

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-THIRD YEAR

1445th MEETING: 24 AUGUST 1968

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1445)	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-FIFTH MEETING

Held in New York on Saturday, 24 August 1968, at 11.30 a.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/1445)

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 previously taken by the Security Council, I now propose, if there is no objection, to invite the representatives of Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Poland and Yugoslavia to take seats at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. Hajek (Czechoslovakia), Mr. M. Tarabanov (Bulgaria), Mr. B. Tomorowicz (Poland) and Mr. A. Vratusa (Yugoslavia) took places at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the question before it, and I wish to acquaint the members of the Security Council with the contents of an official note from the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, addressed to the President of the Security Council.

3. I request the Under-Secretary-General kindly to read this letter to the members of the Security Council.

4. Mr. KUTAKOV (Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs) (*translated from Russian*): The letter reads as follows:

“The Permanent Mission of the USSR to the United Nations presents its compliments to the President of the Security Council and, referring to the letter of the United Nations Secretariat of 23 August 1968 forwarding the text of the telegram from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic, Otto Winzer, of 23 August 1968 which contains his communication to the President of the Security Council, has the honour to draw attention to the fact that this important and urgent communication has so far not been distributed as an official document of the Security Council.

“The Permanent Mission of the USSR expects that this telegram of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic to the President of the Security Council will be distributed without delay as an official document of the United Nations Security Council.”

5. The PRESIDENT: In this connexion I wish to state that the procedure adopted by the President follows some precedents adopted in the past, since in this case the President failed to receive any guidance from the rules of procedure, which are silent in this regard. Anyhow, the President was bound to acquaint the members of the Security Council with the contents of the communication, and this has been done. The President, however, does not make claim to any infallibility, and will gladly comply with any other course which may be agreeable to the Security Council.

6. I call on the representative of the USSR.

7. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I am very grateful to you for having decided to acquaint the Security Council with the letter which the Soviet delegation sent to you late last night in connexion with a letter it received from the Secretariat of the United Nations forwarding the telegram from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic, Comrade Winzer.

8. The fact is that, despite the arrival of this telegram during the day, it was sent to the members of the Security Council so late at night that, as became apparent today, not all the members of the Security Council even learned its contents. I shall therefore take the liberty of reading it here

at this meeting of the Security Council for the information of the Council members. The telegram reads as follows:

“Berlin, 23 August 1968

“To the President of the Security Council
of the United Nations,
“United Nations Headquarters, New York

“Excellency,

“The Security Council of the United Nations, acting in a way which is inadmissible, has inscribed on its agenda the debate on the measures taken by the socialist States for the protection of the building of socialism and guaranteeing the national independence and sovereignty of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

“The Government of the German Democratic Republic most emphatically stresses that the defence and strengthening of socialism in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic serve the cause of peace and security in Europe. For these reasons the Government of the German Democratic Republic must insist on participating in the discussion of these questions by sending an authorized representative.

“The authorized representative of the German Democratic Republic is ready to leave at any time.

“Kindly reply immediately.

“(Signed) Otto WINZER
“Minister for Foreign Affairs of the
German Democratic Republic”

9. In conformity with the accepted procedure and practice, this kind of communication from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of a State—whether a Member of the United Nations or not—must be published as an official document of the Security Council insofar as this communication has a direct and immediate bearing on the matter before the Council.

10. I am not dealing now with that aspect of the matter which shows, beyond any doubt, that the question has been dragged into the Security Council by those who are interested in aggravating the international situation and in distracting attention from current problems connected with aggressive acts (in the full sense of the word) being committed in other places. We have had the opportunity to speak of that in detail.

11. But, apart from that, since this question is being discussed in the Security Council, and since the German Democratic Republic is being mentioned by those who introduced this question for debate, it is wholly logical that the representative of the German Democratic Republic be heard, that he be allowed to be present here at the meeting.

12. As for the telegram of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of that State, well, God himself, as they say, demands that it be published as an official document of the Security Council. Meanwhile, however, this telegram has been circulated to the permanent mission of the members of the

Security Council with some unidentified covering letter stating:

[The speaker continued in English.]

“Please find attached a photocopy of a cablegram, dated 23 August 1968, addressed to the President of the Security Council.

“In accordance with the instructions given by the President of the Security Council, copies of this cablegram are being sent to all members of the Security Council for their information.

“23 August 1968”

[The speaker resumed in Russian.]

13. Is there any way of knowing who signed this piece of paper? It is unsigned, and a photocopy of Mr. Winzer's telegram is attached to it. Therefore the first question that comes to my mind, naturally, is: why has the telegram of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic not been distributed as an official document of the Security Council?

14. The PRESIDENT: Well, first of all I should like to clarify a point. The text of this telegram reached me at a very late moment in yesterday's meeting; according to the note by the United Nations Telegraph Unit, it was received by that Unit on 23 August at 6.58 p.m. That is a point of fact. On the other hand, I think there is no doubt that the Secretariat's note was in accordance with instructions given by the President of the Security Council that copies of the telegram were to be sent to all members of the Security Council for their information. So there is no doubt that copies of the telegram were distributed according to instructions given by the President of the Security Council. Those are two points of fact.

15. As I said, the President followed some of the precedents of the past, but the President does not lay claim to infallibility, and he is agreeable to complying with any course agreeable to the members of the Security Council.

16. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): I should like to say a few words concerning the contents of the telegram of which our colleague from the Soviet Union has just spoken.

17. Our colleague, Ambassador Malik, will not be surprised that our attitude on the question of hearing this person is contrary to his own; as he well knows, his Government and mine have always held opposing points of view on this subject.

18. Pursuant to the communication addressed to the President of the Security Council by the Pankow authorities, it is necessary to recall the position of France on this matter. This position has been expressed by us many times, particularly in documents addressed to the President of the Security Council.

19. France does not acknowledge the right of the authorities of East Germany to speak on behalf of the German

people in international affairs. Therefore, their representatives can not be permitted to take part in our debates. That is all I have to say.

20. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary): I think that, as far as the definition of statehood is concerned, there are certain criteria such as territory, population and government, *de facto* or *de jure* in the territory. As far as the German Democratic Republic is concerned, it is a State and all three criteria accord with that definition. Whether a certain State recognizes it or not is another question.

21. A third problem is whether, because certain members of this body do not recognize the German Democratic Republic, the President is obliged not to publish as an official document of the Council anything coming from its Government—just because some members of the Council do not recognize the German Democratic Republic.

22. Mr. President, you distributed that cablegram to the members of the Council as an unofficial document, and I appreciate it. It was an act which took into consideration the late arrival of the telegram, and it was therefore the best way to distribute it in an unofficial way. But I think that nothing prevents you from distributing this cablegram later as an official document. Indeed, it would be interesting to know what the precedents are regarding a document concerning an issue before the Security Council not distributed as a Security Council document just because it came from a State not a Member of the United Nations.

23. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I should like to say at once that I fully support what has been said to us by the representative of France. The United Kingdom does not recognize that there exists a State or a Government other than that of the Federal Republic of Germany entitled to speak on behalf of the German people in international affairs.

24. Consequently, we consider that to hear the person who asked to be heard would add nothing new to our proceedings, would only serve to delay and confuse our proceedings, which indeed doubtless is the object of the application. The objection to the document is clear, the objection to the document is that it is not a communication from a State and it purports to be so.

25. I would also perhaps say that we consider that the action taken by our President has been sound and correct; we fully support his decision. Our President has said to us that he may not be infallible; it is scarcely necessary for us to say that we all have the highest regard both for his impartiality and his integrity.

26. Mr. BALL (United States of America): The statements that have been made by the representative of France and the representative of the United Kingdom represent also the views of my Government with regard to this problem. I think it may be worth taking a very brief moment, however, to examine why this problem has come before us.

27. To anyone who had the great misfortune to have to endure the filibuster by the Soviet representative Thursday night [1443rd meeting], the primary purpose of this latest

Soviet manoeuvre will be all too clear. That purpose is to provide an issue in the Council which may, for a moment at least, distract our attention from the development of events in Czechoslovakia. While it is true that the régime established by the Soviet Union in the zone of Germany which it has occupied since the close of the Second World War is an accomplice in the crime now before the Council, Ambassador Malik is under no illusions about the usefulness to him or even the novelty of testimony before the Council from still another of the occupiers of Czechoslovakia.

28. The request which is now before us from the Soviet representative has therefore a quality of effrontery. What is shocking in the extreme is that the Czechoslovak peoples, who suffered the brutal occupation of their country by Hitler's armies in 1938, should again have been subjected to the indignity of invasion and occupation by German troops, this time under despotic leaders sponsored and kept in power by the Soviet Union.

29. All we could expect from listening to a representative of the so-called German Democratic Republic would be a lengthening of that long chain of incoherences, irrelevancies and redundancies with which we have already been presented by the Soviet Union and its client States.

30. Ambassador Malik knows that anything that might be said by a representative of the régime in the eastern zone of Germany can authoritatively be said only by those who are, in fact, in charge of that zone, the Government of the Soviet Union. In sum, such an individual could not provide any information that is either authoritative or not already available from the Government which can best inform us, the Government which engineered and directed the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia. Such an individual would be nothing more than a proxy for the Government of the Soviet Union which is already quite adequately and permanently represented on this Council.

31. There is no ambiguity about the situation under the Charter or the rules. Both Article 32 of the Charter and rule 6 are applicable only to States and the régime in the Soviet Zone of Germany is neither a State nor entitled in any way to speak for the German people.

32. I need hardly remind the members of this Council that the territory over which the so-called German Democratic Republic purports to exercise authority is, in fact, only an occupation zone of Germany under the control of the Soviet Union and an inseparable part of the Germany State.

33. The so-called German Democratic Republic régime was created by the Soviet Union, and was imposed on its zone of occupation for the simple reason that the Soviet Union was unable to dominate all of Germany. It thus hoped that by establishing what it called a second German State in its zone it could assure communist domination of at least a part of Germany and perpetuate the division of Germany into the indefinite future.

34. In the specific matter of handling this document, let me only say that my Government expresses the fullest confidence in the decisions that you have made, Mr. President, and in the manner in which you have sought to

dispose of this matter. In that I am sure I express only the sentiments that are felt by the great majority of this Council.

35. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): It is the policy of my Government that only the Federal Republic of Germany is entitled to speak on behalf of the German people in international affairs. We are, moreover, satisfied that the hearing of the person who applied to be heard would serve no constructive purpose. We shall therefore oppose the request for a hearing, and may I add that we should let no doubt arise that the action of invasion by itself can be no passport to this Council.

36. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary): First, I would indeed, welcome, the information concerning the precedents when a document from a non-member State was not distributed as an official document of the Security Council. Second, it seems to me that from the procedural point of view we have jumped a step, because some of the members of the Security Council jumped to a conclusion and expressed their opinion in substance, but I think there are two steps: first, an official document of the Security Council should be issued concerning the invitation and, then, the Council can express itself and, in a democratic vote, can decide to invite or not to invite to the Council table a delegation of a State or someone. Therefore, to make a decision without even having an official document seems to me a little bit strange. So from a procedural point of view I think that the members of the Council can only express themselves over an official document of the Council that is before the Council. This is my point.

37. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The representatives of the NATO countries, which at a certain point created a Bonn State in order to include it in the military aggressive NATO bloc and turn it into their weapon against the socialist countries, are coming out in harmonious chorus against the invitation of the official representative of a sovereign State, the German Democratic Republic, to take part in the debate on the question inscribed on the agenda. This is not new; it is not original, and it is not the first time we have heard such hostile and slanderous statements concerning the German Democratic Republic.

