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Mr. FEDORUKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation considers it necessary to state its views concerning the order of priority of the items on the agenda of the First Committee. This is a serious matter which must be approached with a full knowledge of our responsibilities. It goes without saying that this Committee is the most important political organ of the United Nations and must, first of all, debate the most urgent and important questions of world import. Solutions to these problems are expected and awaited by the peoples of the world. If we are guided by this approach, which is the only justified one, we cannot fail to recognize that among the group of questions which we have to debate it is necessary to set apart and examine, first of all, one very urgent matter, namely, the status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States.

We believe that it might be useful to recall today, at this very hour, that this Declaration, as representatives are aware, was worked out and adopted here in this Committee in the course of the twentieth session of the General Assembly. It is also known -- and of this I should like to remind representatives -- that the Declaration was unanimously supported in a plenary meeting of the General Assembly at that session. It was greeted also with tremendous satisfaction by the peoples of all continents outside the halls of this Organization.
For that reason it is quite natural that this Committee debate first of all the question of the status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty. The truth of the matter is that for us to be able to move ahead towards the achievement of the high goals of the Organization we must first of all have a clear picture of the way in which Member States of the United Nations have approached and are approaching the implementation of that Assembly Declaration, and the way in which they carry out or fail to carry out their obligations under it. Otherwise, a question would arise quite logically: what is the meaning of resolutions adopted in the United Nations, what is the value of decisions if, instead of being carried out, they are punched by various staplers and accumulate in the archives?

The tragic feature of the situation in our view is that our Organization often suffers not from the dearth of relevant resolutions but from the fact that frequently the most important decisions taken by it are buried in dusty archives, forgotten, ignored and often wilfully violated by Member States of the United Nations. There is no need to state at length that this kind of practice is intolerable since it deals a heavy blow to the authority and the prestige of the United Nations.

The violation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States threatens the peace and security of the peoples of the world. And the United Nations must now, without delay, speak out clearly and state that by violating the sovereignty and independence of States, by carrying out armed interference in the internal affairs of other countries, the violators of the Declaration assume the whole responsibility for the ensuing consequences.

Further, after discussing this important and urgent matter, the Committee should in our opinion deal with a series of questions relating to disarmament including the item on the Elimination of Foreign Military Bases in the Countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and other questions.
We consider that the discussion on disarmament matters should start with a most timely problem, that of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, namely, the item entitled "Renunciation by States of actions hampering the conclusion of an agreement of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons". That is a logical way of tackling in substance the matter of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet delegation is in favour of the First Committee's discussing, among the first items, the important question of the withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

Allow me to conclude by saying that the Soviet delegation supports the constructive proposals made at our meeting this morning (1428th meeting) by the representative of Hungary, Ambassador Csátoros, whose great experience and high competence is well known and highly valued by us all.
Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): Since this is the first time that I have spoken in this Committee at this session, I should like to take the opportunity to congratulate the Chairman on his election to this most important office. My delegation is well aware of his previous experience and high competence in the delicate field of United Nations political concerns that are the subject of this Committee's work. He has an intimate acquaintanceship with this Committee and with the political problems of the Organization. He has gained that acquaintanceship both as Vice-Chairmen of the Committee last year and as Chairman of the Special Political Committee at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly. I would add that it gives us personal satisfaction that an outstanding member of the Latin American Group and a representative of our sister Republic in this hemisphere, Ecuador, has been unanimously elected to the high office of Chairman of this Committee. We wish him success; we know he will have it. We pledge him full co-operation in his important work.

I also wish to express our pleasure at the election of our Rapporteur of last year, Mr. Fahmy, the representative of the United Arab Republic, to the office of Vice-Chairman. In our experience with him we have been impressed by his impartiality, his judgement and his very fine qualities, which eminently suit him for the post. At the same time, we applaud the magnanimity which Ambassador Ignacio-Finto, with his great experience, has shown in allowing our choice of Mr. Fahmy to be unanimous.

I should also like to welcome the election of the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic as Rapporteur. His unanimous election confirms that the Organization properly regards personal merit and not geography, size of country, alignment or ideology as the basic criterion for the selection of the officers of its bodies. That is the way it should and must be in the United Nations.

I turn now to the matter under discussion. First, in addition to pledging the Chairman our general co-operation, I wish to pledge him our specific co-operation in heeding the wise counsel he gave the Committee at the beginning of this morning's meeting -- that is, that at this stage we should adhere to the question of the order of business and not deviate by discussing the merits of the items
on the agenda. I think that on the whole his counsel has been followed thus far, although I must say that my friend and colleague, Ambassador Csartorday, made some references to the merits of the problems with which I am in disagreement; however, I shall not reply to them before the Committee reaches the proper stage of its deliberations.

As has been mentioned by several representatives who have spoken, every subject on our agenda is of great importance. If the subject was not of great importance, it would not be before the First Committee, the Political Committee of the Assembly. The task of deciding priorities is therefore a difficult one and should, I believe, not be approached in a spirit of sponsorship of items. Rather, it should be approached in a spirit of a businesslike consideration of which items should be examined first by this Committee. In that respect, the suggestions put forward by Ambassador Barochy, and more particularly his suggestion that questions be placed into four groups of related items, seemed eminently sensible and logical to my delegation. We might have some differences about the specific grouping of items -- for example, I should have thought item 12, on military bases, belonged to the question of disarmament; but that is a detail. In general, Ambassador Barochy expressed sound views about grouping items relating to the same subject and debating them at the same time, in the interest of making progress in our work in an orderly way.

The representative of Saudi Arabia, our distinguished and experienced friend, made some other points that are truly worthy of our consideration. For instance, if the Committee were able to advance expeditiously on the outer space items and to report some accomplishment and progress to the General Assembly early in the session, that would be a great contribution to the Assembly's work. Whether we shall be able to do that depends upon whether the members of the Committee, and particularly those most intimately concerned in questions of outer space, are ready for such a development. We, for our part, are ready, and we would welcome consideration of such agenda items as a matter of priority. We think that it would do a great deal for the world community and the world Organization if the Committee were able to come to an agreement in this field quickly and to report some accomplishment to the General Assembly at an early stage.
If we are unable to do that, we shall have to turn to another item. In our opinion, it would not be productive to report disagreement; rather, we should take time for more reflection and discussion on the subject and for efforts to bridge the differences.

We put that forward not as a definite suggestion, but as our views on the matter.

