210. The PRESIDENT: May I inquire whether the representative of Bulgaria wishes to address the Security Council at this stage.

211. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): As I told you, Mr. President, I should like to speak before the vote is taken on the draft resolution—if, of course, you allow me to do so.

212. The PRESIDENT: I understand that the representative of Bulgaria does not want to address the Council at this stage. The Council is seized of a formal motion by the representative of Canada that we should proceed to the vote. I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

213. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The representative of Bulgaria asked for the floor before. If you give him the floor, I have no objection.

214. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of the United States.

215. Mr. BALL (United States of America): Mr. President, the Security Council . . .

216. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): Point of order.

217. Mr. BALL (United States of America): I am addressing myself to the question of consecutive interpretation. The Security Council, as is the case with every self-respecting legislative body, is the master of its own procedures. Any permanent member of the Security Council has the right to waive consecutive interpretation. But the decision as to whether there has to be consecutive interpretation is a decision for the Council itself to make. And I propose, that if the representative of the Soviet Union persists in this obvious and highly deplorable effort to prevent the Council from expressing its views in a vote by conducting the most patent kind of filibuster, that this Council proceed at this moment to take a vote on the question as to whether we have to endure the agony of consecutive interpretation simply in order to aid the representative of Soviet Union in pursuit of his design to frustrate the will of the Council.

218. The PRESIDENT: I wish to state that I was under the impression that the representative of the Soviet Union had waived the right of consecutive interpretation.

219. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, since the United States representative was absent from the meeting for a while, he apparently took a nap and dreamed that I was insisting on consecutive interpretation of my statement. I am surprised at his passionate statement on it, but there were no grounds for this statement, no reason at all, and he is breaking down an open door. He is so opposed to anything the Soviet delegation says and proposes that in this mood he is evidently ready to speak against the Soviet delegation for all and any reason.

220. I announce that I declared officially to the President that I do not insist on consecutive interpretation, and I consider the United States representative's statement either a misunderstanding or else as a continuation of his slanderous line against the Soviet delegation.

221. Mr. BALL (United States of America): I was apparently the victim of a misunderstanding. It was not my misunderstanding, it was a misinterpretation. As I understood what was said in English, it was that the representative of the Soviet Union insisted upon consecutive interpretation. I think that everyone who was listening understood the same thing. I am delighted that the representative of the Soviet Union does not insist upon this. I think that this is the most useful contribution he has made to the proceedings all evening.

222. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Bulgaria to address the Security Council.

223. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, you asked me a few minutes ago whether I wished to speak on this question. I told you that it was my intention to make a statement before the vote on the draft resolution. However, I think we have misunderstood each other, and that you do not understand exactly what I meant, that is, that if you intended to ask the Council to vote on the draft resolution, I wished to speak before the vote. I wish to thank you for giving me the floor, and also to thank the members of the Security Council for their courtesy, although some of them did not, of course,

want to permit this statement to be made at a moment when something is being prepared—I don't know exactly what—and when the representative of the United States has already made a statement meant to suggest that there will be a meeting tomorrow. I don't know whether that was decided by the Council or by the United States delegation.

224. Also, as I have understood it, the main reason why the representative of the United States insisted that the Council proceed to a vote this evening is that tomorrow morning, when Mr. Jirí Hájek will be here, the United States representative intends to make him a present on behalf of the Security Council, giving him a resolution, or at least a vote, as a gift of welcome here. This may be a highly praiseworthy intention on the part of the United States and its representative here, but it would also undoubtedly please certain reactionary circles of many countries, and particularly those of this country where the Security Council is at present meeting.

225. Since he has mentioned a number of times here that the People's Republic of Bulgaria has undertaken armed intervention against Czechoslovakia, my Government has asked me to take part in the debate on this matter in order to reject categorically the fantastic assertions of some delegations present here. Bulgaria, as a small country which has suffered in the past from intervention by others, particularly by large imperialist Powers which tried and still try to intervene in the Balkans, does not and never will practise intervention in the affairs of other countries, and even less would our country intervene in the affairs of a socialist country to change the established social order there. As a socialist country, we are concerned with the preservation and development of socialism everywhere. If we are in Czechoslovakia now, it is only to help the population of that socialist country to overcome the problems created for it by outside intervention and by internal counter-revolution, the latter supported by reactionary and counter-revolutionary forces outside Czechoslovakia.

226. I therefore categorically reject, on behalf of the Bulgarian Government, the slanderous version of representatives of certain Governments who, as members of the Security Council, wish to set themselves up as judges at the same time, although their hands are plunged in interventions against foreign countries and peoples, and who charge that the People's Republic of Bulgaria would intervene in any way in the internal affairs of the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia.

227. However, before commenting on this matter and on certain fantastic and bizarre assertions of some representatives here, allow me to express my astonishment and indignation at the tone used by some representatives in the course of this debate. Attempting to create easily aroused emotions, the United States representative, in the course of the discussion taking place in the Security Council has already, on a number of occasions, termed the Governments of the socialist countries, accused of having intervened in Czechoslovakia together with the Soviet Union, as puppet governments. Perhaps it is the rule for the representatives of countries such as the United States, and especially for their representatives at the United Nations, to consider

as puppets the small countries with which they nevertheless maintain regular diplomatic relations and which have representatives in Washington and in whose capitals the Government of Washington has diplomatic representatives. Perhaps this is a custom, but it is undoubtedly an execrable custom on the part of these representatives. Possibly such an attitude, adopted towards the small countries with which the United States tries to maintain diplomatic relations, derives directly from the policy it practises, the policy of the discipline of power in which this country is beginning to indulge a bit too much, particularly after the efforts made by the present permanent representative of the United States of America in the United Nations. As you know, he has written a book to give his views on the discipline of power to be applied to others. Such "refined" language on the part of the distinguished representative of the United States is perhaps the result of the custom the representatives of that country have adopted towards some of their allies in the various military blocs which they have established throughout the world, and which they have also adopted in the back-yards of their diplomatic activities.