38. The NATO member States, and first and foremost their main leaders, grossly and cynically misrepresenting the true nature of the events in Czechoslovakia have, illegally, and in contravention of the Charter, imposed on the Security Council a debate on this question which concerns events in a socialist country, openly aiming—by whatever means, by whatever methods—at hindering a normal development of the events in Czechoslovakia and of exploiting this issue which they have imposed on the Security Council to distract its attention and that of the world community from the acts of imperialist aggression in Viet-Nam and the Middle East.

39. Finally, the Security Council is being used by the representatives of these countries, particularly the United States and the United Kingdom, for unbridled slander of socialism, of communism, of the community of socialist countries, of Socialist Czechoslovakia, of all the other

socialist countries for giving it fraternal assistance which has proved effective and therefore arouses the particular annoyance and irritation of those who are betting their money on counter-revolution and reaction in any socialist country, including Czechoslovakia.

40. When it turned out they had lost their bet, they organized a clamorous world-wide slander campaign against the socialist countries. Naturally, the socialist countries expressed the desire to present the events in their true light, and they have every reason to do so. They have a right to take advantage of the Charter of the United Nations and of the rules of procedure of the Security Council. It is the United Nations Charter and the rules of procedure of the Security Council which ensure the possibility and right of each State and its official representatives to participate in the work of the Council during the discussion of a matter affecting the honour, dignity, interests, policy and acts of that State. They have a full right to present the substance of the problems under discussion and to declare their attitude to the matter being discussed. They have a full right at a meeting of the Security Council to unmask the hostile statements, insinuations, misrepresentation of facts and all the other inventions of the representatives of the aggressive imperialist blocs.

41. Of course, the representatives of the NATO countries, and above all of the United States and the United Kingdom, find the true presentation of the facts and events taking place in Czechoslovakia by those whom they accuse undesirable. It does not enter into their calculations. They want only one thing: to exploit the events in Czechoslovakia for wholesale slander, to make political capital out of these events, to distort their nature and distract the attention of all peoples from the aggressive policy of the imperialist Powers.

42. We were able to see with our own eyes what active attempts the United States representative made at one of the previous meetings of the Security Council through procedural tricks and manipulations to deprive even the representative of a Member State of the United Nations, the representative of Bulgaria, of the normal right to speak before this Council. Raising his voice, losing his temper, he tried practically to forbid the Bulgarian representative from taking the floor before the vote on the draft resolution tabled in the Security Council by the United States delegation and others. The members of the Security Council remember that he even tried to deprive the representative of a member State of the Council of the right to ask for consecutive interpretation, although the representative of that State had not insisted on this interpretation. How far can the United States representative's cynicism go when he decides to break the rules of procedure with his own hand, to destroy one of its legitimate rules affording a representative of a Member State of the United Nations the right to insist on consecutive interpretation of his speech into the working languages? This case of the representative of the United States demanding a vote in order to change this right is unprecedented in the history of the Security Council. That right is constitutional, and you, Mr. Ball, have no right, no grounds, for breaking the constitution without the consent of the Members of the United Nations Organization and of the Security Council. That's how far

matters have gone during the debate on this question here. Mr. Ball mentioned the English word "filibuster" here. There is no such word in the Russian language, there is nothing like it because the Russians do not engage in filibustering. That is an Anglo-Saxon practice. Lord Caradon is shaking his head, but he agrees. So do not attribute something of your own to us.

43. And how did matters stand at previous meetings? The Council was convened for 5 o'clock, but then the Anglo-Saxon filibusterers postponed it until 9 o'clock. But what has that to do with us? The discussion became protracted. We had to meet at night, and that is why the American delegate so nervously insisted on a quick vote. Apparently he wanted to go to bed. So if you want to talk about filibustering, say it to yourselves, not to us.

44. Every member of the Security Council has a right, in accordance with the Charter and the rules of procedure, to express his opinion, to explain his position, and to take as much time as is necessary for it, and nobody has a right—not even you, Mr. Ball—to forbid it. Let us just agree on that. Article 32 of the Charter states:

"Any Member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council or any State which is not a Member of the United Nations"—I stress it, any State—"if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute . . .".

Therefore the United Nations Charter, in Article 32, provides a legitimate basis for the Government of the German Democratic Republic to request the President of the Security Council and the Security Council to afford the official representative of the German Democratic Republic the opportunity of appearing here, at this table, with an explanation of the position of his Government which the Anglo-Saxons are accusing of every conceivable sin.

45. Of course, the official representative of the German Democratic Republic will participate in the discussion without right of vote. But no. The representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, with their natural tendency towards filibustering and dictatorship, towards suppressing the will of others and to imposing their own desires, are taking every conceivable measure to prevent the official representative of the German Democratic Republic from participating in the discussion of this question here. On what grounds? They are advancing several arguments, none of which can withstand criticism.

46. You see, the United Kingdom, the United States, and France—which unfortunately has also joined this chorus—do not recognize the German Democratic Republic. But what has this to do with the United Nations? There are plenty of people who don't recognize each other. But that does not mean that the United Nations must follow the whims of the United Kingdom, the United States and the other NATO members, or be guided by their inhumane imperialist principles and rules. It certainly does not. The non-recognition of one State by another is in no way binding on the United Nations and the Security Council.

Not all Members of the United Nations Organization—and thank God, as the saying goes, there are 124 of them—recognize each other and not all of them have diplomatic relations with each other. But what has that to do with the United Nations? When a question concerning their interests is discussed, each of them has the right to participate. Moreover, the Charter of the United Nations is so flexible and just that, on the basis of Article 32, it grants even non-member States of the United Nations the right to participate in the discussion of questions in which they are directly concerned.

47. So on what basis in international law are the United States and the United Kingdom trying to prevent the presence of the representative of the German Democratic Republic, and his participation in the discussion? On the basis of their own imperialist concepts, which have been applied in Europe since the very end of the Second World War. But these imperialist concepts are not binding on anybody, least of all on the United Nations.

48. At all the protracted meetings of the Security Council in the last few days, the German Democratic Republic was subject, as a State, to a slanderous, hostile campaign on the part of the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom. Why, then, don't you Anglo-American gentlemen deign to hear the official representative of the German Democratic Republic and his reply to your slanderous, hostile inventions about the German Democratic Republic? On what grounds do you forbid this? One State after another which considered it appropriate to participate in the discussion of this question applied to the Security Council for permission to do so, and their representatives are present here and participating.

49. Yesterday yet another socialist State, the German Democratic Republic, submitted a request to the Security Council to be admitted to participate in the Council's work in conformity with the Charter and the rules of procedure. Rule 14 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure states:

"Any Member of the United Nations not a member of the Security Council and any State not a Member of the United Nations, if invited to participate in a meeting or meetings of the Security Council, shall submit credentials for the representative appointed by it for this purpose . . .".

Therefore, the rules of procedure of the Council provide for the participation of representatives of States, even if they are not Members of the United Nations. And there are absolutely no grounds for the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and others to object to the invitation of the representative of the German Democratic Republic.

50. The campaign to prevent his admittance to the Security Council began yesterday, inasmuch as the official telegram of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic was not published as an official document of the Security Council. Today this campaign is being continued more actively with the direct participation of the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom.

51. Such a request on the part of the German Democratic Republic is entirely natural, in view of the fact that its participation in the assistance given jointly to the fraternal Czechoslovak Socialist Republic by the Soviet Union, the Polish People's Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic and the Bulgarian People's Republic has been acknowledged and repeatedly mentioned in the Security Council in the statements of the United States representative, the representative of France, and of other representatives. It is therefore entirely natural that this resulted in an official request by Government of the German Democratic Republic that its representative be admitted to the Security Council and take part in its work on the question under discussion.

52. You refer to precedents. But there have been precedents when invitations to participate in the work of the Security Council were issued not only to non-member States, but also to countries which, formally and officially, were not States at all. We need only mention the complaint by Kuwait and Iraq against British aggression. This question was discussed at the 958th meeting of the Security Council, held on 5 July 1961. The Secretary of State of Kuwait sent a letter requesting that a representative of Kuwait be invited to participate in the debate on this question in the Security Council.¹ Despite objections by the representative of the United Kingdom, the President announced it had been agreed that the representative of Kuwait be invited to take a place at the Security Council table. At the time, the representative of the United Kingdom flatly objected to this invitation. Great Britain was being accused of aggression. Obviously, therefore, the United Kingdom representative was most anxious not to hear the truth from the representative of an Arab country, Kuwait. But despite his objections, the representative of Kuwait was invited and participated in the discussion of this question.

53. I recall a second precedent—there are plenty of them. On 19 May 1964, in connexion with Cambodia's complaint on the aggression committed against it by troops of the United States and the South Viet-Nameese puppet régime, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Viet-Nam submitted a request² that the representative of South Viet-Nam be granted an opportunity to take part in the debate on this question in the Security Council. Why? Because Cambodia's complaint accused South Viet-Nam of aggression. Now the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, in their innumerable statements in the Security Council, are slanderously accusing the German Democratic Republic of aggression against the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, distorting the substance of the issue and, in their own interests, presenting matters as though the fraternal socialist German Democratic Republic were committing aggression against a friendly socialist country, Czechoslovakia. Coming as it does from the representatives of those countries which are really committing aggression against other peoples, this has a hypocritical ring to it. Although South Viet-Nam was not and, as everybody knows, is still not a Member of the United

¹ *Official Records of the Security Council, Sixteenth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1961*, document S/4851.

² *Ibid.*, *Nineteenth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1964*, document S/5710.

Nations, its representative was invited to participate in the work of the Security Council. And who insisted on that invitation? The representative of the United States. On what grounds? On the grounds that South Viet-Nam had been accused of aggression, and therefore the statements of an official representative of South Viet-Nam should be heard at a meeting of the Security Council.

54. That is how matters stood then. But now the United States representative is behaving completely differently in the Security Council, when the matter concerns the German Democratic Republic. In every sentence of his innumerable speeches he has accused the German Democratic Republic of aggression, but he does not want to hear the German Democratic Republic's side of the matter. It is more convenient for him this way. Let the Security Council record show only his speech; let all those present hear only his accusation; but so far as the accused is concerned, do not admit the German Democratic Republic here, do not let it have the floor at the Security Council table, do not let it participate in the Security Council's work. The United States representative tries to present this as a just, fair and democratic position, conforming to the United Nations Charter and the rules of procedure in the Security Council. It is hard to defend such an untenable position, Mr. Ball, and you are wasting your eloquence and efforts. What cannot be demonstrated cannot be proved.

55. I have cited these precedents to refute any alleged precedents for not inviting the parties to a dispute. It is essential that elementary respect for legal principles and international law be shown by States which are not interested in giving help to the Czechoslovak people, not in calm, peaceful, friendly settlement of the events in Czechoslovakia, but in exploiting the clear and self-evident fact—the consolidation and harmonization of society in Czechoslovakia—for an irritated, verbose, vociferous, hostile propaganda campaign through all propaganda media and through the speeches of the United States and United Kingdom representatives in the Security Council against the socialist countries, against the German Democratic Republic, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and other countries.

56. Every member of the Security Council now has before him the request of the German Democratic Republic and the letter of the representative of the Soviet Union on this question. Ordinarily in such cases measures are taken in a short time, literally a few minutes, to invite the person who has sent such a request to the President of the Security Council asking to be allowed to participate in the discussion of the question. But this has still not been done, and if it is not done the error must be rectified.

57. Rule 6 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure clearly and specifically provides that:

“The Secretary-General shall immediately bring to the attention of all representatives on the Security Council all communications from States, organs of the United Nations, or the Security Council concerning any matter for the consideration of the Security Council in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.”