What is the situation with regard to the other items on the agenda? It seems to us that disarmament should have high priority. I am well aware of what has been said by other representatives -- that is, that we have talked about this before -- but I am also aware that it is perfectly obvious from the report of the Eighteen-Nation Committee that time is running out on a non-proliferation agreement. That has been apparent to all of us who have followed, with great interest and concern, the Geneva discussions. This body has its own responsibilities in that area. The paramount responsibility of this Committee in the question of disarmament has been emphasized many times. I would not wish to decide so readily that this Committee, through its consideration and deliberation of the matter, could not provide the necessary spark, the necessary impetus, that would contribute to achieving what is so desperately and urgently needed in the nuclear age: a non-proliferation agreement. There is an ever-growing possibility that other countries will "go nuclear". I do not think that anyone desires that at this moment. But the best way to prevent proliferation is to agree upon a non-proliferation treaty with fair terms, a treaty that would at the same time give the necessary assurances to countries that their interests would be protected.

I do not want to enter into the merits of this question. I do not want to fix responsibility, one way or the other, for the lack of progress. I merely wish to say that there is a great urgency about disarmament items, and particularly that of non-proliferation. It would therefore seem to my delegation that it would be logical to address ourselves to that subject very early in our work.
With regard to the other items, I think that we ought to give some thought to the matter. Like the delegation of Colombia, my delegation would greatly welcome a discussion of non-intervention. I referred to that subject in my statement in the general debate in the Assembly and specifically mentioned the Declaration which this Committee recommended to the Assembly and which it adopted at the last session. I shall not repeat what I said in plenary, since that relates to the merits. I would only state again that we would welcome a discussion of the item on non-intervention.

Of course, we are prepared to discuss the important subject of Korea. We think that it is premature at this stage, when the Committee is deciding on the order of its work, to take a decision on how we should deal with the question of invitations. We have dealt with that question in the past in one form. I would suppose that at the proper time the Committee could decide whether anything had happened that would warrant deviating from past practice in dealing with the matter.

Those are our reflections on the Committee's order of business at this session. We place them before the Committee for its consideration.
Mr. CORREIA DA COSTA (Brazil): Mr. Chairman, as you are fully aware of how much we rejoiced at your election this morning, please consider as implicit our warm greetings and assurances of co-operation, and this, of course, applies also to the distinguished Vice-President and Rapporteur.

It was my intention to present a series of comments and suggestions regarding the order of priority of the items on our agenda, but, on second thoughts, I shall refrain from doing so as I am convinced that it would be extremely difficult to conciliate the views so far expressed and make attempts in this Committee to produce a text acceptable to all of us, or to most of us.

This being the case, may I suggest that the Chairman should give himself the task of co-ordinating informally -- and this proved very fruitful last year -- the proposals which have already been put forward by Hungary and Saudi Arabia and the other comments we have heard from the representatives of the United States and of the Soviet Union. This would enable you, Mr. Chairman, to submit to the Committee some time next week, possibly early next week, a proposal that would be likely to be readily acceptable.

Of course, this should not preclude the possibility of other representatives expressing their views before this meeting is adjourned.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Brazil and, in conformity with his suggestion, I now call upon the representative of Peru.

Mr. BEZAURE (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Chairman, to convey to you my warmest congratulations upon your election to the post of Chairman of this Committee. You belong to an aspect of the intellectual life of Latin America in which Ecuador has a place of honour, which is the place of jurists and of humanists, a movement which found an example in Bello, the author of a code and at the same time a man of great erudition in Spanish and a delicate poet. It is an honour for me to refer to that dual aspect of the culture you possess as a jurist and a humanist and to the evidence that through your career in the United Nations you have used this very broad knowledge you possess, which will guarantee the success of our work. The delegation of Peru offers you its felicitations and assures you of its full and entire collaboration.

I am also happy to tender my congratulations to the Vice-Chairman, with whom we worked with great success last year, and to the Rapporteur, the distinguished representative of the Byelorussian SSR.
In all modesty, I would say in all humility, may I succinctly put forward what I consider to be my scale of values on the twelve items before us. It is not a scale of values that determines the importance of the items, but rather their timeliness, a prudent decision about the time when we should discuss this or that question.

Therefore, I will not dwell on the most delicate question of which is the most important item. That I will leave to the conscience of each, but there is a scale of values in terms of timeliness and opportunity. I would be failing in my duty to sincerity were I not to say that our Assembly begins in an atmosphere of great anxiety. There is a war going on among our sister nations of Africa, a war to which we all want to put an end. Today, the hopes of mankind, the fervent prayers of all human beings, are directed towards peace and towards the creation of conditions which will favour peace, to the creation of a climate in which initiatives may emerge so that it will be possible the better to understand any idea or procedure that may bring us close to what we might call, if not immediate peace, at least a certain process that leads to peace.

I have been wondering, and I am sure that all representatives are asking themselves the same question, whether at this time, when we wait for this timely and discreet exchange of views which will ensure peace in Viet-Nam, it would be advisable or desirable to have a more or less heated debate, however sincere, on this very thorny subject.

I know that the item on intervention has very interesting aspects, interesting as much for those who consider that it can give rise to application of juridical measures constituting condemnation of certain policies, as it is for ourselves, for us who took part in the discussion of the matter of intervention -- I myself took some part in it, and with high representation in all groups. I leave aside the aspect pointed out by the representative of Colombia, which we could term intellectual or sentimental, the aspect of incompatibility with our principles and with the Declaration which we unanimously approve -- the countries that abstained later joined in its approval -- because discussion of this aspect could introduce into our debate a note of division or disagreement.
I consider that the role of the small Powers at this time is that of creating a climate of intelligence and knowledge for the great nuclear Powers, whose enormous responsibility is the capacity to help mankind improve its lot or to lead it to destruction or suicide. Therefore, I feel that however important this item may be from the point of view of a scale of values, so to speak, of a general and abstract nature, it may be that a discussion of this at the very outset of this session might bring about some bitterness and might create a climate that would not be favourable to the kind of hopeful work and silent and fruitful co-operation by means of which all the countries of the world must work together in favour of peace.