228. As far as my country is concerned, we indignantly reject such vulgar language and this impertinent attitude. Need we remind the distinguished representative of the United States here before the members of the Security Council, that the Bulgarian people has fought courageously and heroically for over twenty years against fascism and international reaction so as to be able to stand beside the Soviet Union and the socialist countries in their constant efforts for the progress and welfare of their peoples and of all humanity? During this heroic struggle, it lost over 70,000 victims who fell in the struggle against fascism and reaction in our country, killed, hung and executed in a merciless but unremitting struggle. If we take a count and make a comparison with the losses suffered by the United States—a large country—in the course of the two world wars, this certainly represents a much higher proportion *per capita*. However, we are not speaking of the two world wars; we are speaking of the political struggle the Bulgarian people have carried on for two decades in order to stand beside their brothers in the struggle of the socialist peoples, to stand side by side with the Soviet Union.

229. A people which has been capable of waging such a struggle, under the guidance of its leaders, could never be anybody's puppet. It is by its own free choice alone that the Bulgarian people have wished to be with the Soviet Union, and that it is with the socialist countries in their struggle for the progress of all humanity, for the peace and welfare of the world.

230. Of course, there have been times in the past when Governments which were in the pay of the imperialists and participated in the imperialists' quarrels might have served as puppets of those imperialists. But, thanks to the struggle of the Bulgarian people, those days are gone forever. Perhaps that is why certain imperialist countries and their representatives here, and certain imperialist circles, so keenly regret that those times are over in Bulgaria, and also in other countries which are now free to move towards socialism and progress. Such assertions are to be scornfully rejected. Nobody should be allowed to make them in the Security Council, all the less a representative of the United States.

231. Having dealt with this slander against my country, I should now like to comment on the procedure which has been adopted by the Security Council regarding the question before it, to show how inadequate and impossible it is, and that it already betrays premeditation, bad faith, the bad faith of those who have introduced this question in the Security Council.

232. In a letter dated 21 August 1968 [S/8758] addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representatives of Canada, Denmark, Paraguay, the United Kingdom and the United States have, upon instructions from their Governments, requested that an immediate meeting of the Security Council be convened to examine the serious situation in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. At the same time, the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in another letter [S/8759] also addressed to the President of the Security Council, has explained and emphatically stressed the fact that there is no justification for the examination of this question by the Security Council. He added: "... military units of the socialist countries have entered the territory of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic pursuant to a request by the Government of that State, ...". He also stressed that: "Needless to say, the above-mentioned military units will be withdrawn from the territory of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic as soon as the present threat to security is eliminated and the lawful authorities find that the presence of those units is no longer necessary."

233. Despite these explanations given by the Governments of our countries—which have never engaged in aggression of any kind against another country and have never infringed on the sovereignty of any independent State—the representatives of the Government of the United States and of other countries continue to insist on saying that there is an intervention in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia; they continue to insist that no aid should be given the Czechoslovak people so that it may eliminate the counter-revolutionary elements which have established themselves in certain crucial points of Czechoslovak life and are trying to exploit their positions in order to change the political system of this country and bring it to restore capitalist reaction.

234. However, it must be noted that the fraternal aid which the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are giving the Czechoslovak people now is not very different from the aid given it in other cases and periods of its development, whether in the form of close economic collaboration or of military and other assistance in defence against its enemies, both from outside and against the tools of counter-revolution and reaction within the country. But at those times, although the imperialists always opposed fraternal aid between the socialist countries, they could not allow themselves to mix in the internal affairs of the socialist countries. They did not permit themselves to do so, because they were aware that the principle of this mutual assistance underlay the very foundations of all the declarations and documents drawn up and adopted by the fraternal parties and by the socialist countries in all their contacts and activities.

235. Of course, it is an old habit of the imperialist circles all over the world, and particularly in the United States,

always to be against the socialist countries and socialism in general. It is scarcely necessary to try to prove it. The very statements of the United States representative before the Security Council during the present debate are there to prove it. Under these circumstances, one may legitimately wonder—and one does, indeed, wonder—what are the real reasons which lead the representatives of certain countries and certain imperialist circles to intervene, through the Security Council, in the internal relations of the community of socialist countries. This is all the more surprising since certain representatives who initiated this debate repeat here *ad nauseam* that these events supposedly have occurred at a time when Czechoslovakia was supposed to be developing, improving the socialist order in its country; that the Czechoslovak people were creating a better socialist society in its country. This is odd and, of course, ingenuous. It is really remarkable to observe that, at a certain moment in the history of the development of socialism in a given country, the most obstinate enemies of socialism announce that they are ready to ensure the conditions necessary for this particular development of socialism. Certainly this can not fail to create serious doubts regarding their true intentions.