58. This important request received from the Government of the German Democratic Republic in connexion with the

question tabled for the Security Council's consideration at the insistence of the United Kingdom and the United States, was received—as you announced, Mr. President—around 6 p.m. yesterday. The Council was meeting at that time. Had steps been taken immediately, that communication would have been brought to the attention of the members of the Council within an hour, at the most, and measures could still have been taken yesterday. But this was not done. Letters were sent which, as has become apparent today, did not reach the addressees. In view of this, and in conformity with the United Nations Charter and the rules of procedure, the Soviet delegation considers it indispensable that the lawful representative of the German Democratic Republic be invited to participate in the work of the Security Council on the question under discussion.

59. The PRESIDENT: I think the President, out of respect for the Council, should forgo entering into polemics with any member. However, as the representative of the Soviet Union mentioned procedural tricks and arbitrary postponement of meetings because of filibustering, I am bound to state that the President, and no one else, assumes full responsibility for the conduct of the business of the Security Council. I feel obliged to repeat what I said at a previous meeting: that as President of the Security Council I do not admit pressure from any member—and when I say “any member”, I mean any member, regardless of whether he is Anglo-Saxon, Caucasian, or of any other ethnic group; I really will not stand for pressure from any member.

60. I repeat that in the special case of the decision taken I do not make claim to any infallibility and I am prepared to take any course agreeable to the Council, and will gladly comply with the request made by the representative of the Soviet Union, provided it is approved or agreed to by the Security Council.

61. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): Mr. President, in my view, you are perfectly correct in circulating the note dated 23 August to the Secretariat, which was attached to a communication from an individual named Mr. Winzer, purporting to be the Foreign Minister of the so-called German Democratic Republic. The so-called government of which Mr. Winzer is a purported member has no right, of which my Government is aware, to represent any part of the German people. It would therefore be quite inappropriate to circulate the communication in question as an official document of the Security Council. Nor would it be in any way appropriate for this Council to agree to participation in our discussion by anyone purporting to be “an authorized representative of the Government of the German Democratic Republic”.

62. It has been alleged that this application should be considered in terms of Article 31 of the Charter and Rule 37 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure, but those texts—that is, of the Article of the Charter and of the rule of procedure—clearly refer to a Member of the United Nations not a member of the Security Council. Now, in the case of the applicant, we know of no such State existing, although an administration within the Soviet occupied zone of Germany may have claimed to be such.

63. As to the remarks of the representative of the Soviet Union, I think it will not have escaped those who listened

to them that it is not strange, though surprising, that there is this emphasis upon the “aggressive, imperialist NATO members and spokesmen” at a time when it is an established and undisputed fact before the Council that it is certain members of the Warsaw Pact that have invaded and occupied a fellow communist country—an aggression which has already been condemned in this Council.

64. There has also been much talk of “capitalist monopoly” from the same source. As far as this debate has revealed, however, it is the representative of the Soviet Union who has shown himself a master of monopoly, both of points of order and procedural questions, all at the expense of discussion of the substantive issue, which is the Soviet-led intervention in the affairs of another State which led to the occupation of Czechoslovakia.

65. As to the arguments raised by my Hungarian colleague, I would say that the only point in his statement with which I fully agree is that this question which has been put to you, Mr. President, should be discussed and decided by the democratic method of a vote.

66. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, as you know, one of the rules my delegation observes is that of brevity in our statements. In the light of the question before us at present, I should like to set forth in a few but unequivocal words the position of my delegation, a position which has been stated and reiterated on many occasions and in various assemblies.

67. The Republic of Paraguay does not recognize the existence of the so-called German Democratic Republic, which we regard as nothing but a German zone of foreign military occupation. Therefore, we do not recognize that it possesses any right to speak on behalf of the German people as a whole, or for part of it whose only legitimate spokesman is the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany. The conduct of my delegation will be guided by this view.

68. Finally, since it seems that some delegations wish to raise doubts on the way you, Mr. President, have proceeded in these circumstances, I wish to inform you that, in the opinion of my delegation, your behaviour and the measures you have adopted are set within the bounds of the strictest propriety.

69. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Bulgaria has asked to speak, but before calling on him I should like to have from him a clarification of whether his remarks will bear on the Czechoslovak issues as such—in which case I think he could wait until we have disposed of these procedural points—or whether they will bear on these procedural points, because, in this connexion, I could say that I have some doubts about the possibility of invited representatives engaging in discussions on questions of Security Council procedure, so I should like to have first a clarification of his intentions.

70. I call on the representative of Bulgaria.

71. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): With regard to the discussion which has developed

here about inviting the German Democratic Republic to participate in the debate, in which it is accused of crimes, it seems to me that we have gone beyond the stage of a discussion on procedure, particularly in view of certain statements by speakers who oppose this invitation. At a certain point the speakers began to accuse the German Democratic Republic of crimes declaring, however, that there was no need for it to participate in this discussion.

72. That is why I wish to clarify this point and then, Mr. President, leave it to you to settle the question of procedure. I repeat that I have no intention of insisting on the question of procedure.

73. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Bulgaria for his co-operative statement. Does any other member wish to address the Council?

74. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Since I wished above all to clarify certain points which have been raised in this debate, don't you wish, Mr. President, to take a decision on my request to speak on this question, since I have only explained what I intend to say?

75. The PRESIDENT: Maybe I misunderstood the representative of Bulgaria, and I apologize. I would like to state a ruling on this question but I would like to appeal to him for his co-operation, to the extent that if he could postpone his remarks to a later stage of our proceedings we might avoid another procedural wrangle on the question of whether or not he should speak at this moment. As I see the situation, we are still debating the procedural question arising from the communication received and from the note that was addressed to me by the representative of the Soviet Union. That is the matter now under consideration, and I think the practice observed here has been that discussion of those procedural matters should be restricted to the members of the Security Council. I say this with all due respect to the representative of Bulgaria, who is, by the way, an old friend of mine, but I certainly appealed to him in order that he could forgo his remarks at the present moment.

76. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I should like to make a correction to my previous statement. I mentioned Article 32 of the Charter, but I meant Article 31 of the Charter which says:

"Any Member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council may participate, without vote, in the discussion of any question brought before the Security Council whenever the latter considers that the interests of that Member are specially affected."

77. Therefore, we consider it appropriate to give the representative of Bulgaria the opportunity to express his opinion of the question under discussion.

78. The PRESIDENT: As I said previously, I have not stated any ruling on that, and I would be prepared to let the representative of Bulgaria set forth his views, if there is no objection on the part of the members of the Security Council. As I hear no objection, I am very glad to recognize the representative of Bulgaria.

79. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): Thank you, Mr. President, and I also thank the members of the Council.

80. With your permission, I shall make my statement in Russian, since some of the documents I have are written in that language.

[The speaker continued in Russian.]

81. Since the question under discussion has gone beyond the limits of a procedural matter, we find we are at a stage where it may perhaps be necessary to say a few words about what has been said and raised for discussion here.

82. First we must mention the question raised here by the representatives of those countries which are accusing the Soviet Union and the other socialist States of aggression against the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, at the same time also accusing the German Democratic Republic of it as well. They accuse it constantly, in all their statements, and say a great many unpleasant things about the German Democratic Republic. They accuse it, but at the same time, they don't want to listen to it. Where has it ever been seen or heard that somebody is accused without being given a hearing, so that he may answer and have a chance to justify himself? Is it not strange to hear such accusations in the Security Council? So why do you accuse? Where is it customary to accuse somebody without giving him the right to be heard? The majority of the members of the Council, or at least a large number of them, are lawyers who know that nobody can be condemned without a hearing. But they want to condemn the German Democratic Republic instead of giving it a hearing. That is why it seems to me, Mr. President, that this can not be allowed.

83. The second question advanced here as an argument by some members of the Council for not wishing to hear the representative of the German Democratic Republic was that the German Democratic Republic is, allegedly, not a State since they do not recognize it. What has their recognition got to do with it? There are many States which they did not recognize in the past. The Soviet Union, for instance, was not recognized by some States for 20 or 30 years; nevertheless, the Soviet Union continued to exist. Nobody prevented it from becoming one of the world's greatest States and from influencing international policy. Nobody has prevented it from being a permanent member of the Security Council, here and now. So what does it have to do with the matter here if some States do not recognize the German Democratic Republic? That is no reason for failing to invite the German Democratic Republic, especially when it is accused of committing some sort of crime which is in fact non-existent.

84. The German Democratic Republic, in the letter sent to the President of the Security Council, states:

[The speaker read out the telegram the text of which appears in paragraph 8.]

85. Mr. President, we too are being accused of the same crime. They say the German Democratic Republic and its representative can tell us nothing new here. Yet perhaps

they have much that is new to tell, more than anybody else, because their representative knows what crimes against the socialist camp have been prepared in certain countries, and particularly in West Germany. It has been said here—and since I have the floor, permit me to mention it, Mr. President—that the German Democratic Republic is not a State; but, I insist, the German Democratic Republic is indeed a State, regardless of whether certain Governments and countries which dislike socialism recognize it or not. That is another matter. It has been said here that non-States can not participate in the meetings. The Soviet representative has mentioned several examples of cases in which even non-States (not those which are not recognized) have been allowed to participate.

86. In addition, I should like to remind the Security Council of another case in which some persons, even private parties, have been invited to participate in the Security Council's debates. For example, when we discussed the Cyprus question, right at the beginning, the representatives of the Turkish and Cypriot communities were invited several times. They participated in the meetings and gave explanations to the Security Council on these questions. The representative of Turkey, who is present here, could remind the Council of this, and so could the representative of Cyprus. They know who participated, regardless of the fact that, at the time, one of the parties denied the right of the Turkish representative in Cyprus to speak before the Security Council.

87. Under these circumstances it seems to me, Mr. President, that although the Security Council should not be considering this matter, if it wishes to do so and since it does wish to do so, the matter should be presented in the proper light. As the problems being examined and the way they should be considered are unclear to the Council, the representative of the German Democratic Republic should be invited; he should participate in order to show how impossible, unjustified and groundless it is to discuss the matter being examined here by the Security Council on the initiative of some imperialist States.

88. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I wish to speak very briefly, and solely on the question of procedure.

89. An important question for the Council has arisen in the course of our discussion this morning. It is a question with which we are all familiar. It is the question whether a non-member of the Council can be permitted to participate in discussions on questions of procedure rather than substance. This is a matter which has been considered from time to time in the past.

90. All I should like to say now is that, speaking with the very greatest respect, I thought that you, Mr. President, dealt with the matter admirably and certainly have given no ruling in this matter. And I would also like to say that I understood clearly from my friend the representative of Bulgaria that he wished to speak not on solely a procedural matter but on a question of substance.

91. I think it is important for our records that these points should be noted, and that it should be clear that on the main matter—the procedural matter to which I refer—we

have today taken no decision and, certainly, created no precedent.

92. The PRESIDENT: I understand that we have taken no decision. I told the Council that I shared the doubts that have now been expressed. The only thing the President did was to consult the members of the Council as to whether they had objections to Dr. Tarabanov speaking at this moment, and as there was no objection I gave him the floor.

93. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I should like to draw attention to the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom. He hastened to speak after you, with the assent of certain members of the Security Council, rightly, legitimately and in conformity with the Charter gave the floor to the representative of Bulgaria who had been invited to take a seat at the table of the meeting of the Security Council. But I suspect that the representative of the United Kingdom intends not to allow admittance to the meetings, or even not to allow those who are admitted and invited to participate in the work of the Security Council to express their views on questions which are unacceptable to his country and his Government. I think such occasions could arise in the future, and that is why he is putting in his reservations in advance. But let us not go into this matter in detail. This statement was *post factum*. The Bulgarian representative has presented his views, and this matter may as well end there.