In this connexion, it seems to me that we should apply one of the rules of Descartes. I am an Augustine myself, and therefore I have great sympathy with some of the things that Descartes said. What I find enticing and seductive in him, above all, is what he called his "rules of method". In the case of an intellectual type of works, not only intellectual but also moral, representing the very operation of an institution as responsible as the United Nations, we must bear in mind the fact that it is more advisable to begin with the easy things and slowly work ourselves into the more difficult ones, to begin with the simple things and then go on to the complex ones.
Since at this time our agenda includes items such as that on outer space, where apparently there is some rapprochement between the two great super Powers, why not begin our work with that subject, so as to give us some ray of hope? Why not take up later the other items where we have the advantage of the preliminary study authorized by the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament? We would then leave for a time when there will be greater serenity and a greater chance of success, and perhaps when there will be more encouraging news, the more touchy problems such as those of intervention and Korea.

With all due respect, I should like to suggest these ideas for the consideration of our wise Chairman.

On the other hand, I support the initiative taken by the delegation of Brazil. It seems to me that an endless discussion would only cause us to lose precious time that could be better devoted to more important questions. Why not let the Chairman, in contact with the various groups, weigh the different views expressed here and put before us, with his customary wisdom and authority, a draft that will save time and increase our hopes for success in our work?

Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): Now that we have started our discussion on the order of priority for the items on our agenda, I think that many delegations will have much to say, particularly on questions of special interest to them. Some delegations have stated that they had no pet items on which they would insist. That is why they made objective statements. This would be all very well if there were no questions which are considered as urgent by world public opinion at this time, questions which world public opinion would like to see us discuss and solve as quickly as possible.

When we debate the order of priority of the problems before us, we must take into account, in the first place, the timeliness and urgency of the items on the agenda of this Committee. This would be in conformity with the desires and expectations of all of world public opinion.
One of the questions that was most debated last year, the conclusion of which was awaited with the greatest impatience by world public opinion, was that of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States. The Committee was able at that time, with great difficulty, to adopt unanimously, or nearly unanimously, a declaration in that regard. There were some abstentions, of course, but they did not change the situation.

Under these conditions, we believe that this is a matter of interest for everyone, particularly for the public opinion of all countries. This declaration was adopted as will be recalled, because of the pressure exerted by world public opinion. The necessity for the adoption of such a declaration was felt by all countries, especially by the small States and above all by those which had reason to believe that preparations were being made to intervene, in one way or another, in their internal affairs and to use force against them.

I must stress that the implementation of the declaration that was adopted last year has not been made obsolete by the evolution of events. What is happening in the world today only stresses once more the need for that declaration, the need for such an initiative.

Thus we believe that in this situation, if we want our Committee to do good work, if we wish it to perform the important tasks which have been entrusted to it, if we wish it to be able to meet the expectations of world public opinion, it will be absolutely necessary for us to take up as the first point on our agenda the item entitled: "Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty".

The second item which the Committee should debate and which also is politically timely at present, is without doubt, in the opinion of the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, that of eliminating all obstacles in way of the conclusion of an agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Preparatory studies have already been made on this question by the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament at Geneva -- or rather the Committee of Seventeen, as someone observed this morning. Those preparations were fruitful as regards the manner in which
the question was discussed. Now the necessary measures must be taken for the purpose of giving new directives to that Committee which will meet again soon. There is an imperative necessity for such measures. Of course, immediately afterwards, it would be a good idea to discuss the report of the Committee which has been presented here.

In our opinion, the problem which should be discussed in the third place, because it is interesting, important and one of the most urgent questions, is that of the elimination of foreign military bases in all countries in which they are situated. Indeed, the military bases established in foreign countries not only are used as required for the objectives assigned to them in various treaties, but also serve generally to encourage intervention in the countries in which they are established or as staging points for intervention in neighbouring countries which suffer greatly from this state of affairs. Since the question of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of states was settled rather clearly last year by the General Assembly, and since we wish to see how the Declaration adopted to that end has been implemented, there is good reason to discuss also the question of the elimination of foreign military bases in the countries in which they have been set up.
Another question which is important in the view of the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is that of Korea. It is all the more important because it is the continued use of the flag of the United Nations to cover the occupation of South Korea which prevents the Korean people from taking the initiative towards reunification. This is something which redounds to the very great detriment of the United Nations. The activities of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea have served, up to now -- as everyone here well knows -- only to cover the presence of United States forces and to enable them to continue occupying South Korea.

As I have said, the continuation of this situation is to the very great detriment of the United Nations. That is why the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the "Withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the cover of the United Nations and the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" is an important question which should be discussed. Such a discussion would enable us eliminate this scourge of the use of the United Nations flag for ends which are totally at variance with the work and activities of the United Nations.

It is in the light of these considerations that we should like the Committee to work on and adopt an order of priority for the agenda items allocated to it. We have, of course, other observations to submit on other problems, but we wanted first to make known certain comments on the most important matters we had in mind.
Mr. AZNAR (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): In my view, and I believe in the view of all representatives, the importance of each of the groups of items that were so clearly analysed this morning by Mr. Baroody, theoretically speaking, is the same. In fact, all the items are of importance to us. In the observations that were made here by the representatives of Hungary, Saudi Arabia, Colombia, Brazil, the Soviet Union, the United States, Peru and Bulgaria, we find reasons in support of the different positions that have been taken. But I must say that I am in no way surprised to find that the sponsors of certain draft resolutions and proposals should, at the beginning of this session of the First Committee, express alarm and request priority for their proposals. We can all easily remember what happened last year.

Last year, except for a most eloquent statement by Mr. Belaunde on the question of non-intervention, there was no true debate on this question. What was the reason? It was because this question was left to the end of the session. Its discussion was postponed time and again. It was raised when delegations had become tired and when many representatives were preparing to return to their respective countries. It was raised when we did not have in the Committee the type of climate that was needed for a serious debate of the question of non-intervention.

It is logical that unless necessary precautions are taken this year to prevent the same situation from arising, we shall find ourselves discussing the problem of non-intervention in December, with great haste, without being able to go into the substance of the matter, without being able to analyse it and without being able to accomplish any serious work. This is the truth of what happened and of what probably will happen this year unless we do something to prevent it.