236. In general, the Members of the United Nations, as well as non-member States, have been accustomed to seeing the United States and the imperialist circles violate the sovereignty and independence of countries in all continents in order to change the social systems or help the agents of imperialism in these countries to change those systems and establish the most backward reaction and even fascism. There are many examples of this in various parts of the world, both near and far from the United States of America. For all those who till now have been accustomed to the aggressive action of the United States, the sight of the latter announcing that it is in favour of defending a socialist State in order to improve the form of this socialist society is very odd indeed. Until now, the United States has never come out in defense of an independent and progressive State, let alone in defense of a socialist State, of course. Yet at present it seems very much interested in the development of socialism in Czechoslovakia, and seems particularly anxious to ensure the conditions for such development in order to give free rein to the forces within this country. This is really a most peculiar desire, a desire which, one might think, is contrary to the very nature of imperialism.

237. Nevertheless, from the statements made here by the United States representative, it emerges that the latter is really interested in intervening, and wants to safeguard the process begun in Czechoslovakia for the development of socialism. Perhaps we might be somewhat less surprised if we were to examine the explanations given in certain passages of the speech of the United States representative in the discussion here. In fact, in his speech yesterday he spoke of the country of “Masaryk, Benes and Dubcek”. By aligning these three names on an equal footing, was he not trying to stress that the Czechoslovakia of Dubcek should and could also be aligned with that of Masaryk and Benes? Isn't that what he meant? Such a notion on the part of the representative of the United States and of certain circles in his country could, of course, readily explain the concern and anxiety with which the imperialist circles are trying to

ensure the “freedom” of those—a few thousand “mercenaries” of counter-revolution and international reaction—who, by the fiercest and most extraordinary coercive methods, are trying to turn back the wheel of history.

238. It is a curious way to conceive and practice freedom: to gain control of the press, which is the heritage of a country and party, and make it available to counter-revolution, as has been done since the beginning of this year in Czechoslovakia. Moreover, it should be noted that pressure and even brutal terror have been exercised against the leaders appointed by the corresponding organs of the Czechoslovak Communist Party to head these organs, in order to prevent them from performing their duties. It is indeed a curious concept of freedom, to gain control of the State television and radio—the most powerful information and propaganda media the world has known to date—and make them available to the counter-revolution, thus preventing the most responsible men of this country and of the Czechoslovak Communist Party from using them.

239. Such freedom, designed to prepare public opinion for the return of reaction, counter-revolution and, when we come right down to it, fascism, which plunged Europe and the world into two world wars during the lifetime of a single generation, is nothing but freedom to prepare new hecatombs for the peoples of Europe and the world.

240. The imperialists—with all due respect to Mr. Ball, who expressed the bizarre idea that the Soviet mission has a machine or even a computer to insert the expression “imperialist” or “imperialism” after every three or four words, and this machine or computer seems to worry Mr. Ball so much that he talked about it here for quite a while—naturally the imperialists cannot, as I say, favour freedom in Czechoslovakia. However, they are for the freedom of precisely those counter-revolutionaries who are to change the political system of today's Czechoslovakia for the benefit of the imperialists and capitalists, for the benefit of the fascists who have established themselves in West Germany and are now trying to unleash a war in Europe, or at least to create tension which could lead to war in Europe and the world.

241. Such freedom for the counter-revolutionary elements is simply tantamount to depriving the populations and workers of Czechoslovakia of their freedom. The Czechoslovak people, the Communist Party, and their leaders have no need of such freedom, and have not asked for it. Such freedom, intended to undermine, change and transform the political system in order to set up a reactionary system, is necessary only to the supporters of the reaction and counter-revolution of international imperialism. This view is also appropriately expressed in the letter [see 1441st meeting, para. 210] from a group of members of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, members of the Czechoslovak Government and Parliament, which says:

“In Prague . . . during spontaneous meetings attended by many thousands, matters came to the point of gross indecencies when various elements attacked the Party and insulted its representatives whom they themselves repeatedly obliged to participate in these meetings. In the

centre of the city a public campaign was started to collect signatures in favour of liquidating the people's militia. Communists who expressed their point of view in the discussions at these spontaneous street meetings were rudely silenced and physical force was frequently used against them. Many of those who signed the letter at the Auto-Praha works were persecuted in a shameful manner, even to the point of dismissal from their jobs. The press continues, although indirectly, to defame publicly leading functionaries by other more sophisticated means, and this organized subversive activity reached its climax in the last few days: a group of right-wing extremists quite openly attacked the premises of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party in Prague.

"Thus, the extremist forces have not heeded the Party's appeal, but have further intensified their subversive activity, attempting to provoke conflict in our country regardless of the consequences. Thus a situation has arisen in which the obligations deriving from the Bratislava Declaration of six fraternal communist and workers' parties, which also bears the signature of our Party's representatives, are being publicly, systematically violated."

242. Further on the letter reads:

"Aware of our responsibility towards our people, filled with true patriotic feeling, with the feeling of international socialist solidarity, aware of our international commitments, we have assumed the initiative of rallying all patriotic forces in the name of our socialist future and our homeland.

"The danger of fratricidal strife, which has been prepared by the reaction and which would be a tragic repetition of Lipan (this refers to the battle at Lipan in 1434) has confronted us with the need to make the historic decision of appealing to the Soviet Union and to the other fraternal socialist countries for assistance. Our allies have granted us this assistance, as they did in 1945 when it was a question of our very existence."

243. This appeal is conclusive evidence of the state of mind prevailing at the moment when the counter-revolutionary forces tried to gain control of all Czechoslovakia. It expresses the anxiety of a people faced with counter-revolution organized by the reactionary forces outside and inside the country. The efforts of the representative of the United States to discredit this appeal by his cynical remark on "its so-called Russian original" have certainly misfired. It has only shown once more the pattern followed by the American imperialists in their frequent interventionist practices throughout the world. It is their own practice which they are trying to lay at the Soviet Union's door.