94. I should like to make some additional remarks regarding the question of procedure under discussion in connexion with those statements made by the representatives of Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom concerning the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany. It is essential that light be shed in connexion with the misrepresentation, lack of objectivity and distortion of facts shown by these three members who have spoken against the German Democratic Republic in relation to the existence of the Federal Republic of Germany. They have restated here the usual illegal and unrealistic position of their countries. That position is expressed in the refusal to recognize objective reality, the objective fact of the existence of two sovereign German States. Contrary to logic, common sense, reality, and the actual situation in Europe, they have perpetrated gross discriminatory attacks against one of these German States, the German Democratic Republic. This step can only be interpreted as yet another manifestation of the dangerous course of these States, aimed at fostering the revanchist aggressive tendencies of the ruling circles of the Federal Republic of Germany.

95. The Soviet Union has always steadfastly come out against all and any attempts, from whatever side, to discriminate against the German Democratic Republic, including attempts made within the United Nations system. Discrimination against the German Democratic Republic is continuing within the United Nations for well-known reasons. Such a practice was established by the Anglo-Saxons who, at one time, dominated the Secretariat of the United Nations. Therefore, references to precedents created by the British and Americans are untenable.

96. The German Democratic Republic is a sovereign independent State. Consequently, it pursues a policy of peace, a policy directed towards ensuring peace in Europe and in the whole world, towards political, economic and cultural relations with other countries. It scrupulously observes the principles of the United Nations. By its freedom-loving foreign policy designed to strengthen peace and security in Europe and throughout the world, by its steadfast, just support of nations struggling for their national freedom and independence against the forces of imperialism, colonialism, violence and exploitation, the German Democratic Republic has earned widespread respect all over the world and particularly among the developing States which have only recently acquired their national independence.

97. Together with other member States of the Warsaw Treaty, the German Democratic Republic stands guard over the achievements of socialism, the interests of all peace-loving peoples, the interests of peace in Europe and in the entire world. For the first time in the history of Europe, in one part of former Hitlerite Germany a truly peace-loving State—the German Democratic Republic—has appeared, and no attempts by the imperialist forces to distort, misinterpret or disregard this historical fact and reality can change this state of affairs.

98. Recently a new Constitution was adopted by popular referendum in the German Democratic Republic. This event extends far beyond the borders of the German Democratic Republic. It testifies to the great successes of socialism in the German Democratic Republic. It reflects profound social and political changes occurring in Europe and the world. This is a convincing demonstration of the vitality and strength of the social system chosen by the people of that country. It refutes the false insinuations of imperialist propaganda concerning the German Democratic Republic. This new Constitution of the German Democratic Republic confirms the devotion of this socialist State to the ideals of socialism, peace, freedom, and the independence of peoples. It proclaims that the German Democratic Republic conducts a foreign policy serving peace and mutual understanding; it supports the struggle of peoples for independence; it develops friendly co-operation with all States on the basis of equal rights and mutual respect.

99. The Constitution of this State resolutely declares that the German Democratic Republic will never launch a war of conquest, will never use its armed forces to infringe upon the freedom of peoples. The propaganda of war and revanchism characteristic of West Germany, cultivation of ideas of racial and national hatred which everybody can see in West Germany, under the Constitution of the German Democratic Republic are regarded as a crime.

100. The popular referendum held in the German Democratic Republic showed that 94 per cent of this country's population voted in favour of this new Constitution. This popular vote has shown the whole world how groundless, hostile, slanderous and arbitrary is the West German Government's claim to speak on behalf of all Germans. Those who make this kind of claim evidently think it may still be possible to resurrect the 1,000 year German Reich proclaimed by Hitler and that they, the revanchists and

aggressors, will become the masters of the fate of the whole German nation and of the entire world. But Hitler's Reich, which unleashed the gravest war in the history of mankind, collapsed beneath the weight of its crimes. There is no going back to it. What was once Hitler's Reich, from which the peoples of Russia, France, Great Britain and many other European States suffered, has now existed for eighteen and a half years as two independent and equal German States: the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany.

101. The people of the German Democratic Republic resolutely reject the West German ruling circles' infringements on the sovereign rights and national dignity of the German Democratic Republic, attempts at gross interference in its internal affairs. By their vote for the socialist constitution, the people of the German Democratic Republic have clearly asserted that they will never surrender the gains acquired at the price of hard work and the struggle against imperialism and reaction. The Constitution of the German Democratic Republic, expressing the will of the nation, firmly declares that the unification of Germany is possible only on the basis of democracy and socialism. The ruling circles of West Germany do not wish unification on a progressive basis, otherwise they would long since have recognized the German Democratic Republic as an equal, independent partner. They would have renounced their practice of undermining the international position of the German Democratic Republic; they would have accepted the many proposals of the Government of the German Democratic Republic aimed at the normalization of the relations between the two German States. Thus, however we approach the problem of unification—whether from the social-class or the political standpoint—, no real conditions for unification exist at present. Therefore, it is essential and logical, even for the fiercest opponents of the German Democratic Republic, to consider the real fact of the existence of two German States over a long historical period, and to draw the appropriate conclusions.

102. The imperialist propaganda on the part of the enemies of the German Democratic Republic spreads versions to the effect that the German Democratic Republic is not a State since, allegedly, the only representative of the German people is West Germany. The legal untenability of this thesis has been repeatedly demonstrated by the Soviets and many other States. The assertion that the Federal Republic of Germany is the only representative of the German people and the only successor of the former German State is an absolutely arbitrary and fantastic concept. It suits only the organizers of the NATO military-aggressive bloc; it affords them the possibility of maintaining West Germany among their main partners and military strike force in Western Europe.

103. The fact is that two new independent, sovereign States have arisen on the territory of the former German State: the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany. They have absolutely equal rights and represent their respective parts of the German people. To question this would be tantamount to denying the multiplication table or Newton's law. Naturally, that can be done, but those who do it place themselves in a more than ridiculous position, all the more so when they claim, at a

meeting of the Security Council, that if they do not recognize the German Democratic Republic, the rest of the world should not recognize it either. Well, that is something that lies beyond their power, no matter how much they may shout about it here.

104. The Security Council must not let itself be carried away by such absurd reasoning, since the Security Council is a serious, responsible body and fulfils serious, responsible functions. It can not become like that unfortunately renowned court in the United States which still quite recently ruled that man did not descend from the apes and forbade the teaching of Darwin's theory on those grounds.

105. The absurdity of the reasoning by which the Federal Republic of Germany is the only representative of the German people is also borne out by the fact that the Federal Republic of Germany maintains certain specific relations with the German Democratic Republic, including trade, economic, cultural and other relations. Just recently both sides have been taking steps to raise the level of these relations at the proposal of the Government of the German Democratic Republic.

106. The representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom openly support the intentions of the ruling circles of the Federal Republic of Germany to continue to cling to the obsolete, rotten and archaic lines of the major power neo-colonialist policy of Germany imperialism. They support the ruling circles of the Federal Republic of Germany as NATO allies on this matter. They create all and any obstacles to prevent the German Democratic Republic from taking its rightful place on the international scene. But the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has demonstrated by its own actions the untenability of the outdated Hallstein doctrine. The Federal Republic of Germany declares its readiness to exchange diplomatic representatives with the European socialist States which not only recognized the German Democratic Republic long ago, but are also linked to it by the Warsaw Treaty organization system, as well as by treaties of friendship, collaboration and mutual aid, that is, by close bonds of alliance.

107. Consequently, in Bonn, with the complicity of the Anglo-American allies and protectors, some new kinds of modifications in the norms of international law are being concocted—modifications which have been discarded by facts themselves—and demands are being made that the majority of States act according to these modifications and use them as a basis for their conduct in international affairs. This means that the ruling circles in the Federal Republic of Germany, along with those of the United Kingdom and the United States, arbitrarily divide States into two categories, so to speak: European socialist States, which Bonn approaches with one criterion; and the developing countries, towards which the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers it can use the language of dictators, ordering them not to have relations with the German Democratic Republic. This is nothing else but neo-colonialism in practice.

108. Many countries of the world are guided in their policy by a recognition of the objective fact of the

existence of two sovereign and equal German States: the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany. This is apparent in the very active contacts of the German Democratic Republic with a number of developing countries at governmental and parliamentary levels. The economic, scientific and technical co-operation of many countries with the German Democratic Republic is constantly being strengthened and expanded. In the German Democratic Republic's capital, Berlin, new official consular and trade missions are continuously being established.

109. Who, except the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, will deny that in the heart of Europe there have been two German States for a long time—the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany—, each with its own constitution, parliament, government, central and regional administrative organs? How can anyone deny such objective facts? The whole world knows that for sixteen years the United States denied the effective existence of the Soviet Union, but finally recognized this fact and established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union which they still maintain to this day and will, I hope, continue to maintain. As far as we are concerned, we are prepared to continue to maintain these relations.

110. The United States has not recognized the Chinese People's Republic for more than sixteen years. But does that change the facts? The Chinese People's Republic exists: that's an objective fact. Of course, it exists despite the will and wishes of the United States. But this in no measure diminishes the fact. The position of the United States, Great Britain, and some other NATO countries towards the German Democratic Republic is an equally unrealistic and fantastic policy.

111. Lord Caradon, Mr. Ball, it really does exist, and you feel it daily. So why do you deny its presence and make every effort to prevent its official representative from coming here to present the position of his Government? The existence of two German States is an irrefutable fact and, of course, needs no approval either by the United States, the United Kingdom, nor, particularly, by West Germany. With all the differences in their social and economic systems, as well as in the direction of their foreign policies, each of these two German States is subject to international law and a lawful heir of former Germany. The German Democratic Republic considers the prevention of the outbreak of war from German soil the highest requirement of its foreign policy. The German Democratic Republic has become a powerful stronghold of peace in the heart of Europe and, under the present conditions, not a single Government, not a single country participating in international relations can fail to disregard the German Democratic Republic's new role as an independent, sovereign State in world politics in the cause of the stabilization and strengthening of peace on the European continent. We are speaking of a State which, by the volume of its industrial output, is among the ten most highly economically developed countries in the world. Yet the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom consider that it does not exist on the face of the earth. Is this blindness, or imperialism? Obviously, the latter. The German Democratic Republic has conscien-

tiously and consistently fulfilled its obligations under the Potsdam Agreement. It has removed the influence of fascist and militarist forces from its society and has carried out a democratic reorganization of the country's entire political and cultural life. Since the earliest days of its existence the German Democratic Republic has pursued a foreign policy which is in strict conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

112. The constructive attitude of the Government of the German Democratic Republic to the main world problems has again been demonstrated by the fact that the German Democratic Republic, unlike the Federal Republic of Germany, was among the first States to sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and is a full-fledged partner in it. It is particularly important for you to note this, Mr. Ball, because we worked on the preparations for the conclusion of this Treaty in collaboration with your distinguished predecessor, Mr. Goldberg. So far as the Government of the Soviet Union is concerned, we consider this Treaty as an important step forward towards achieving the main goal of modern mankind: universal disarmament and the banning of nuclear weapons. And it seems, if I have understood correctly, that the positions of our countries coincided on this matter. But when it came to signing, the German Democratic Republic signed the Treaty, while your ally and friend the Federal Republic of Germany, on various pretexts, did not sign it. Judging from reports in your own press, there is reason to suppose that your friend and ally, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of West Germany, Mr. Brandt, is trying to exploit the forthcoming Conference of Non-Nuclear States in Geneva for aggressive revanchist purposes, this Conference which was convened by its sponsors to create better international conditions for the reduction of international tension, for banning atomic weapons, halting the testing of these weapons, destruction of all stockpiles of such weapons, and for the use of the greatest discovery in the history of mankind—atomic energy—for peaceful purposes on the basis of broad international collaboration.