I should like to say that for the delegation of Spain, having said that all the items on the agenda are important, the question of non-intervention is of very special importance, as is the question of the elimination of foreign military bases. Apropos of this latter item, and in passing and without stressing the matter today, I should like to say that I am rather surprised at the title which has been given to it: "Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America". When I was a boy, we were taught that the world was divided into five parts: Africa, Asia, America, Europe and Oceania. I do not know whether a critical analysis of history and geography still preserves this division of the world, but for the purpose of what I have to say here I shall abide by this division into five parts, and say the following. If there is a military base which is not in
Asia, Africa or Latin America, does it mean that the question does not have to be discussed? May I point out that in saying this I am not committing my views at all on this question of foreign military bases. I shall express our views quite clearly at the right moment. I think this is a very complex problem and that it is one of the most important parts of the enormous machinery of war and peace. I believe that not all foreign bases fall under one concept of what is considered a military base. However, that is another matter. But I should like to ask why Oceania and Europe are omitted when reference is made to foreign military bases.
Having said that in passing, I do hope that we shall not be placed in the difficult position of having to discuss this problem of non-intervention at great speed and with insufficient seriousness. It seems to me that, in order to avoid lengthy and endless discussions, and in keeping with what was said here and proposed by the representative of Brazil, we should put the matter in the hands of the Chairman, so that the Chairman, after whatever contacts and negotiations he may deem it necessary to hold with the different delegations which have spoken here, may bring us a plan wherein we shall find a complete guarantee that there will be no discussion on intervention or military bases except with the necessary time and care that they call for.

Mr. BUENIAK (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): First of all, may I congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on your election to the office of Chairman of this Committee.

Knowing well your experience and your personal qualities, the Czechoslovak delegation would like to express the conviction that, under your guidance, the First Committee will discharge its duties successfully. The Czechoslovak delegation would also like to congratulate the Vice-Chairman of the First Committee, Ambassador Fahmy, as well as its Rapporteur, the Permanent Representative of the Byelorussian SSR, Mr. Tchernouchtchenko.

The Czechoslovak delegation would like to explain the reasons for which it considers that the First Committee should consider as the first item of its agenda the question inscribed on the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly upon the initiative of the delegation of the Soviet Union and entitled: "Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty".

There is no doubt that world public opinion reacts with great concern when seeing the ever-worsening international situation today. The course of the general debate has also confirmed this growing concern of the peoples and the Governments of the world. The main reason for such a dangerous development is the policy of force, of interference in the internal affairs of States, of violation of their sovereignty and their territorial integrity. The forces of
aggression have unleashed in various parts of the world their interventionist activities directed against the legitimate interests of peoples aspiring to independence and self-determination.

That is why the adoption at the last session of the General Assembly of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States met with full support and concurrence on the part of the peoples of the world. However, that Declaration is not being carried out by some of the very States who voted in its favour.

The dangerous situation in South-East Asia continues, and this year it has greatly worsened and is at an ever-more dangerous point for the world. That is why we consider that the interests of peace dictate that the United Nations should once again raise its authoritative voice against the use of force in international relations and take the necessary measures to ensure consistent implementation of this Declaration. It is why we consider also that the item proposed by the Soviet Union must receive priority and become item 1 of our agenda. That would also underline the importance which our Organization attaches to all measures aimed at a consistent carrying out of the principles of the Charter.

I should also like to state our views concerning two items relating to Korea. As the Czechoslovak delegation has already stated in the General Committee, we wish to see the so-called Korean question stricken from the agenda of the General Assembly. Since that has not been done, we must take into account the fact that there are two items on our agenda concerning this problem. The one of which the Czechoslovak delegation is a co-sponsor is fully consonant with the tasks that must be fulfilled by the present session of the General Assembly; that is to say, the task of contributing to the speediest withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea and the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

That is why we consider that this question must be debated urgently, and this requires no further clarification.

Generally speaking, the Czechoslovak delegation fully supports the proposals made by the representative of Hungary this morning, Ambassador Csàtorday, concerning the agenda of our Committee.
Mr. NATSUI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, may I, first of all, congratulate you on your unanimous election to the Chairmanship of this important Committee. We look forward to a fruitful collaboration with you and with your colleagues of the Bureau: our newly-elected Vice-President, Ambassador Fahmy of the United Arab Republic, and the Rapporteur, Ambassador Tchernouchtchenko of the Byelorussian SSR, to whom we also offer our warm congratulations.

It is understandable that a certain amount of time must be spent at the outset of our work in dealing with procedural questions such as the order in which we are to consider the items on our agenda. My delegation, however, hopes that we shall not have to spend too much time and that it will be possible for us, with the minimum of delay, to proceed rapidly to the substance of our work.

In this connexion, I should like to support the proposal of the representative of Brazil to put in your hands, Mr. Chairman, the necessary consultations.

May I now be permitted to express the view of my delegation on this question of the order of business. The items allocated to this Committee this year, all of which are doubtless very important, could possibly be classified in the following four categories: first, questions concerning disarmament -- we might include items 97 and 98 in this category; second, those on outer space; third, those which are related to the problem of Korea, and finally, the question of the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States.

It is the view of my delegation that the disarmament items taken together, and in particular the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, item 26, and that of the urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests, item 28, are the most important and urgent and should consequently be accorded priority in conformity with the practice we have always followed in the past.

I listened very carefully to the suggestion made this morning by the representative of Hungary that top priority should be given to the item entitled "Status of the Implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States...", and to the comments that have been made with regard to the suggestion by speakers who have preceded me this afternoon.
I must say that we do not entirely share the view held by those delegations that top priority should be given to this item. If agreement could be reached along the lines of the suggestion made this morning by the representative of Saudi Arabia, to the effect that the Committee might give top priority to the questions concerning outer space, my delegation would be prepared to go along with it.

We believe that the outer-space problem requires urgent attention by the Committee this year, as we are very anxious to see an outer-space treaty concluded as soon as possible. I might add that, following the precedent in similar cases, we could thoroughly examine items 30, 89 and 91 as a group, having a general debate on all three items, and then, if necessary, examining them one by one in their present order, since all three items are closely interrelated.

There is one further question concerning the order of items to which I feel obliged to refer only because it was raised this morning by the representative of Hungary and referred to subsequently by others. Customarily, if I recall correctly, the Committee has deferred consideration of the Korean item, that is the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, to the end of our agenda. We have not objected to that procedure in the past, nor do we intend to do so now. This year we have a new item concerning Korea on our agenda, item 93, and it has been suggested that this item should take priority over item 31, the UNCURK report. We are not at all convinced that the arguments advanced in support of that suggestion are valid; on the contrary, we are persuaded that priority should be accorded to consideration of the annual report of a duly constituted United Nations body, namely UNCURK. I strongly believe that these two items dealing with Korea should remain in their present order, item 31 first and then item 93, with the possible understanding that the two items will be taken up together and a general debate conducted on both of them at the same time. From the practical point of view, moreover, I have no doubt that when we come to the consideration of the UNCURK report, the proponents of item 93 will have ample opportunity and will feel quite free to express their views. But when we come to the final stage of our examination of these items, that is the consideration of any specific proposals that may be advanced, they should be taken up in their present order, namely the UNCURK report first, and then item 93.
Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom): As this is the first time that I have, with your permission, Sir, the opportunity to address this Committee, I would certainly wish in the first place to offer you, Mr. Chairman, both personally and on behalf of my delegation, our sincere congratulations on your unanimous election. We feel lucky indeed to find our work this year presided over by such a distinguished diplomat, with so many personal, intellectual and diplomatic qualities.