244. It is worth noting that, to go to the lengths of resorting to provocations such as that of trying to involve the Security Council in a matter outside its purview, and talking about the aid given by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to Socialist Czechoslovakia, the American imperialists must really have been touched to the quick on the sore point of their counter-revolutionary and

subversive schemes. To try to involve the Security Council in the settlement of the situation in one of the countries of the socialist community—a situation which it is trying to settle with the aid of some of its partners—without having been specifically requested to do so by this or the other countries concerned, is nothing but pure and simple intervention in the internal affairs of those countries, which is forbidden by the letter and spirit of the Charter itself. Neither the Security Council nor the United Nations have a right to intervene in the affairs of a country, or between countries, unless they are asked to do so.

245. Even the statements of the Acting Permanent Representative of Czechoslovakia yesterday evening, which caused such joy and enthusiasm in the patently interventionist circles, and his statements this evening, mentioning cabled press reports and clandestine radio stations, in no way indicated that an intervention by the Security Council in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia had been requested. Moreover, we have been informed that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has announced his intention to discuss all these matters resulting from the operations undertaken to clear and improve the atmosphere in Czechoslovakia, and to create the conditions of calm required to give the Czechoslovak people a chance to put its own house in order. This Minister intends to reopen the discussion of these questions and to settle them in a spirit of understanding with the socialist countries concerned, and within the community of socialist States, and not try and submit them to the Security Council, which he has no intention of doing.

246. Unless we are mistaken, this information was also transmitted to us through the Mission of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. Mr. Ball's literary games concerning the alleged telephone conversations of neutral diplomats with staff members of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs are nothing but the figments of an over-active imagination, serving only to amuse the public. They are a fitting demonstration of what happens when the representatives of the imperialist countries run short of arguments: they use their imagination, or that of those who come to their aid. Nevertheless, the fact remains—and this is important—that in the present circumstances the United Nations and the Security Council should not immix itself in the internal affairs of a socialist country which has not asked them to do so. Nor should the organs of the United Nations mix themselves into the internal affairs of the socialist community without being invited to do so. On the contrary, if the Security Council means to abide by the duties and tasks assigned to it under the Charter, it should put a stop to the attempts of certain countries to intervene in the internal affairs of any State, and especially of a socialist country by using the Security Council and thereby involving the United Nations in such intervention. Such an attitude on the Council's part would serve in the future as a lesson to those countries which want to immix themselves in the affairs of other States using the Security Council as a mask for their manoeuvres. They who intervene in the internal affairs of various countries in different parts of the world, who carry on a dirty war of extermination against the Viet-Nameese people in order to introduce a new colonial system, neo-colonialism, in Viet-Nam, and those who actively support them or maintain tacit complicity by their silence

will thus be warned by the Security Council that it will not let itself be drawn into such a manoeuvre.

247. If the Council wishes to be equal to its mission, it can only refuse outright to adopt any resolution whatever which is requested by these countries. That is the only way the Security Council can deal with those who wish to exploit it to pursue their imperialist activities and their interventions in the affairs of other countries.

248. Moreover, I can assure you, on behalf of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, that the socialist countries will never permit anybody to interfere in their internal affairs.

249. The PRESIDENT: Now that the representative of Bulgaria has made his statement before the vote, may I assume that the Council has no objection to following the course proposed by the representative of Canada, that is to say, that we should proceed to the vote on the text of the draft resolution that has been tabled.

250. I understand that the representative of India has signified his intention to address the Council before the vote in a statement in explanation of vote. If he is prepared to speak I shall be very glad to give him the floor.

251. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): At the 1441st meeting of the Council, my delegation read into the record a statement by the Prime Minister of India on the grave situation in Czechoslovakia. I would like, with the Council's permission, to quote two passages from that statement:

"... The principle of non-interference by one country in the internal affairs of another constitutes the very basis of peaceful coexistence. We have always believed that international relations should be governed by respect for the sovereignty and independence of nations, big or small. We have always stood for the right of every country to develop its personality according to its own traditions, aptitudes and genius. India has always raised her voice whenever these principles have been violated.

"...

"I am sure I reflect the opinion of the House when I express the hope that the forces which have entered Czechoslovakia will be withdrawn at the earliest possible moment, and the Czech people will be able to determine their future according to their own wishes and interests, and that whatever mutual problems there may be between Czechoslovakia and its allies will be settled peacefully. The right of nations to live peacefully and without outside interference should not be denied in the name of religion or ideology." [1441st meeting, para. 125.]

252. The Prime Minister of India made another statement in the Indian Parliament yesterday, that is, on 21 August, on the subject under our consideration. She said:

"We are wedded to certain basic and fundamental principles to which we have adhered all these years, and I would like, with the permission of the House, to restate them: We ardently and sincerely believe that every State

should be left free and unfettered to decide its own future and its own destiny. We believe that there should be no external interference in the affairs of any country. Thirdly, force should not be used as the arbiter of decisions, and finally, differences in ideology or social systems can never be an excuse for interfering in one another's internal affairs."

253. Another passage from the statement of my Prime Minister is particularly relevant. I would like, with the permission of the Council, to quote that passage. She said:

"In the present situation, the immediate need, as I have said yesterday, is for the withdrawal of the forces which have entered Czechoslovakia so that the Czechoslovak people may be free to determine their own future for themselves without any intervention and in an atmosphere which is free from tension. Whatever problems there may be between Czechoslovakia and its neighbours should be settled peacefully by means of negotiations and not through the use of force. The processes of peaceful co-existence which we have tried to promote for so many years must be allowed to develop unimpeded."