113. This is the difference, Mr. Ball, in approach and policy between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, between the two sovereign, independent States of Germany. The first is in favour of the policy of peace and international co-operation; the second is in favour of ideas of revenge and preparation for recarving the borders of Europe, and your active support of this State is fraught with grave dangers and consequences not only to the cause of peace in Europe but for the whole world, because the experience of the first two world wars has shown that the outbreak of war on German territory then spreads over the whole world and the peoples of the whole world suffer by it.

114. The German Democratic Republic has never been for the use of force against the sovereign rights or territorial integrity of other States. On the contrary, it has often made peaceful proposals designed to ensure security in the centre of Europe and the normalization of relations between the two German States. The policy of the German Democratic Republic is aimed at the creation of a healthier political climate in Europe, and the establishment of mutually advantageous collaboration among all European States. At

present, it is impossible to conceive of present-day Europe without the German Democratic Republic. The proposals of the German Democratic Republic aim at strengthening peace and security in Europe; they are of a constructive nature. The position of the German Democratic Republic on all such basic problems as disarmament, the liquidation of colonialism, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, international collaboration, and others have earned it the well-deserved respect of many Member States of the United Nations. It is therefore natural that discussions of the alleged right of the Federal Republic of Germany to represent not only the population of West Germany, but also that of the German Democratic Republic, can not encounter understanding on the part of these Member States of the United Nations which firmly adhere to the positions of the Charter and defend the interests of peace. Such claims are absurd and groundless. Not a single State in the world has represented or can represent a people outside that particular State's jurisdiction.

115. It may be said, in passing, that the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany itself contains articles under which its Government organs represent only the Federal Republic of Germany in international affairs, and nobody else. I draw the attention of the American and British representatives, who have taken such a hostile stand against the German Democratic Republic, to this. In the Paris Agreements signed in 1954 by your countries, Mr. Ball and Lord Caradon, and by France (I request that this be made known to Mr. Bérard) on one hand, and by the Federal Republic of Germany on the other, it was openly and specifically stated that the State authority of the Federal Republic of Germany is exercised only on its own federal territory. It is absolutely obvious that the Government of that country has not the slightest right to any claims on the territory and people of the German Democratic Republic. It is perfectly obvious that the Governments of States which maintain relations with the German States would never think they are dealing through Bonn not only with the Federal Republic of Germany, but also with the German Democratic Republic. The German Democratic Republic has its own international agreements, including those which speak clearly and specifically of the inviolability and stability of its national borders. When some State or other makes claims in the United Nations to represent other countries as well, then, no matter who makes them, they can only be regarded as a direct violation of the basic principles of the United Nations. And in this case, the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom are making just such an attempt. It can be interpreted only as an attempt to satisfy in some way or, as they say, to assist the revenge-seeking ambitions of certain most aggressive circles of the Federal Republic, to help their NATO ally make these dreams come true.

116. The Soviet Union's attitude towards such attempts can only be negative. The Soviet Union considers it harmful and dangerous to support such illegitimate claims by the ruling circles of the Federal Republic of Germany. Wilfully or involuntarily—but in this case wilfully on the part of the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom—this would mean to collaborate in raising international tension and encourage just such aggressive forces in West Germany as advocate forced recarving of the existing borders in Europe.

117. As for the most recent events in Czechoslovakia, the aggressive forces of West Germany are showing their hand completely. In this connexion I must take some of the Council's time and present some facts. The revenge-seeking elements in Bonn do not conceal their plans regarding Czechoslovakia, which aim at a restoration of capitalism there or, as the British newspaper *The Observer* put it openly, "creeping capitalism". They want a repetition of Munich and a violation of the territorial borders and integrity of sovereign socialist Czechoslovakia. Here is what a leaflet put out by one of the organizations of the Sudeten Germans in West Germany says:

"The Sudeten provinces are a legitimate component part of the German Reich, just like Silesia, Bavaria and the Rhineland. The Sudeten Germans are full-fledged citizens of the German Reich, just like the Silesians, Bavarians and the Rhinelanders. This unambiguous legal status—the pamphlet continues—was in no way altered by the Postdam Agreement of the victorious Powers in 1945 since, according to the declaration of the allied Powers on 5 July 1945, the assumption of power by the victorious forces was not to result in the annexation of German areas. Therefore, since 1945 the Sudeten provinces represent the Czechoslovak occupied zone in the same way as the areas east of the Oder and the Neiss represent the Polish occupied zone. The people expelled from these territories are expelled citizens of the German Reich whose possessions the occupiers have unlawfully confiscated.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany—the leaflet continues—is the legitimate heir of the German Reich, and, as such, is not empowered to declare, either overtly or covertly, any renunciation of claims to German areas whether they be in Silesia, East Prussia, Pomerania or the Sudeten provinces, and thus prejudice the position of the pan-German representation at any general international peace conference."

Such are the revanchist objectives stated by the hostile elements in West Germany under the sponsorship and protection of the West German revanchists.

118. Equally cynically aggressive plans for recarving the borders of Western Europe have been just as openly announced by official personalities of the Federal Republic of Germany. Some time ago the Minister of Finance of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Strauss, stated in an interview with the newspaper *Sudeten Deutsche Zeitung*:

"Abrogation of the Munich Agreement would be tantamount to acknowledging as non-existent a document which is absolutely valid in fact and accepted on the basis of international law. We shall never agree to such an interpretation. The Munich Agreement was concluded on the basis of a valid international treaty which remains legally valid."

119. That is how a West German revanchist puts the problem, demanding and making claims to the lawful territories of neighbouring States, the socialist countries. And these claims of the ruling circles receive the support of their NATO allies. A whole series of other facts could be

mentioned, particularly the extremely frank statements of West German newspapers. For example, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* wrote:

"In its policy, the Federal Republic can only play the role of passive observer, even though it is alarmed and understands that any turn of events may indirectly affect it. Everything which might go beyond such passive observation or give rise to an impression of active participation on our part is fraught with fatal consequences."

120. The article goes on to say that it is essential to give aid to those forces in Czechoslovakia which are useful to the West German revanchists. The same newspaper has openly acclaimed victory, and its comments have been presented on West German television as follows:

"If Czechoslovakia is moving on the way to social democracy, then it is perfectly clear that it will be much easier for us to talk to a social-democratic, although still formally communist, Czechoslovakia."

121. That is what the West German revanchists are betting on. Recognizing that West Germany's role in the subversive and hostile acts performed against the socialist countries, including socialism in Czechoslovakia, is too obvious, the West German press has recommended caution in carrying out such acts of subversion and provocation. On 22 July the *Nürnberger Nachrichten* wrote:

"Just as the President of the Federal Bank, Blessing, recently sounded out the situation in Ottawa, so all similar contacts should be carried on entirely unobtrusively and quietly."

122. The *Frankfurter Allgemeine* advised the West German revanchists as follows, and I quote: "Where effective aid is needed, it should be given in the most inconspicuous way."

123. These are the directives published in the West German press. The kind of aid from the West German revanchists to the socialist countries, referred to here, is described quite frankly in the *Deutsche National Zeitung*, which wrote:

"The Czechoslovaks will also be unable to benefit forever from the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans. Sooner or later a change will come, and it is preferable that this change be made voluntarily, with mutual respect, rather than later under the pressure of international political conditions."

124. This is an outright demand for revenge, a claim for revision of borders and a direct hint at threats. The imperialist policy of West Germany has often been condemned in the United Nations. Everybody knows its special role in the aggravation of international tension, in support of the colonial régimes of Salisbury, Pretoria and Lisbon, and its support of all the criminal actions being perpetrated by the South African racists in South West Africa. The United Nations has repeatedly condemned West Germany for its participation in the colonial wars conducted by the

régime of Salisbury, Pretoria and Lisbon against the African peoples.

125. Facts are stubborn things: neither the hypocritical oratory nor hostile attacks by the NATO country representatives against the German Democratic Republic can cover up the participation of the West German revanchists and their highly placed protectors in the attempt to overthrow socialism in Czechoslovakia and bring the world to the brink of catastrophe. Having failed to achieve their objectives in one of the socialist countries, they now attempt, in violation of the United Nations Charter, to deprive one of the parties concerned—which they have so antagonistically, slanderously and cynically accused of aggression, intervention, breach of international law, and so forth—of its right to appear before the Security Council to present the real situation and unmask the slanderous falsifications of the British and American representatives. We categorically reject these provocatory attempts which reek of the cold war. No matter how often these representatives repeat their statements, and no matter what their attitude towards the German Democratic Republic, the German Democratic Republic is an independent sovereign State and fulfills its function in international affairs independently. And sooner or later the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Canada will be obliged to recognize and accept it, just as the United States accepted the fact of the Soviet Union's existence in the world, although it took them sixteen years to do so.

126. Our request that the German Democratic Republic be admitted to participate in the debates of the Security Council as an interested party is legitimate and just. We fully support the appeal of the Government of the German Democratic Republic contained in the telegram of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of that country, Comrade Winzer. Our support of this appeal is based on the United Nations Charter and on historical facts. And therefore any attempts to deprive the German Democratic Republic of its legitimate right by all kinds of tricks, intrigues and slanderous statements, and counting on the automatic majority in a vote, only unmask the United States and its allies once more as enemies of the establishment of a lasting peace in Europe and the world, and as partisans to the aggravation of international tension.

127. In conclusion, Mr. President, the Soviet delegation insists once again that the representative of the German Democratic Republic be invited to the Security Council to take part in the debate on the question inscribed on the agenda.

128. The PRESIDENT: Since the point of precedents has been raised by the representative of Hungary, I wish to recall that on 9 June 1967, Dr. Winzer sent a cable to the President of the Security Council on the subject of the Middle East question, asking that it be distributed to the members of the Security Council. It was circulated as a third-person note, exactly as the President did yesterday, at the directive of the President of the Council on 14 June 1967. To the best of my knowledge, the Security Council did not in that case modify or revoke the decision that had been taken by the President; and to the best of my knowledge—and I beg to be corrected if I am wrong—the decision has stood.

129. On the other hand, I should say that one of the main elements that guided me in my decision of yesterday was the contents of document S/7891, which refers to a *note verbale* dated 2 May 1967, from the Secretary-General addressed to the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations. I understand that the question referred to the point of the handling of communications from non-members of the United Nations regarding the implementation of Security Council resolution 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966 on the question of Southern Rhodesia. The note of the Soviet Union had been circulated in document S/7882. I think it might be of interest if I were to read out the *note verbale* of the Secretary-General:

“The Secretary-General, in interpreting resolution 232 (1966), both with respect to the information he is to collect and to include in his report on the implementation of the resolution, has had full regard to operative paragraph 8 of that resolution, in which the Security Council: ‘calls upon States Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies to report to the Secretary-General the measures each has taken in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of the present resolution’. In accordance with the Council's instructions, the information circulated by the Secretary-General and included in his report [S/7781 and Add.1 and 2] is therefore from those States from which the Council has required such information. Nevertheless, it should be noted that, in addition, at the request of the Permanent Representative of Bulgaria, the Secretary-General circulated ‘a statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic on the implementation of resolution 232 (1966) adopted by the Security Council on 16 December 1966, concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia’ [S/7794]. The Secretary-General drew attention to this statement in an addendum to his report issued on 9 March 1967 [S/7781/Add.2] containing information received after the issue of his original report.