Permit me also, Sir, to extend my delegation's congratulations to both your distinguished Vice-Chairman and your distinguished Rapporteur. Their unanimous elections which we have witnessed this morning, and indeed your own too, have been welcomed by so many speakers from so many quarters of this Committee that they seem to me to be a happy augury for our future work this year.

If I may for a moment turn to the question of the order of work of this Committee -- and I promise that I shall endeavour not to enter into the substance of these matters but to stick to the procedural points -- it seems to my delegation that there is something of a division, to put it mildly, among us in this Committee as to how our work should proceed and in what order. I therefore very much welcome the proposal put forward by the representative of Brazil that time should be given to you, Mr. Chairman, to enter into consultation. I feel confident that if such time is given to you, you will be able to come forward with proposals from the Chair that will be acceptable to all of us.

In these circumstances I would not suggest this afternoon any fixed blue-print which my delegation might wish to put forward for a complete order of business for all our work this year in this Committee. I would, however, like to offer one or two observations on some preferences in the order of work which my delegation feels are worth putting to you this afternoon.

It has become something of a tradition in this Committee that each year disarmament -- which by any account must be regarded as one of the most urgent and important problems facing all of us in this world -- should be discussed as a matter of priority in what is in fact the principal political Committee of the United Nations General Assembly and one which is primarily directed to peace and security. By this I do not suggest that precedent or tradition should always be followed and be followed blindly. But nevertheless, I note that the President of the General Assembly has, in effect perhaps, followed this precedent: he has
transmitted to us our items of work, as agreed and sent to this Committee by the General Committee, and he has listed them in an order which I find, and which my delegation finds, in many respects appealing. He has, for instance -- and to my mind, rightly -- listed first four items on the general subject of disarmament which, as one whole, represent the result of a year's work of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, which has been meeting regularly in Geneva since the last session of the General Assembly. It is true that certain additional items which are also concerned with the disarming of nations have been proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union to the General Committee this year. These items have been allocated to this Committee, where they appear as items 11 and 12; and among other things, the representative of Hungary, if I recall aright, has suggested that they, as urgent and important items, should be given priority. It seems to me, however, that in general terms, it is with disarmament that it will be right and proper for us to start our work.

You will see, therefore, that my delegation does not favour giving top priority to the matter of non-intervention, as has been argued by some members of our Committee in the course of today's meeting. While, however, we have a strong preference for taking disarmament as the first item on our agenda, I would suggest that these four items be considered in this respect as one. We would, however, agree, if a consensus emerges towards this end, that outer space should be taken as the first item on our agenda.

I do not wish to say more at this stage, except to put these thoughts to you. It seems to me that if we could take up the suggestion now made by the representative of Brazil, you, Mr. Chairman, would have the views of many of us -- of varied kinds, admittedly -- before you, a good basis on which you would, if you so agreed to do, be able to carry out your consultations.
Mr. KHALAF (Iraq): When this question of the implementation of the Declaration on the inadmissibility of foreign intervention was put forward for discussion in the General Committee, my delegation stated that this was a most important question and that it should be a recurrent one which should be discussed in the General Assembly every year, if only because the General Assembly should have firsthand knowledge and information on the implementation of the resolution.

This resolution, which was adopted unanimously last year, should now be considered with regard to its present stage of application. This is why my delegation shares the view of those who believe that this question should be given top priority in our deliberations during this General Assembly.

Of course, there have been some practices that have been followed by this General Assembly concerning the discussion of certain questions -- questions of disarmament, non-proliferation, and others -- but this, as the representative of the United Kingdom just said, does not mean that this is a rule which could not be changed.

May I say also that the representative of Brazil made a very important suggestion this afternoon that you, Mr. Chairman, should consult with delegations for the purpose of finding some order of work to be recommenced to this Committee and acted upon, of course after having heard the views of the delegations around this table and even outside.

My delegation thinks that this is a very good procedure that has been suggested, and we will support it. But we also believe that this Committee does not have to finalize its position regarding the order of all the items on the agenda of this Committee. We can, for example, decide, upon your recommendation, Sir, that we take up one or two items first, and then we will see, later. We do not have to spend so much time in arguing about the order in which we should like to see all these items set out. Also, as regards the joining together of items of the same nature, we do not have to agree upon that now; we can of course discuss that whenever an item related to another item is about to be taken up by the Committee.
Thus, my delegation wants to make three points: first, that the suggestion made by the representative of Brazil was a very wise one; second, that this question of the implementation of the Declaration on the inadmissibility of foreign intervention should be given top priority in order that world public opinion and also the General Assembly may be aware of what steps have been taken to implement it; and, third, that we could later finalize our decision regarding the grouping of the various items and the order in which we should like to have them discussed.

Then, some statements have been made concerning the advisability of having a controversial item discussed at the beginning. I do not know that there is any item which is not controversial that is before this Committee, especially those items which have been coming before this Committee every year now. They are still controversial, and we still discuss them. So I think that the fact that an item is controversial does not really mean we should not take it first; I think it is just the opposite: because it is controversial, because it is new, we should give it a better chance by discussing it right at the beginning, rather than leaving it to the end, only to rush it and again postpone it for discussion at another session of the General Assembly.

Those, Mr. Chairman, were my delegation's remarks concerning this question.

Mr. PINEDA (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, may I first of all be permitted to congratulate you most sincerely upon your election as Chairman of the First Committee. May I also congratulate our Vice-Chairman, the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Fahmy, and the Rapporteur, Mr. Tchernouchtchenko, of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

My observations will be very brief. First of all, I should like to support the proposal of the representative of Brazil that you, Mr. Chairman, in consultation with the delegations, might submit to us at a subsequent meeting a plan for the order of our debate. However, in order to co-operate with you in your work, my delegation would like to point out which items it is most interested in. When I say "most interested in", I do not mean to imply that we are not interested in the other items, but rather that we believe that some priority
should be given, in terms of time, in the first place, to matters connected with disarmament; and in the opinion of my delegation, especially to General Assembly agenda item 24, which is designated as item 1 in document A/C.1/931: namely, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Jointly with this item, my delegation would be interested in having our Committee discuss General Assembly agenda item 28, which is item number three in the agenda of this Committee, and which refers to the urgent need for suspension of the nuclear and thermonuclear tests.