254. In the light of the statements of the Prime Minister of India, it will be clear to the Council that India firmly supports respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Czechoslovakia. It should be equally clear that we are against any interference in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia. As our Prime Minister said, the immediate need is for the withdrawal of foreign forces from Czechoslovakia. At the same time, I should like, to place on record our deep sympathy with the heroic people of Czechoslovakia in their present ordeal.

255. The draft resolution contained in document S/8761 was submitted to the Council late yesterday morning. In our view, it is necessary to examine fully the implications of this draft resolution on the situation in Czechoslovakia and on its leaders and people. Surely, it is recognized that any action of this Council must be directed towards alleviating the grave situation in Czechoslovakia. The prime necessity is the withdrawal of foreign forces from Czechoslovakia and the safety and security of its leaders and people. With this in mind, we have informally suggested some changes in the draft resolution, principally to remove the judgement of condemnation. Unfortunately, some of the co-sponsors were not prepared to consider any changes in the draft resolution. Therefore, my delegation will abstain on the draft resolution.

256. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): It is with profound misgivings and real anxiety that my delegation has followed both the development of the situation in Czechoslovakia and of that which we are to call a debate in this Council. There has been virtually no debate, since, with regard to both substance and form, it has been impossible to apply any of the generally accepted rules. One is almost led to believe that the breach of principles must inevitably result in the mishandling of the rules of common procedure. On this point, my delegation wishes to stress that no discussion, no consultation, no negotiation worthy of the name has taken place among all the members of the Council. Some delegations, particularly

those of Africa and Asia, have often been criticized precisely on that score. But these delegations have never acted lightly at the Council level, even and particularly when the effective implications of a resolution were such that the debate was on a more or less heated tone.

257. Precipitation and haste were justified, we were told yesterday morning, by the fact that by tonight there would no longer be any constitutionally established authorities. The representative of Socialist Czechoslovakia appositely replied that the occupation forces had not succeeded in imposing on the Czechoslovak people representatives whom it had not elected.

258. My delegation had referred to certain developments which made the continuation of negotiations even more necessary. The representative of Czechoslovakia duly and explicitly informed us that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Mr. Hájek, was coming to New York to take part in the present meetings of the Security Council and that he hoped Mr. Hájek would have the opportunity of explaining his country's position in detail.

259. Moreover, although it is only fair to mention that at the worst of times reasonable time-limits have been granted to delegations and their Governments to enable them to reach the decisions they considered appropriate, that is not the case today. What is more, by an insidious campaign, those whose only fault is that they advocate as wide an agreement as possible in as short a time as possible are being accused of schemes to promote some sort of manoeuvre. Let it be clearly established that the Algerian delegation shall seek no other course but to safeguard the Charter.

260. Our uneasiness has given rise to a certain caution, due to the fact that the main complainants, those who have chosen to adopt a tone of resentment, practically hysterical admonitions and the most far-fetched professions of faith are the ones who, when Africa, Asia or Latin America are involved, display an off-hand passivity which ill conceals the ties of interests, and confine themselves to appeals to pious principles. Is there supposed to be one standard for Europe, and another for the rest of the world? Nothing is more striking or more deserving of our most painstaking attention than the contrast between the dignified, noble and courageous attitude of the Czechoslovak delegation, which is completely restrained, and the attitude of those who have assumed the role of champions of a cause in order to better disguise their responsibility in South-East Asia, South Africa and the Middle East. They have given proof of aggressivity, excess, and have manifested a kind of political and intellectual courage barely distinguishable from provocation.

261. We should therefore pay the tribute they deserve to the representatives of Czechoslovakia who, by their clear-sightedness, have refused to yield to provocative attitudes.

262. My delegation wishes to take note of the statements made here on 21 August 1968 [1441st meeting] by the representative of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Jan Muzík. My delegation has noted with close attention the message addressed to the nation by President Svoboda.

263. I am also in duty bound to state emphatically that, now as in the past, Algeria fervently adheres to the right of peoples to self-determination, and to the principles by which foreign forces occupying the territory of another State should be withdrawn and the settlement of problems should be sought within the framework of a peace based first on justice and subsequently on stability. There can be no grounds or justification for occupation, whatever its character, of the territory of a State by foreign armed forces. Consequently, foreign interference, whatever its form, cannot be accepted. It is in everybody's interest to put an end to occupation by the withdrawal of such forces within the framework of respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity. However, as has rightly been observed here, the tragic crisis which is at present shaking the Czechoslovak nation must be set in its European context, a context which, as you must all know better than we do, is primarily determined by a balance accepted by everybody since the Second World War. This balance, based primarily on military blocs and tacit acceptance of a political and territorial *status quo*, must necessarily undergo a phase of adjustment and instability. Those who are inspired by this objective, both here and elsewhere, have long since chosen the course of non-interference and self-determination.

264. We have the feeling that all these conditions apply to the situation in Czechoslovakia, and that is why our adherence to these principles is greater than ever. That is why we understand and share the convictions of socialist Czechoslovakia, especially concerning the most acute problems of Viet-Nam and the Middle East, for there is no doubt that tolerance of the aggression in Viet-Nam, like tolerance of the aggression in the Middle East—a tolerance which has become crystallized in signs of a certain impotence on the part of our Organization—has been a determining factor in the development of the crisis in Central Europe.