“So far as the general question of the circulation of communications is concerned, the policy of the Secretariat in this regard has been explained on numerous occasions in the past. The Secretary-General believes that it is beyond his competence, in the absence of explicit directives from the deliberative organ concerned, to determine the highly political and controversial question whether or not certain areas, the status of which is in dispute among Members of the United Nations, are States within the meaning of the ‘all States’ or ‘States not Members of the United Nations’ formulae which on occasion appear in United Nations resolutions. The Permanent Representative will recall, in this respect, the statement made by the Secretary-General at the 1258th plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 18 November 1963,³ where he said, *inter alia*, that:

“In conclusion, I must therefore state that if the “any State” formula were to be adopted, I would be able to implement it only if the General Assembly provided me with the complete list of the States coming within that formula, other than those which are

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1258th meeting, para. 101.

Members of the United Nations or the specialized agencies, or parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice.’

“While these remarks were made within the context of an agenda item on the question of extended participation in general multilateral treaties concluded under the auspices of the United Nations, they were intended to define the general rules applicable in other cases such as the present.

“As the Secretary-General believes it is outside his competence to interpret formulae of the nature referred to above, he has no alternative but to continue the existing practice until the Security Council or the General Assembly direct to the contrary.” [S/7891]⁴

130. That is the *note verbale* of the Secretary-General and, as I said before, it was one of the main elements that guided me in my decision yesterday. Again, I repeat that I do not claim infallibility, and I am prepared to follow any course which is agreeable to and approved by the Security Council. These remarks of mine, of course, refer only to the procedural point of the question of the distribution of the telegram—the way it should be distributed. In no way has it any bearing on the ultimate question of the invitation of any given State, because it is my understanding that only the Security Council can take a decision on that. But, even on the question of the distribution of the telegram, I do not insist on the practice that has been followed but I am willing to take any course of action which may be approved by the Security Council.

131. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary): Mr. President, first I should like to express my thanks and appreciation for the answer you gave to my request.

132. I should like to state that it is not for the Security Council to decide by vote whether the German Democratic Republic is or is not a State. Any kind of voting on that issue would, of course, not change the situation in the German Democratic Republic and would not be considered to be decisive on the matter.

133. There are a number of multilateral international agreements in which States participate in agreement even though they have reservations. The United Kingdom, for instance, signing as a party, entered the reservation that its participation in a multilateral international agreement does not mean that it recognizes the Republic of China as being representative of China. Nevertheless it participated.

134. Therefore, by analogy, it is quite acceptable, for a Government that does not recognize another Government to join it in an international agreement on certain matters, or even not to protest the distribution of a document emanating from that source, even though it does not recognize it as a State.

135. I should like to point out that there are some differences between the present case and the cases you, Mr. President, have mentioned. First of all I should like to

emphasize the fact that the Secretariat supplied you with the example of only one case in Security Council history when a document from a non-member State had not been distributed. That was in June 1967, and again that document came from the German Democratic Republic. Indirectly, this seems to suggest that all the documents coming from other non-member States, when some issue is at stake on which they feel it necessary to communicate in one way or another with the Security Council and request participation in its deliberations, have been distributed as official documents of the Security Council. I would therefore venture to say that this constitutes discrimination against the German Democratic Republic. And let me add that there is another difference between this case and the case that you mentioned which took place in June 1967. It is that during the present debate reference has on a number of occasions been made to the German Democratic Republic, and to a certain extent the German Democratic Republic is a party to the issue. The 1967 statement therefore was quite of a different nature from the one you distributed unofficially on this occasion. I think that these two points should be taken into consideration by you in regard to the distribution—I emphasize that, the distribution—as an official document of the cablegram you have received.

136. The PRESIDENT: I am flattered by the fact that the representative of Hungary appears to overrate the powers of the President of the Security Council. He said very clearly that the Security Council had no power and no right to determine whether a given area is a State, but surprisingly, he appears to imply that the President has the power to make a decision in that regard and to enforce it. Unfortunately, the President is not as powerful as the representative of Hungary seems to imply. I am flattered, but I am nevertheless helpless in that regard.

137. All that I can do is place the question before the Security Council. This was the wise course taken by the Secretary-General on a previous occasion, and this is the course I am taking today. I will gladly exercise any action, or adopt any course, approved by the Security Council.

138. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I want to confine myself to a short statement. You have just quoted the letter with which we are all familiar, but which was drafted in an entirely different connexion. The representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and some other countries are accusing the German Democratic Republic of committing some sort of international crimes imagined by them—aggression, invasion, and so on.

139. It is altogether natural and logical that, when a State is accused of this kind of crimes, the best method, in conformity with the Charter and the rules of procedure, is to give the Government of that State the possibility of sending its official representative to New York, to invite him to the meeting of the Security Council and give him the opportunity to appear and explain the position and viewpoint of the Government he represents.

140. The document you have read to us was drafted by the department headed by Mr. Stavropoulos, whom we all

⁴ Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1967.

know and respect, and apparently refers to another matter. But in this particular case, the Security Council ought to act justly, since an injustice once committed against the German Democratic Republic should not become a precedent for a repetition of an injustice by the Security Council in its capacity as the main organ concerned with the maintenance of peace and security.

141. It would be logical therefore, and entirely in keeping with the generally accepted international norms as well as with the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the rules of procedure of the Security Council, to grant any country the right to participate in the discussion of such important international problems regardless of the attitude of any members of the Security Council towards that country, whether they like it or not; the representative of that country should be invited and his explanations heard. This will not be to the detriment of anybody—neither those who oppose this course, nor the common cause of international peace and security.

142. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Soviet Union for his statement. I should like to make some clarifications and to reassure him that my remarks on the precedents I invoked referred only to the question of the distribution of the document. Of course, I did not intend to imply any decision or orientation concerning the question which is not a question of substance anyway—the ultimate question of inviting or not inviting a given State. The precedent I referred to was only in justification of the decision taken yesterday by the President of the Security Council.

143. The other matter, and even this matter, is for the Council to decide.

144. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary): Mr. President, I have to apologize if I was unable to make what I wished to say absolutely clear. I am, and I was, of the opinion that it is not for the Security Council to make a decision by voting on the issue of whether the German Democratic Republic is or is not a State, or an economic and political unit. But it was not my intention to say that the President alone can make a decision on that issue. But, it seems to me that in the case of a document coming from this economic and political unit, from the German Democratic Republic, what you distributed unofficially you distributed because you felt that you had to let the members of the Council know that you received a document from that source. And because of the urgency, that was the only possible way to let the members of the Council know. But it seems to me that, because of the differences between the present case and the case you mentioned and the general practice of the Secretariat concerning communications from the German Democratic Republic, you can distribute this as an official document, and I agree with you that this is the next step to be taken in regard to the invitation to participate before we discuss it further. But it seems to me that if we are talking about filibustering in this case, the filibustering has been started by those who, from the very outset, declared that because they do not recognize the German Democratic Republic they did not want to see the cablegram you distributed as an unofficial document as a Security Council document and this is, to put it mildly, an unacceptable and

undemocratic practice in this Council and it seems to my delegation that there is no reason to act this way and to prolong our deliberations by this long discussion.

145. It was provoked by those who attempted to convince you not to distribute this communication as an official document because they do not recognize the German Democratic Republic, because they think that only the Federal Republic of Germany can speak on behalf of the German people.

146. The PRESIDENT: I feel bound to clarify a point. When I referred to the lateness of the hour at which I received the communication, it was only because I wished to clarify a certain point for the representative of the Soviet Union when he said that the cable had arrived in the early afternoon. Thus as a question of fact, I mentioned that the stamp of the Telegraphic Unit of the United Nations bore the time 6.53 p.m., if I am not mistaken, so that I received it at a very late hour. But in no way did I try to imply that my decision of yesterday was due to the lateness of the hour. I did not imply that. I just clarified a point that had been raised, a point of fact raised by the representative of the Soviet Union.

147. It was a decision the President took in accordance with what I understood was the practice and I was mainly guided by the contents of the document of the Secretary-General to which I referred. That is a point of fact.

148. Now the representative of Hungary suggests that we should distribute this telegram from what he calls a political unit—that is not my terminology, it is the terminology of the representative of Hungary—as an official document, and what I am telling him is that I shall be bound by the decision of the Council. If he makes a formal proposal and if there are no objections—but it appears that there are—I shall be glad to comply with the request. That is the point which I would like to clarify.

149. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I should like to say first of all that I am very happy at last to find myself in full agreement with the representative of Hungary when he says that there is no need to prolong this discussion any further.

150. I have only this to say, the only two things I think that need to be said at this time. First, I should like to say that I am sure that all of us share full confidence in the judgement and the actions of our President. And secondly, I would wish to point out, after these many hours, that no proposal, no motion has been put to us. If a proposal is put to us, we shall be happy to vote on it. If there is no proposal to be put to us, then I suggest that we should return to the business of our agenda.

151. The PRESIDENT: Actually, the Council is not seized of any proposal. If there are no objections, we can proceed with the consideration of our agenda.

152. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Obviously, I have been misunderstood. I proposed that the representative of the German Democratic Republic be invited. There are all

possible grounds for making this proposal. I substantiated them in my statements. In his official letter, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic requests a reply. How will you answer him?

153. The PRESIDENT: I will reply whatever is decided upon by the Security Council and I shall be guided by the decision of the Security Council in this regard.

154. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I took it from what we just heard from the representative of the Soviet Union that he had a formal proposal he wished to make. I hope that he will now formulate it so that we may vote on it.

155. The PRESIDENT: Will the representative of the Soviet Union formulate his proposal, so that we can vote on it?

156. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I am ready to state my proposal for the third time. I propose that, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter and the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Security Council, the Council invite the representative of the German Democratic Republic to participate in the debate on the question on the agenda of the Security Council without right of vote.

157. The PRESIDENT: I shall put the Soviet Union representative's proposal to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Hungary, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

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

Abstaining: Algeria, Brazil, India, Pakistan.

The proposal was rejected by 9 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

158. The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed with the consideration of the item on our agenda. I understand the representative of Czechoslovakia has asked for the floor, and I now call upon him.

159. Mr. HAJEK (Czechoslovakia): As a member and responsible representative of the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, I am taking the floor in this august and important body of the United Nations. I am doing this with emotion, sadness and regret, for the subject on the agenda constitutes a tragic event and a tragic situation in my country.

160. It is not the fault of the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic that its relations with some other socialist countries have become an issue before the Security Council and the subject of debate with the intervention of other non-socialist countries, a debate in which certain anti-socialist arguments have been raised. The responsibility for that lies on those Governments which, in

spite of the agreed principles of mutual relations many times proclaimed and recently pledged by the joint declaration of their highest representatives in Bratislava on 3 August of this year, in spite of bilateral and multilateral obligations stipulated in treaties, occupied by their armed units the territory of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in the night on 20 August and in the morning hours of 21 August.

161. This act of use of force cannot be justified by anything. It did not take place upon the request or demand of the Czechoslovak Government nor of any other constitutional organs of this Republic. The declarations of the President of the Republic, of the National Assembly, of the Government, and also of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, which, to my knowledge, have been presented to this body for its information, clearly attest to it. If, in some of the five countries, whose Governments participate in the occupation, mention is made of requests made by some constitutional political representatives of Czechoslovakia, let me say that there has never been a reference to a single name, and to the knowledge of the Czechoslovak Government, no such demand was ever made.

162. Neither can the military occupation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic be justified by the concern for the external security of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic or for the fulfilment of obligations arising from the joint defence of the countries of the Warsaw Treaty. The Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has fulfilled these obligations conscientiously and has never left any doubt about it that it is determined and capable of doing so also in the future. That has been expressed on many occasions, and even the Governments of the five countries do not claim that, at the moment of the occupation, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic was in an imminent danger of military aggression from abroad, against which, after all, the Czechoslovak army was prepared and capable and prepared to defend itself, which even the leading commanders of the Warsaw Treaty recognized during their visits from May to July.