In saying this, my delegation wished to stress the importance which my Government has always attached to these two problems, which, in our view, are the most important ones in reference to disarmament.

Immediately after these items, and because of the position of my country, which was clearly established last year in this very Committee, we would ask for an examination of General Assembly agenda item 96 -- which is item 10 in document A/C.1/931 -- namely: the item relating to the status of the implementation of the Declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty, which we consider of the utmost importance.

With these suggestions, and realizing that in order to reach an agreement on the agenda, the Chairman will require the co-operation of the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur in harmonizing the opinions of all parties insofar as possible, I wish to reiterate our support for the proposal made by the representative of Brazil, which was supported this afternoon by various delegations, to the effect that the Chairman should be authorized to submit a draft agenda to the Committee for its consideration.
Mr. Amjad Ali (Pakistan): May I, on behalf of my delegation, extend to you, Mr. Chairman, our sincere congratulations on your unanimous election as Chairman of this important Committee. In you, Sir, we have a man of great experience and ability, a jurist and a poet. I am quite sure that, under your able guidance, the work of this Committee will proceed smoothly and successfully. My delegation would also like to extend our congratulations to Mr. Fahmy of the United Arab Republic, our Vice-Chairman. His work as Rapporteur is well known to all of us and we could not have made a better choice as Vice-Chairman.

We congratulate also the Rapporteur, the Permanent Representative of the Byelorussian SSR, on his unanimous election to that post.

I had no desire to speak in this procedural debate, but since so many delegations have supported the proposal of the representative of Brazil, I should like to do so also. I thought that if my delegation also presented some suggestions, it might be of some help to you, Mr. Chairman, in ascertaining the views of those delegations that have spoken here and other delegations, in order to be able to reach a consensus in regard to the order of business and priority to be granted to the various items on our agenda.

My delegation has taken its cue from that wise, able and experienced statesman, Mr. Belaunde of Peru, whom I have had the honour of being associated with since 1950 and who always gives us such words of wisdom and valuable advice. He mentioned the concept of timing, and I was attracted by that approach. Therefore, I should like to apply that question of timing to the order of our business.

As has been said by many representatives, from the point of view of timing the most important item is the question of non-proliferation of weapons. If I recollect correctly, some representatives have said that time is running out; and I should like to associate myself with that phrase: time is really running out. Therefore, the most urgent item, from that point of view, in the opinion of my delegation, is the question of non-proliferation.
We would certainly have no objection to having this item placed first on the agenda, if that should be the consensus reached after consultation with various delegations. But it could be discussed with other items which may form a group because if it is believed that the debate should proceed in an orderly sequence, perhaps some other items of the same nature could be linked together with this first item.

As for the remaining items on the agenda, my delegation has no strong views as to the order of priority and we are willing to go along with the majority of the Committee members in this respect.

I should like however to refer to one point which was stressed by the representative of Spain. As we all know -- and this has been repeated by many delegations -- all the items which have been entrusted to this Committee are very important. According to some delegations, certain items are more important than others; but they all have to be discussed during this session of the General Assembly and, as the representative of Spain rightly said, they should be discussed properly and in an orderly manner so that some items are not discussed for one month while others are neglected.

I know how difficult it is to work out any kind of time-table and to adhere to it when it has been worked out, but at least, after consultations have been held and a consensus reached concerning priority of the various items, it might be useful, Mr. Chairman, if you would be kind enough to indicate how many days each item is allotted so that we may have that information before us all the time. Then all delegations would bear in mind that there are other items which are very important and time must be allowed for discussion of those items.

Mr. CHIMIDDCRJ (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time that I have spoken in this Committee, I should like to take the opportunity, on behalf of the Mongolian delegation, to congratulate you and your worthy assistants upon your election to these important positions. I should also like to say how happy my delegation is that our Committee has such a competent body of officers. In our view, this is a good augury for the success of our work.
On the question of the organization of the Committee's work, I should like to make a few comments in supporting the proposal of Mr. Csárdai, representative of the Hungarian People's Republic, concerning the order of priorities of the various items on our agenda.

Previous speakers, for quite understandable reasons, have referred to some items as being particularly timely and I should like to say a few words concerning these items.

The general debate, in which more than half of the delegations have participated up to now, proved that all the speakers agreed as to the tenseness of the present world situation. This is due to the interference of various States in the internal affairs of other States. This intervention has various guises and manifestations, such as open armed aggression, as is the case today in Viet-Nam. That is why my delegation, without underestimating the importance of problems such as the exploration and use of outer space, the moon and other celestial bodies, suggests that we should begin by discussing the item which is the most important on this planet of ours. We would wish top priority to be given to the question of the status of the implementation of the Declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States as an urgent and important question on our agenda. We are of this opinion because of the urgent requirements of the situation today, despite the reasons why some delegations wish to discuss this matter and despite the fact that some delegations will describe as propaganda what is actually the defence of the struggle of peoples for their national liberation.

My delegation considers that items 10 and 12 in document A/C.1/931 are closely linked and we would agree to have item 10 discussed first, followed by the discussion of item 12, since my delegation has always been in favour of discussing the problem of the elimination of foreign military bases as an urgent and important question.
Concerning the withdrawal of foreign forces from South Korea, an item which my delegation is co-sponsoring, we consider that the situation in Korea at present is a dangerous source of international tension, and for that reason we feel that great attention must be paid to the problem.

My delegation also agrees that items 7 and 8 should be discussed somewhat later because the sponsors of those items should have an opportunity to make further efforts towards harmonizing their positions so that when we come to discuss those matters there should be more hope of obtaining an agreed text on an international treaty concerning the exploration and use of outer space and celestial bodies.

In conclusion, may I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to ascertain the views of the Committee concerning the proposal of the delegation of Brazil. The delegation of Brazil has suggested that consultations be held by you with other delegations so that you may present to the Committee a certain order of priorities for items on the agenda.

Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (interpretation from French): Since this is the first time we have spoken in this Committee, the Algerian delegation would like to extend to you, Mr. Chairman, its sincere congratulations upon your election to the post of Chairman of this important Committee. We are convinced that under your wise guidance this main Political Committee of the United Nations will make substantial progress along the path to the solutions that have to be found to so many difficult problems.