265. The Council had a choice between the path of the cold war and that of safeguarding a vital principle: the rights of a people. Either we wished to act effectively, and in that case we should have acted differently, or else we wished to exonerate ourselves of blame, and in that case we could have gone about it differently. We cannot at one and the same time engage in or conceal violation of the Charter and act as its authorized defenders. There is now no doubt that the Council has chosen the first of these paths, since the result this Council is clearly going to achieve is that of having compiled yet another propaganda file, thereby causing great moral and political damage to socialist Czechoslovakia, which will have suffered the outrage of deceit.

266. Nothing is more repugnant than to see those who oppress Viet-Nam, who aid the annihilation of Palestine, cry out in self-righteous tones against the oppression of Czechoslovakia, while claiming to be the advocates of a policy to save this same Czechoslovakia, in this Organization and this Council where, by unfair power relationships, the most just causes are defeated. The procedure, the way the debate and the negotiations have been conducted, even the content of the resolution can mean only one thing to us: the law, the Charter and Czechoslovakia have been sacrificed to the creed of the cold war.

267. True, the balance of blocs, the balance of hegemonomies, could only lead to a state of international tension in which the peoples attached to their natural rights are the sole losers. How, then, could anyone have entertained the illusion that while this policy was being pursued systematically everywhere in the world, Europe would have remained an oasis of *détente*? Our hope, here as elsewhere, is that the troops may be withdrawn, that intervention may end, and free self-determination may be fully implemented.

268. We share the genuine anxiety and sadness of those who, like ourselves, have cherished and upheld, for themselves and for others, the cause of freedom and independence of peoples, wherever they may be. Everyone, every people, every nation has the right to develop within the framework of its sovereignty and integrity. To strike at these principles is to strike at our faith, our creed.

269. The force of the powerful has wounded the Arab nation in Palestine. The force of the powerful continues to inflict bloodletting on Asia, in Viet-Nam. The force of the powerful persists in imposing *apartheid*, racism and the exacerbated domination of a policy of colonialism by settlement on Africa. In short, the world continues to suffer from a well-known disease: the global co-protectorate.

270. In the light of these considerations, my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution S/8761.

271. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary): In explanation of our vote, I would like to state very briefly the following.

272. First, from the very beginning we considered that the discussion of the situation in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic did not serve the interests of the people of that country, but, on the contrary, only those of the imperialist Powers and of their allies, the counter-revolutionary forces in Czechoslovakia. Therefore, we voted against the inclusion of this item on the agenda of the Security Council.

273. Secondly, the text of the draft resolution before us does not alter our opinion. It makes the situation even worse, and it is in the interest only of the NATO countries which planned and submitted it. It is distasteful that they presented themselves as true defenders of the Czechoslovakian Communists, whereas they try to destroy all the achievements of socialism in that country.

274. Out of these considerations, my delegation strongly opposes the draft resolution and will vote against it.

275. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In its statements during this debate, the Soviet delegation has adequately demonstrated the whole fictitious, groundless and provocative nature of this endeavour to discuss the question of the situation in Czechoslovakia. This venture was provoked by the leaders of the NATO imperialist aggressive bloc countries in order to divert attention from the crimes being committed by the imperialist forces in Viet-Nam, in the Middle East and in many other parts of the world. The representative of Algeria has just spoken of this in detail.

276. The representatives of the imperialist countries have shamefully, hypocritically assumed the role of defenders of socialism in Czechoslovakia. Actually, they are infuriated by the collapse of their plans and intrigues to accomplish a counter-revolutionary coup in Czechoslovakia, to wrest Czechoslovakia from the community of socialist States and turn it into their satellite, their colony. Nobody asked them to discuss this matter. They acted illegally. They have violated the Charter of the United Nations, by dragging this question into the Security Council and by the use of their automatic majority.

277. Everything that has been said by the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and other representatives of the NATO countries, all this slander, insinuation, misrepresentation, this attempt to shift the blame for international tension to the innocent, all this is also reflected in the draft resolution they have introduced. This draft resolution and its presentation are just as illegal and contrary to the Charter as the raising of the question itself for discussion by the Security Council. This sorry scrap of paper is a summary of the slanders and fabrications with which the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom have spoken at such length here. This draft reflects the imperialist designs of these two Powers and some of those who support them.

278. These actions are aimed at a further aggravation of the international situation, at interference in the internal affairs of other countries—which nobody has asked these Powers to do and against which, on the contrary, the whole world protests—in order to cover up imperialist aggression and intervention in a number of the world's regions and especially in Viet-Nam and the Middle East.

279. The Soviet delegation considers the tabling of this draft resolution just as illegal and contrary to the Charter as the debate on this question itself.

280. In view of these considerations, the delegation of the Soviet Union will vote against this draft.

281. The PRESIDENT: As no further speakers have indicated a desire to take the floor at this stage, I consider that the Council is ready to vote on the draft resolution contained in document S/8761 sponsored by Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay, Senegal, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

282. I have been asked to draw attention to a small change that should be made in operative paragraph 1 of the English text. Operative paragraph 1 should read "*Affirms that the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic must be fully respected*". That is to say the noun "sovereignty" should be substituted for the adjective "sovereign".

283. I should stress also that the name of Senegal has been added to the names of the sponsors of the draft resolution.

284. The Security Council will now proceed to vote on the eight-Power draft resolution in document S/8761.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Paraguay, Senegal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Hungary, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Algeria, India, Pakistan.

The result of the vote was 10 in favour, 2 against, with 3 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted, one of the negative votes being that of a permanent member of the Council.

285. The PRESIDENT: A number of delegations have signified their intention of speaking after the vote. Accordingly, I now call on the next speaker on my list, the representative of the United States.