163. The military occupation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic cannot either be justified by arguments about the alleged danger of counter-revolution. These arguments themselves are juridically invalid, and even when we leave aside the absolute invalidity and nullity of such arguments, allow me—for I consider it necessary—to state that, until the occupation, the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic fully controlled the situation on its territory, on which there was a socialist order. The organs of public administration and peoples' power were functioning. Intensive, democratic political life, based on the socialist concept of the society, on the plurality of social organizations united in the National Front and recognizing the leading role of the working class and of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, had been developing.

164. In the course of the process which the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia started in January 1968, and the substance of which was the elimination of bureaucratic deformations, the full application of humanistic and democratic substance and sense of socialism, as well as the

renaissance and regeneration of political activities and initiatives of the people, and all-round discussion was developing. Its development substantially strengthened both the socialist and patriotic feelings and orientation as well as the leading role of the Communist Party, based on the natural authority emanating from the initiatives of ideas, concepts and deeds. In this way, we supported the broad positive stream of people's political initiative, guided by the Communist Party, and we resisted any extremist forces and phenomena.

165. I venture to say that under the leadership of Alexander Dubcek and other comrades of the Central Committee, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has as never before gained such natural authority and undeniable leadership among the two nations of our country—the Czechs and the Slovaks. That is also attested to by the spontaneous powerful stream of socialist patriotism which has developed, particularly in the summer months, and which has manifested itself in positive deeds, in working efforts, in voluntary collections of funds necessary for the solution of vast economic problems and tasks.

166. These positive, truly patriotic and deeply socialist manifestations of popular initiative made entirely secondary in our political life those negative anti-socialist phenomena which disturbed us, and which also disturbed our friends abroad and which, whether objectively or consciously and intentionally, could have become allies of the forces hostile to socialist Czechoslovakia. We have been conscious of their existence. We did not underestimate them, and we resisted them. However, we considered it correct to struggle against them primarily through the wide popular initiative which would have isolated those negative forces and would thus also make possible administrative steps which understandably no State can waive, and which we were not willing to waive, either.

167. Precisely in recent days and weeks, immediately before the occupation, the correctness and effectiveness of our method started to bear fruit.

168. I would not have talked about this because this is an internal matter of our country, but from the verbatim records, I get the impression that some of the representatives who have tried to justify the steps taken against Czechoslovakia have insisted on these phenomena, and presented them in a distorted way. And I should like to point to such statesmen and political leaders of the socialist world as President Tito from Yugoslavia and his colleagues, as well as the Chairman of the State Council of Romania, Nikolai Ceausescu, and his colleagues who convinced themselves about this only just recently, during their visits in the week preceding the fateful occupation. Their testimony only confirms what the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the leaders of the political life of our country, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, are declaring with full responsibility and face to face to the occupation forces and to the world public—which means that before the August occupation Czechoslovakia was, and remained, dedicated to the cause of socialism, of socialist construction, of socialist development, faithful, willing to fulfil and capable of fulfilling its obligations vis-à-vis the community of other

socialist countries in Europe. Its domestic life developed firmly on the socialist basis and toward socialist objectives. Its leading political force, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, went through a process of profound internal regeneration which enabled it to grow, to be strengthened and invigorated in an all-round manner, and to gain greater authority and support on the part of all the people.

169. The National Front, firmly based under the leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, on socialist principles, became stronger as a framework for the political life of the country. The negative phenomena and their impact on mass media were being isolated, and a conscious voluntary discipline which corrected those manifestations was developing among all those who were responsible for handling the mass media and for handling communication and information in public life. Consequently, nothing could justify the apprehensions and doubts about an alleged danger of counter-revolution in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. The Government had the situation firmly in hand and had also sufficient means to repel any real attack against the foundations of socialism. The order and discipline in our political life, the socialist and patriotic consciousness of our people, the genuine leading role of the working class and of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia are all attested to by the reaction of all our country to the occupation. Absolute faithfulness and obedience to the legal organs; non-recognition of the orders issued by the occupation armies; consistent, successful efforts to maintain the work of the Communist Party, the backbone of our national life; expeditious convocation of the Fourteenth Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, which, under the stresses of the situation, adopted decisions resolutely demanding the end of the occupation and showed unshakable fidelity to the leadership of Alexander Dubcek—all these offer significant proof, even now, of how those who thought they were entitled to interfere by such means as the occupation misunderstood our situation, misunderstood our people and misunderstood the whole of our social development.

170. If there is anything that seriously endangers the cause of socialism in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, if there is anything that is creating a danger that may compromise it in the world, it is precisely the insensitive and illegal proceedings of those Governments that have carried out the occupation of the territory of socialist Czechoslovakia, an occupation which has disrupted the functioning of the economic, social and political life of the Republic and made it impossible for the constitutional organs and democratically elected leadership fully to exercise their sovereign rights and carry out the tasks entrusted to them by the people. For, as you know, some of those leaders have been put in a very difficult situation, and it is precisely this restriction of the possibilities for freely pursuing political work, precisely this enforced—even if, thanks to the popular initiative, only partial—*vacuum juris*, that has created the gravest danger to the cause of socialism in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

171. It seriously damages and profoundly hurts the natural feelings of friendship which our people have always harboured and continue to harbour towards the peoples of the Soviet Union, of Poland, of Bulgaria, of Hungary and of

the German Democratic Republic. At the same time, there is a much greater possibility than heretofore for a situation in which these feelings, these hopes, this faith in socialism—in the really humane forms and methods in socialist society which have met with the tanks of the occupation—may degenerate into frustration and even into negativism, with all the consequences of anti-socialist attitudes of a part of the population. And even if we try in the situation, difficult as it may be, to resist such negativism, we have, for the time being, no full possibility to do so, prevented as we are by the occupying forces; therefore the responsibility for such consequences lies entirely on those who ordered the occupation.

172. The danger resides also in the international response to this act. To a much greater degree than ever in the past, a situation has been created for slanderous propaganda, for actions by forces hostile to socialism and to peace which will try to misuse the fact of the occupation of Czechoslovakia for the purpose of creating anti-communist, anti-Soviet campaigns; of rejecting and denying the policy of peaceful coexistence; of slandering the whole socialist community and its important, its paramount role in striving for and assuring peace. At the same time, such a campaign may be used for the justification of the aggressive policies of imperialism in Viet-Nam, in the Middle East and elsewhere.

173. The international situation, which in recent times has shown some promising signs of improvement, has been deteriorating. Tensions have been growing. For these consequences also, immensely fatal for the cause of world peace, the responsibility lies on those decided on the occupation. In agreement with its people, the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic will never lend itself to these aims to contribute to negative consequences and assist the intentions of the enemies of socialism. In this connexion, may I be allowed to state that my delegation absolutely dissociates itself from any attempt to denigrate or to deny the existence of the German Democratic Republic, even though such attempt may be linked to expressions favourable to Czechoslovakia. It remains one of the principles of our foreign policy that the existence of two German States is one of the pre-conditions of peaceful settlement and the creation of a working European system of security.

174. We resolutely oppose any attempt to link our name and to link the present situation in Czechoslovakia to attacks against the cause of socialism and communism, in which we continue firmly to believe. For the Czechs and Slovaks decided for the socialist road freely and on their own initiative, and they have no intention of leaving that road. After the Munich experience, after the experience of imperialist-Fascist occupation, after their heroic struggle and the liberation in which the Soviet armies played such a paramount role, the peoples of Czechoslovakia set out upon the road of socialism, and, under the leadership of the Communist Party, in 1948 beat back the attack of domestic and foreign reaction. In 1968, they started—again under the guidance of the Communist Party—to eliminate the deformations of the fifties which had been detrimental to the cause of socialism, and build their own road of socialist development, create such social and political models as

would correspond to the profoundly humanitarian substance and sense of socialism and to our democratic traditions and mentality, and also to the significant tasks arising from the present period of the development of human society, to the scientific and technical revolution, and to efforts towards peace and co-operation among all nations.

175. I would like to emphasize that the national individual features of our people, influenced by all their progressive, revolutionary, democratic and humanitarian inheritance, influence their thinking and bring them close to all progressive currents in Europe as well as in the whole world, of both the past and the present; that they create typical feelings for the logical integration of the intellectual and creative sources of the world; and that, they are crowned with a profound sense of what is correct, just and beautiful and that this is objectively reflected in the moral and aesthetic features of character of all our people. That has also been expressed very clearly in the whole of our political development from January 1968—which, I should like to stress once more, was being oriented towards socialist objectives, was standing firmly on a socialist base, and was never intended to leave the context of the socialist community of nations.

176. The present occupation has struck a heavy blow to those efforts. We are deeply disappointed, offended and humiliated; and this is even more cruel because it came from such countries from which we had not expected it in the least, and from which we did not deserve it in the least. We are saying this with sadness, but without hostility. We firmly believe that this fateful act was done on the basis of incorrect consideration, incorrect information, and incorrect analysis of the situation.

177. The Czechoslovak Government, in full harmony with the feelings of the people, is willing consistently to follow the road of socialism also in the future, and to restore and strengthen its fraternal ties with the countries of the socialist camp—even with those countries with which these ties have been so gravely hampered, so gravely impaired by recent events. We are fully conscious of everything that links us with those fraternal countries; we do not forget the traditions of these ties; we never lost sight of how important these bonds are to us; and we also hope that our partners will become aware of how important and advantageous it is to them to have these bonds, on the basis of equality and respect for sovereignty and independence. Nor do we forget what we owe to the peoples of the Soviet Union and other peoples of the fraternal countries. We highly appreciate, especially in this moment, the profound understanding and genuine acts of fraternal assistance given at present to our renaissance process and to our people by fraternal Yugoslavia and Romania. We consider this to be the real manifestation of a genuine socialist internationalism. We wish only that the Governments of the five socialist countries, seeing the unity of our people in the face of the occupation units, and seeing the dangerous consequences of their occupation, may grasp as soon as possible how enormous and tragic a mistake they have made, and will make a decisive and speedy correction and reparation.

178. Too much harm has been done, and it is an urgent responsibility not to permit accumulation of further harms.

Together with our people and the world public, we firmly hope that the current negotiations of the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Ludvik Svoboda, and his delegation in Moscow may contribute to this end. Even in this serious moment when the five countries are not fulfilling their obligations towards us, we ourselves continue to consider as binding upon us the principles, aims and objectives of our socialist foreign policy. We continue to strive for understanding, unity and close co-operation among the socialist countries, and for the strengthening of our mutual bonds, while respecting fully the national interests, and specific features of each of those nations. We continue to strive in the spirit of peaceful coexistence for the ensuring of peace and wide international co-operation in the spirit and letter of the Charter. We continue to support the progressive efforts of the peoples of the whole world in the struggle against colonialism, imperialism, and against any aggression, be it in Viet-Nam, the Middle East or in the Caribbean. That gives us every right to oppose with all resoluteness such disrespect for international obligations where we ourselves are involved.

179. These are the principles which our Government claims when it demands that the foreign troops—foreign even if they come from friendly countries—leave our country without delay and that the sovereignty of our country may be fully restored and applied throughout its whole territory. The rights and functions of the constitutional representatives and political organs and their members must be fully respected. In harmony with the views of all our people and the recent decisions of the Fourteenth Congress of the Communist Party, we consider all acts of occupation organs as illegal.

180. We think that to accept this position which our Government and all our constitutional organs firmly defend may form the basis for a future solution. Only on this basis will it be possible for the Czechoslovak people to join its efforts to those of the other fraternal countries to do away with the negative consequences of the present occupation and to continue in its efforts to develop an advanced socialist society corresponding to its traditions, mentality, and the needs of our times. On this basis, we hope it will be possible to heal the deep wounds and to restore friendly relations with the peoples of those countries whose Governments are responsible for the current deterioration.