May I also add that it is with great pleasure that the delegation of Algeria congratulates Ambassador Ismail Fahmy upon his election as Vice-President of our Committee, and also our Rapporteur, the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Nevertheless, the Algerian delegation believes that at this stage in the debate, different trends have emerged. Hence we support the suggestion of the representative of Brazil who invites our Chairman to continue consultations with the different members of the Committee in order to arrive at an order of priorities that will reflect those trends that have emerged in this Committee.

Without formally invoking article 117 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the delegation of Algeria would invite the Chairman to adjourn the debate in order to proceed with the consultations suggested by Brazil, and supported by many delegations.
Mr. CORNER (New Zealand): Mr. Chairman, may I first say how happy the New Zealand delegation is to be working under the guidance of the three members of our Bureau that the Committee has unanimously elected. Since the main burden will fall upon you, as Chairman, I shall add our conviction that we members of the Committee could not have made a better choice than you, Sir, who combine experience, negotiating skill, imagination and an emotional conviction that progress must be made in solving some of the great problems such as the proliferation of nuclear weapons and disarmament that are on the agenda of the Committee this year.

I wish to make only three points and these very briefly. First, to support the suggestion of the representative of Brazil that you, Mr. Chairman, might discuss the question of the order of items with members of various groups and, taking into account the comments that have been made in this Committee, come back to the Committee with specific proposals.

Secondly, I should like to support the point that has been made by the representative of Japan and others that there should be a logical grouping of the items that we are to discuss. It is clear that the twelve items that are on the agenda of the Committee fall into a logical grouping. We have five items on disarmament including two on non-proliferation. We have three items on outer space; two items on Korea, one item on non-intervention, and one of military bases. It seems clear that for the convenience of the Committee those items should be arranged in some way that facilitates orderly discussion and the proper tabling of proposals for the Committee.

Thirdly, I should merely like to suggest that those engaged in the negotiations on establishing the order of items, may view with some scepticism the claim that some of the items, added to the agenda, are in fact new. It will surely not have escaped the notice of members of the Committee that in the placing of some so-called urgent items on the agenda, we are confronted with what is in effect a new procedural device.
The item on non-intervention was one that was thoroughly discussed last year. It has been the subject of examination in another Committee in the meantime -- the Friendly Relations Committee. It appears on the agenda of the plenary session, in a related form, as the Czechoslovak proposal. If the intention of this item is to enable a discussion of Viet-Nam, then, of course, there are also other places where Viet-Nam is already being discussed -- the plenary session -- and where, in our view, it might well have been and should now be discussed: the Security Council.

However, it may well be that members of the Committee wish to discuss not only Viet-Nam but the question in its broader aspects including, doubtless, such matters as the historical expansion of various States at the expense of their neighbours. Certainly, if it is the wish of the majority that this matter should be taken at an early stage in our proceedings, the New Zealand delegation would raise no objection. I merely point out that it can hardly be claimed that this item has either novelty or urgency.
I would also draw attention to the alleged item on military bases, and would note that a Soviet draft resolution dealing with exactly the same point was discussed in April of last year in the Disarmament Commission and was withdrawn. The subject has, of course, also been raised in the Fourth Committee at various sessions.

As for the alleged new item on Korea, I am sure it will not have escaped the notice of representatives that in this very Committee last year, on 16 December, the delegations of Hungary and Mongolia submitted a draft resolution the main operative paragraphs of which would have had the Assembly decide to withdraw from South Korea all United States troops and other foreign military personnel stationed there under the flag of the United Nations, and to dissolve immediately the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. That draft resolution was, of course, thoroughly discussed and was rejected by a large majority.

There is, of course, no reason why members cannot bring up exactly the same items in the Committee again. But, as I have said, it cannot then be claimed that they are either novel or urgent items.

In connexion with the Korean item, I would suggest that when the Chairman and others are discussing the order of items it might well be kept in mind that the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea -- the United Nations body in Korea -- is an item on the agenda and must surely be discussed before a proposal relating to the abolition of that body.
Mr. AUGUSTE (Haiti) (interpretation from French): Going beyond the ritualistic formulas, I am particularly happy to extend to the Chairman the congratulations of my delegation and myself on his election to this high post in the First Committee. He is among the great and outstanding diplomats who honour our continent and our Latin American group.

I also extend my sincere congratulations to the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur, who will certainly assist the Chairman with efficiency.

We regard the suggestions made this morning by the representative of Saudi Arabia, Mr. Baroody, as extremely constructive. They are full of commonsense and wisdom and reflect the great experience of a man who has a deep knowledge of the political problems of our Committee and their consequences. In principle, my delegation will support those suggestions unreservedly.

If, however, those suggestions are not accepted over the others, my delegation will support the no less wise proposal made by the representative of Brazil that the Committee should leave it to the Chairman to undertake the necessary consultations and then submit his suggestions to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The names of two representatives are still on the list of speakers. I understand that they do not wish to speak precisely on the order of priority of the items inscribed on our agenda; that, rather, they wish to exercise their right of reply or to offer some clarification. Before calling on them, I should like to sum up the procedural position as I see it, in order that we may have a clear view of where we stand.

During the discussion this morning and this afternoon, various suggestions have been made regarding the manner of grouping the items and the priority to be given to the discussion of the items. I do not think that this is the right time to summarize each of the proposals that have been made. They are different in nature, although I think that they could be reduced to three fundamental positions.

However, another suggestion is before the Committee -- the one made by the representative of Brazil that the debate on this question should be suspended for the moment, that the Chairman should then proceed to undertake consultations, and that at a subsequent meeting he should report to us. I am, of course,
(The Chairman)

in the hands of the Committee. However, I think that the task that has been assigned to me is very difficult, and I would therefore venture to suggest that all the officers of the Committee, and not merely the Chairman, should assume this very heavy responsibility. If the Committee decided to accept that procedure, we could postpone a final decision to our next meeting -- which could be held on Wednesday, 12 October. That would allow time for consultations among the various delegations.

I do not want formally to invoke rule 117 of the rules of procedure, because I do not think that that was the intention of the representatives of Brazil and Algeria. I would merely suggest that the debate on this matter should be suspended until consultations with the various delegations have been carried out by the officers of the Committee.

If that procedure is acceptable, this meeting could be adjourned after we have heard the representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply or to make some clarifications of points raised during this debate.