286. Mr. BALL (United States of America): This is the 105th time that the Soviet Union has employed its veto to frustrate a decision by the Security Council. No one at this table is surprised; no one is surprised that a Power which views Czechoslovakia as its private colonial domain and which has vetoed by naked and brutal force the right of the Czechoslovak people to breathe the air of freedom should undertake without apparent qualms or reservations to try to shut off and frustrate this solemn and serious body, the Security Council.

287. The Soviet veto in fact is what we would expect of it. The Soviets had signalled it by their conduct throughout our proceedings. It is an expression of arrogance, of callousness, of total indifference to the higher sensibilities of all mankind.

288. Your veto, Ambassador Malik, may stifle the legal vote of this Council, but it cannot suffocate the soul of a proud people defying the imposition of an *Ersatz* Government made in Moscow. Your Government, Ambassador Malik, can veto a Security Council resolution, but it cannot veto for ever or even for a long time the stubborn insistence of the Czechoslovak people to pursue their own national development within the communist system. Your Government, Mr. Malik, can veto the past Government of Czechoslovakia and install your *Quislings*. But how long do you expect that you could make these brutal actions survive?

289. Over the centuries tyrants have tried to kill freedom again and again and again. They have not succeeded. They have tried to destroy hope; it has defied them. They have tried to blunt and brutalize the finer instincts of mankind. They have failed. The aggression of the Soviet Union and some of its clients in the Warsaw Pact will fail in the same way. Just as Moscow is finding it extremely difficult to fabricate a synthetic Czechoslovak Government tonight, so will the Soviet Government discover that the veto of the earnest aspirations of the Czechoslovak people will be written in sand. History will unquestionably demonstrate that the most wretched victims of the veto you have cast tonight will not be the Government or the people of Czechoslovakia but rather those frightened and rattled leaders of the Soviet Union who launched the invasion and the brutal occupation of Czechoslovakia, for their action

has called into question not only their judgement, not only their perception, it has also called into question their humanity. And let there be no doubt, Ambassador Malik, what they have done, what your Government has done is self-destructive. Their repressive action will some day be repudiated by their successors with the same violence, with the same vehemence that the cruel and repressive acts of Stalin were repudiated by his successors.

290. Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan): I take the floor to explain the vote we cast a while ago. My delegation abstained from voting on the resolution which was just put to the vote. The Council met in the evening of 21 August on an urgent basis. Late that night we were informally provided with the first draft of a possible resolution to be submitted in the Security Council. Yesterday morning a revised version of that draft was made available to my delegation at about 11 a.m. The Council has been in continuous session since 10 p.m., and it then proceeded to vote on the draft resolution. Due to the shortness of time between the presentation of the draft and the vote and due also to difficulties in communications with my capital, I regret that it was not possible for my delegation to receive final instructions on the draft resolution just voted upon. In these circumstances the delegation of Pakistan was left with no choice but to abstain on that resolution.

291. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): I have asked to speak at this time to consider the results of the vote announced by you, Mr. President, in which the Soviet veto has led to the rejection of the resolution sponsored by eight of the delegations here present. The result, as has been said, was no surprise. But in the light of that rejection, I believe that we must briefly consider, before we adjourn, what further action the Security Council should endeavour to take in view of the continuing seriousness of the situation in Czechoslovakia.

292. In my remarks this morning I referred to the intolerable situation created by the fact that the lawful authorities in Czechoslovakia have been subjected to the indignity of being forcibly removed from office. We were given further grim and profoundly disturbing information about these leaders by the Acting Permanent Representative of Czechoslovakia earlier at this meeting. I realize that the representative of the Soviet Union, while rejecting any right of this Council to give consideration to or show concern about the events which are taking place in Czechoslovakia, has nevertheless sought to reassure us on the basis of certain Tass statements concerning the fate of the displaced Czechoslovak leaders. I might say, however, that we in this Council have not found these statements based on Tass reports entirely reassuring.

293. I would therefore hope that in the present situation the Council would see fit as a minimum measure to consider a simple draft resolution which I now propose on behalf of the delegations of Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay; Senegal, the United Kingdom and the United States, which reads as follows:

"The Security Council,

"Concerned at reports about the current developments in Czechoslovakia including the arrest of Czechoslovak leaders,

"Requests the Secretary-General to appoint and despatch immediately to Prague a Special Representative who shall seek the release and ensure the personal safety of the Czechoslovak leaders under detention and who shall report back urgently."

294. Of course I will not insist on a vote on this draft resolution tonight since I am sure that delegations, as many have indicated their concern about the timing of the previous resolution, will wish to have time to consider the text of this draft resolution which I have just read out and seek instructions from their Governments and to consult on it.

295. I would ask the Secretary-General to have this text circulated as well as the translations by tomorrow morning.

296. The PRESIDENT: The draft resolution which has been submitted will be circulated as requested.

297. I call on the representative of the Soviet Union in exercise of his right of reply.

298. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, taking advantage of my right of reply, I should like to make a short statement calling attention to the fact that the malice, slander, insinuation, pathological animosity and hatred towards the socialist countries, socialism, the lofty ideals of communism on the part of the representative of American monopoly capital in the Security Council have reached a climax in his equally spiteful, hostile concluding statement.

299. He mentioned the Soviet veto. Evidently he keeps an exact score of the number of times the Soviet delegation has used the veto. But the veto has enabled, does, and will continue to enable the Soviet Union, during the existence of this international Organization, the United Nations, to defend the just cause and interests of many, many peoples of its own and other countries against the threat of imperialist aggression, subversion, invasion, slander, and of that struggle which was instituted against the first socialist country in the world, the Soviet Union, since the very earliest days of the glorious, great 1917 October Revolution.