181. On this basis it will be possible for Czechoslovakia, as a Member of the United Nations, again to devote its endeavours to the constructive efforts aimed at international co-operation and the ensuring of peace throughout the world.

182. The solution itself, we are fully aware, lies squarely with the Governments of the five countries which have occupied our country, and in negotiation with the constitutional authorities of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. I believe, however, that the Security Council, having discussed this problem, could contribute to such a solution by taking a wise stand and by helping to create a favourable atmosphere for an effective and expeditious solution of the situation and for creating such a basis as I have tried to outline.

183. The PRESIDENT: In my capacity as the representative of BRAZIL I wonder whether I may be allowed to make a very short statement in explanation of vote. I wish to state that my abstention when the vote was taken on the proposal of the Soviet Union was only due to circumstances. My sole personal judgement indicated for the President the exercise of restraint, discretion and silence. It does not in any way reflect, and should not in any way be construed to reflect, any change in the attitude of the Government of Brazil concerning the status of the nature and capacity of the authorities which addressed a telegram to the President of the Security Council.

184. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): I wish to make a brief statement on the position of my delegation in this matter, but I am willing to yield to any representative who would like to speak before in the exercise of the right of reply, if any representative has so signified.

185. Lij Endalkachew MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): Mr. President, I should like to be allowed to explain the vote of my delegation on the procedural matter which was decided upon earlier.

186. In explaining the vote of my delegation, I should like to say that what obliged my delegation to take a stand in the matter of the request of the Government of the German Democratic Republic to come and appear before the Council is the contents of the telegram addressed to you, in that the request was based on a claim that the representative of those authorities would come here as a representative of a State.

187. Ethiopia does not recognize those authorities as being a State and it is for this reason that my delegation was obliged to cast a vote against the motion. I want to make it clear at the same time, however, that this stand taken by us is without prejudice to the traditional position we have taken with regard to rule 39 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Security Council.

188. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): The serious situation in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic bears directly on the question of respect for the basic rights and duties of States under the Charter of the United Nations and the rules of international law.

189. Mindful of the purposes and principles of the Charter, Pakistan firmly believes that the people of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic are entitled no less than any other people, regardless of their social system, to exercise their sovereign rights and to enjoy the freedom from fear of threat or use of force.

190. The armed forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Polish People's Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Bulgaria have entered the territory of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. It follows that the international community as well as the Security Council have a vital stake in the withdrawal of these armed forces at the earliest possible moment. In this context, the Pakistan delegation notes the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union in the Security Council that the withdrawal of

the armed forces of the five socialist States will be carried out.

191. In order to view the situation in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in its true perspective and with the right sense of proportion, it is necessary to bear in mind that the entry of foreign forces has taken place as a result of a crisis in the relations between the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the five socialist States. No territorial demands are being made; no claims are being put forward; no doctrine propounded about secure boundaries.

192. In the view of my delegation, the right to national sovereignty, self-determination and freedom from the threat or use of force are categorical imperatives. The reality is, therefore, all the more painful that the most powerful States of the world have sometimes evinced a selective approach in this regard. It is not necessary for me to cite specific instances in which the great Powers have intervened in the affairs of sovereign States which they consider to lie within the spheres of their own vital interests.

193. Having discussed the serious situation in Czechoslovakia, the Security Council finds itself unable to act because the basic assumption underlying its establishment and functioning does not hold. When the permanent members of the Security Council stand diametrically opposed, the capacity of the Organization to act effectively is paralysed. The question arises: what then is to be done? Happily, the picture is not one of unrelieved gloom. The Chief of State of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, a hero and a patriot, President Svoboda, is now in Moscow acting on his own volition to find a way out of the situation in his country. I quote from his statement broadcast over Radio Free Prague yesterday:

“We must all be aware that the issue is to find an honourable and dignified way out of the present situation which is threatening to have tragic consequences for our people and their fatherland. Please be aware that it is necessary to continue building our Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to proceed further on a path of democratic development of our socialist fatherland in the spirit of the January Plenum of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee.”

194. Yesterday [1444th meeting, para. 67], the representative of the United States made a truly statesmanlike reference to these negotiations and said that if an agreement should come out of them then “obviously this Council should do nothing to interfere with that hopeful and commendable process”. The representative of Yugoslavia also expressed the desire of his Government for a peaceful solution through direct negotiations.

195. My delegation would like to pay its respectful tribute to the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, who has undertaken the task of entering direct negotiations with the highest representatives of the Soviet Union with a view to arriving at an honourable adjustment of the critical situation. We trust that the negotiations are taking place on a basis of genuine equality and that their outcome will be consistent with the sovereign rights of the Czechoslovak

Socialist Republic, as well as in conformity with the spirit of the earlier accords between the Czechoslovak leaders on the one side and the Soviet Union and the four socialist States on the other which had issued a joint statement. We believe that it is only from such negotiations that an honourable adjustment of the situation, as envisaged in Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations, namely, “in conformity with the principles of justice and international law”, can be brought about, leading to the evacuation of the armed forces of the five socialist States from the territory of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

196. Turning now to the draft resolution presented by Canada on behalf of the eight sponsoring Powers [S/8767] that “the Secretary-General . . . 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 . . . report back urgently”, the Pakistan delegation is conscious of the humanitarian concern which originally prompted the eight Powers to sponsor the proposal.

197. In another situation, when a well-known popular leader was jailed for demanding his people’s right to self-determination, the Pakistan Government had hoped that the Security Council would have shared a similar concern.

198. I would have had some comments to make regarding the need to revise the text of this draft resolution. However, in view of reports that the Czechoslovak leaders are participating in negotiations in Moscow, it may not be necessary to pursue the proposal any further.

199. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, I have just received a Tass telegram from Moscow. It is in English, and I shall read it:

[*The speaker continued in English.*]

“Meeting in Kremlin, Moscow, August 24, Tass:

“The talks between the delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, headed by Ludwik Svoboda, the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, and leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government were resumed on August 24. As on August 23, the talks were held in a frank and comradely atmosphere. The sides mutually agreed to continue the talks on August 25.”

[*The speaker resumed in Russian.*]

200. The delegation of the Soviet Union is profoundly convinced that any matter arising between the socialist States can and must be settled by those countries without any foreign interference, especially interference by imperialist Powers. On these premises, the delegation of the Soviet Union considers that any appeal or action—whatever its form and whoever originates it—, which could be used by the imperialist forces and their powerful propaganda in their interests cannot contribute to the settlement of, and measures adopted to reach an agreement concerning, the problems which have arisen.

201. At the present stage of the debate here—which, as the Soviet delegation has pointed out, is an illegal debate—, I shall confine myself to acquainting the Security Council with the appeal of the Governments of the five socialist countries to the citizens of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. I shall read the text of this appeal, and I request that the President of the Security Council and the Secretariat of the United Nations publish this document as an official document of the Security Council.⁵

“Appeal to the citizens of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, published in the newspaper *Izvestia* 23 August 1968.

“Brothers, Czechs and Slovaks!

“This comes to you from the Governments of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People’s Republic, the Polish People’s Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

“In answer to the appeal for help addressed to us by the party and State leaders of Czechoslovakia faithful to the cause of socialism, we have ordered our armed forces to provide the working class and the entire Czechoslovak people the support necessary to the defense of their socialist achievements, which are threatened by the increasingly pressing encroachments of the forces of domestic and international reaction.

“Such action has resulted precisely from the collective obligation assumed by the communist and workers’ parties of our brother nations at Bratislava to jointly support, strengthen and protect the socialist achievements of each people and to repulse the schemes of imperialism.

“The counter-revolutionaries, encouraged and supported by the imperialists, are avid for power. Having seized the key positions in the Press, radio and television, the anti-socialist forces have defamed and vilified all that has been created by the hands of hard-working Czechs and Slovaks over twenty years of struggle for socialism.

“The enemies have harassed the cadres loyal to socialism, shaken the foundations of law and order, ruthlessly prevented class-conscious workers and peasants from participating in the political life of the country, and persecuted the honest intelligentsia who did not wish to take part in activities against the people. Flouting socialist laws, the counter-revolutionary forces have created their own organizations in preparation for seizing power, and all this has been camouflaged by demagogic phrases about democracy! We are convinced that this will not mislead the Czechoslovak people, who are devoted to the ideals of socialist democracy. Genuine freedom and democracy can only be ensured by strengthening the guiding role of the working class and its vanguard—the glorious Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

“This was precisely the goal set by the January Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of

Czechoslovakia, which made a start in rectifying the errors permitted in the past. Our parties and peoples supported the just endeavours to strengthen and further improve socialist democracy. But in recent months, the anti-socialist forces, skilfully camouflaged, have carried the matter to the point of shaking the foundations of socialism. A number of persons who have penetrated the State and party leadership of Czechoslovakia have actually been sheltering these subversive activities, thereby helping the counter-revolutionaries to marshal their forces for the final stage in the struggle to seize power.

“At the Soviet-Czechoslovak meeting at Cierna and Tisou and at the Bratislava conference of the communist and workers’ parties, the Czechoslovak representatives declared their intention to safeguard the interests of the working people and to halt the activities of the reactionaries seeking to undermine socialism. They promised to strengthen the unity of Czechoslovakia and the fraternal socialist countries.

“However, these assurances and commitments have remained unfulfilled, which has further encouraged the anti-socialist forces and their foreign sponsors to intensify their hostile activities. Its enemies have been preparing to plunge the country into chaos and to sacrifice the freedom and independence of their homeland for their own mercenary, selfish ends.

“The counter-revolutionaries calculated that in the complex and tense international situation created by the aggressive activities of the United States, and particularly by the growing activity of the revanchist forces in West Germany, they could succeed in wresting Czechoslovakia from the community of socialist States. But these are vain hopes. The socialist States are powerful enough to stand up for a brother country and to defend the cause of socialism.

“Dear friends!

“Your class brothers have come today to help you.

“They have come to you, not to interfere in your internal affairs but in order to repulse counter-revolution, together with you, and to defend the cause of socialism and remove the threat to the sovereignty, independence and security of your homeland.

“The armed forces of your fraternal allied countries have come to you to ensure that no one can deprive you of the freedom won in our joint struggle against fascism, that no one can prevent you from moving forward on the shining path of socialism. These armed forces will leave your territory as soon as the threat to the freedom and independence of Czechoslovakia has been removed.

“We believe that the unity and solidarity of the fraternal peoples of the socialist community will triumph over the schemes of their enemies.

“Long live socialist Czechoslovakia!

⁵ *Ibid.*, *Twenty-third Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1968*, document S/8772.

“Long live friendship and brotherhood between the peoples of the socialist countries!

“(Signed) Council of Ministers of the Peoples Republic of Bulgaria
“Council of Ministers of the German Democratic Republic
“Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People’s Republic
“Council of Ministers of the Polish People’s Republic
“Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics”

202. At the present stage of the debate, the delegation of the Soviet Union considers it possible to stop here.

203. The PRESIDENT: During the course of his last intervention the representative of the Soviet Union requested that the document which he read out be distributed as a document of the Security Council. If there is no

objection the Secretariat will take the necessary steps to that effect.

204. As I have no more speakers on my list, I propose to adjourn the meeting now.

205. A substantial number of delegations have signified their desire that the Council should reconvene urgently to resume consideration of this item of which the Council remains seized. Monday at 10 a.m. has been suggested tentatively, with the understanding that the Security Council might reconvene earlier if it was found necessary after informal consultations had been held. I shall contact members in this connexion, with the understanding that unless it is decided otherwise the Council will meet Monday at 10 a.m. I wonder whether this course is agreeable to the members of the Security Council.

206. Since there is no objection, and with that understanding, I propose to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.

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. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем 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.