300. The Soviet veto has helped to save the freedom and independence of many countries of the Arab East, and to thwart the ill-intentioned plans of enslavement of the Americans, the British, and many other imperialists towards free countries.

301. The Soviet veto has ensured the admission to the United Nations of those countries whose admission was blocked for many, many years by the American and British imperialists. It was the Soviet veto, applied over seventy times in similar cases, which helped to admit Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Mongolia and a number of other countries to this important international Organization.

302. For many, many years the Anglo-American imperialists, utilizing their automatic majority in the Security Council, opposed the admission of a whole series of States, and it was only the Soviet Union veto which, in strict

conformity with the Charter, helped to protect the interests of those countries and enabled justice to prevail: those countries became Members of the United Nations Organization in 1955, when the imperialists, feeling that they were powerless to overcome the provisions of the Charter, were obliged to accept a "package deal" and agreed to admit sixteen countries at once, including those against whose admission they had voted for many years since the very establishment of the United Nations.

303. Therein lie the strength and greatness and the international importance of the Soviet veto, and your slanderous accusations, Mr. Ball, are neither new nor original. We have heard them repeatedly from your predecessors. They cannot alter the substance of the issue. We have employed, do, and will courageously and proudly employ the veto against attempts by the imperialists to impose their will and their commands. Your intention to impose your commands was obvious from your behaviour, your speeches, and your concluding words.

304. You needed to conceal the evil deeds in Viet-Nam by this disgraceful document which you introduced into the Security Council, this shameful action by which you, the representative of monopoly capital, not even scorning this kind of hypocrisy, decided to play the part of the defender of communism and socialism. You spoke of tyrants. But the most dreadful tyranny of all is the tyranny of imperialism. The people of Viet-Nam, the peoples of the Arab countries feel it constantly, every minute, every second. With your country's collaboration, and that of American monopoly capital in particular, the tyranny of imperialism also reigns in a number of regions of Africa, supporting racism in South West Africa, in South Africa, in Southern Rhodesia, in the Portuguese colonies and in many other places.

305. We were saying that somebody drowns regions, countries and territories in blood. Now, who could that be? Don't all those present know that it is you who drown the fields, villages and cities of Viet-Nam in blood? Your hands are drenched in blood from these evil deeds, from this imperialist tyranny, this effort to impose its commands, its will, to subjugate the freedom-loving peoples of Viet-Nam, of the Arab, African and Latin American countries to American financial capital. There is the most dreadful tyranny of modern times: the tyranny of imperialism.

306. You dare to speak of the leaders of other countries. You would do better to speak of your own leaders, what they are doing and how they are carrying out their policy in Viet-Nam, in the Middle East, and in many other countries. Your hysteria here, your spite and hostility show that you have found you are powerless in Czechoslovakia to establish and maintain the rule of your secret service, of counter-revolution and reaction with which you have sympathized, to which you gave directives through your propaganda and espionage organizations, which you financed creating an unbearable situation, preventing the Czechoslovak people from developing freely and independently along the socialist course. You had plans to impose your imperialist course, the domination of the monopolies. But this bet was defeated by the common efforts of the fraternal socialist

countries which courageously came forward to render assistance to the Czechoslovak people who found themselves faced by the threat of international imperialism and its conspiracy against the socialist countries.

307. The fate of peoples is and will be determined by the peoples themselves, and not by the imperialist system which is condemned by history.

308. I do not insist on consecutive interpretation according to the usual practice.

309. The PRESIDENT: As I have no other speakers on my list, I think we have no alternative but to adjourn. After informal consultations, the opinion has prevailed that the Security Council should meet later today—Friday, 23 August—at 5 p.m. If there is no objection I shall adjourn the meeting to 5 o'clock.

310. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I consider the proposal of the Canadian representative as a new trick of the NATO countries. In this dirty story he appears as the chief mouthpiece and representative of the Anglo-American circles. Having failed in their attempt to impose the resolution on the Security Council, they are now trying another trick. They are trying to drag the Secretary-General of the United Nations into this dirty business of theirs, that is, their interference in the affairs of a socialist country and in the common affairs of the fraternal socialist countries. The reason for this venture is perfectly obvious. I presume there are no grounds for this kind of venture. One illegal move, one violation of the Charter did not go through. It was defeated. Now diversionary manoeuvres are being

adopted in order to impose their commands, their will, their determination on the Security Council and the Secretary-General, by the attempt to claim that this is allegedly not a substantive proposal. Oh no, my fine gentlemen! This is indeed substantive, and you will not succeed in by-passing the Charter and involving the intentions of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in your imperialist designs. Therefore, I consider that there is no need at all to convene the Security Council tomorrow on this matter.

311. The PRESIDENT: I shall state the procedural situation. A draft resolution has been submitted by eight delegations, and in order for us to proceed to consider that draft resolution and vote on it, the opinion has prevailed, as a result of informal consultations that took place in accordance with the usual practice, that a meeting should be called for 5 p.m. tomorrow for the purpose of resuming our discussion. Therefore, if there is no objection, I shall adjourn this meeting with the understanding that we shall meet again in this chamber at 5 p.m. tomorrow.

312. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation reserves its right to state its views again at the time you have mentioned, Mr. President.

313. The PRESIDENT: I assure the representative of the Soviet Union that he will have ample time to state his views, and with the consent of the Council I propose now to adjourn this meeting.

The meeting rose at 3.55 a.m. on Friday, 23 August 1968.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Приводите справки об изданиях в нашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