If there is no objection, I shall take it that that procedure is adopted and that the officers of the Committee will consult the various delegations and will then present to the Committee, not their own suggestions, but a report on the position as they understand it and on the agreements, if any, that have been reached.

On that understanding, I now call on the representative of Cuba, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. ALARCON QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Since this is the first time that I have spoken in this Committee at this session, I should like to congratulate the Chairman on his election to that high office. I also congratulate the Vice-Chairman, Ambassador Fahmy, and the Rapporteur, Ambassador Tchernouchtchenko. I shall limit myself to those few words of congratulations, since I do not wish to take up too much of the Committee's time when I have asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.
(Mr. Alarcon Quesada, Cuba)

During the discussion today, and in connexion with the proposal for the organization of our work that was made by the representative of Hungary and that we fully support, an accusation was made, apparently in defence of the principle of non-intervention, against the first conference of solidarity of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, held at Havana, the capital of Cuba, last January. We had already learned, through a broadcast by a rather unreliable station, that a group of illustrious "defenders" of American democracy had already met to that end.
As we see it, these attacks against the tri-continental conference and against the peoples' countries and organizations that attended the meeting pursue the only purpose of justifying imperialist interests while diverting world public opinion from the concrete aggressions that are being committed against the people of Viet-Nam and other peoples. The peoples' countries and organizations of the three continents met in Havana to strengthen their struggle against imperialism, colonialism, racial discrimination, exploitation of oligarchies, misery, starvation and illiteracy.

In short, they met to fight intervention and its consequences by imperialists and colonialists since such interventions have occurred against our peoples. The imperialists have always used this kind of ruse to deceive peoples, but it is not so easy to deceive them. Similar words were spoken by the colonial lackeys of the past in order to defeat Simon Bolivar and the valiant armies that fought for American independence. Similar criticism was launched against the Panama Conference of 1866, which was convened by Bolivar, among other things, to aid the nations of our continent that were then subject to colonial domination and to help them towards independence.

Moreover, the armed struggle in Latin America was not born in January of this year, it was born long ago and it has its roots in the secular existence of our peoples in the face of the rapacious avarice of imperialism and the servility of the oligarchies that paid lip service to them.

Cuba is proud of having provided the site for this tri-continental conference, and supports all the agreements arrived at. Each man will find in history the place he has chosen for himself. We shall raise the standard of Bolivar with pride, and those who imitate the imperialists of the past may find that they will occupy the same place in history as those they imitate.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call upon the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to exercise his right of reply and clarify some of the points raised in the debate.
Mr. FEDORENSK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We take the floor in the exercise of our right of reply to certain speakers and in order to clarify our position. We do this so that what we are about to say can be taken into account during the further discussions on this matter, including the forthcoming consultations between the officers of our Committee and various delegations.

During the debate on the order of priority of the items on the agenda of our Committee, certain representatives, motivated by their own considerations, expressed different views on this matter. Many of these views undoubtedly deserve our full attention and close scrutiny, but some of the representatives went so far as to refer to lengthy considerations and to launch into lengthy disquisitions of a legal, political and historical nature.

It goes without saying that we cannot disregard the experience of the past and the methods used in the past in debating various problems, and that we cannot disregard the wisdom accumulated over the centuries, but it would hardly be justified to think only of the past and to hearken back to a time when people, including the canonized, categorized the knowledge of their day and were in the throes of ancient and obsolete conceptions.

Times have changed, and our attitudes have changed towards many phenomena of the present day world. We are in duty bound to examine facts and phenomena in the spirit of our times and of our conception of the world. In this connexion, we cannot help but draw attention to some statements made today in this Committee.

First of all, I think that our Committee should not become a forum for academic discussion. With all respect to various academicians, we have met here in order to examine in the most responsible manner important, timely and urgent political problems, problems which we must discuss because life itself demands this.

Further, as could be understood from the debate, various representatives thought that the Committee could examine questions which are non-controversial and which would not be likely to give rise to polemics. Of course, so far as considerations of comfort are concerned, this approach and attitude might commend itself to some delegations. But, are these the considerations that should guide our Organization? Can we be motivated by this kind of consideration and approach when discussing items on the agenda of the Political Committee? No, the problems confronting us are problems of peace and security which are much too serious for that. They require an immediate discussion and decision by us.
It is well known that the very existence of the United Nations is due to the fact that mankind is constantly submitted to various troubles, tribulations and dangers when conflicts arise and when military interventions and wars of aggression take place. Why then should we in the main Committee of the General Assembly create illusions and fall prey to such illusions and think that all is for the best in the best of worlds and that the waters of the international sea are untroubled?

Have we the right, under present conditions, to allow ourselves to be deluded and content ourselves with pious words concerning successes achieved and the harmonious atmosphere prevalent in this Committee if, in fact, we did not even come close to discharging our duty or carrying out the responsibilities of our Organization? Our Committee, which is in duty bound under the Charter of this Organization to discuss the most important political problems of contemporary life, cannot look for an easy way out and cannot deal only with the easy problems. It has no right to avoid discussion of important and urgent problems, problems connected with the fate of peoples and the sovereignty of nations, the maintenance of international peace and security.

Of course, much can be said about the priority of various items on our agenda, but we must draw attention to the fact that as a result of the most flagrant armed intervention and interference from abroad, in violation of the Declaration adopted in this Committee last year, blood is flowing and cruel war is being waged in South-East Asia.
There is an escalation of aggression confronting us. Can we, in these circumstances, delay discussion of an urgent and important matter such as the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States?

Mr. Csatorday (Hungary): Mr. Chairman, my delegation was very glad to hear that, under your guidance and wise leadership, the Bureau is going to undertake some consultations with the various delegations in order to assign priorities to the different items on the agenda of our Committee.

My delegation has submitted a proposal, and we have heard some arguments against it. We do not find those arguments convincing enough, but of course opinions of this kind can be very individual and very subjective.

I should also like to stress some general remarks that have been made by some very distinguished and very experienced representatives. These general considerations could be very influential during the consultations which you will hold, Mr. Chairman. Among other things, we have heard an appeal to the effect that, since it would be advisable for our Committee not to start its work in a bad atmosphere, we should create a more agreeable atmosphere among the delegations. There was even a suggestion made not to report disagreements, to try to report agreements on everything and not to take up the controversial issues but just to discuss those issues on which we agree.

It is the view of my delegation that we can have a very pleasant atmosphere in our discussions, and we hope that the discussion will be on the basis of normal procedures, that they will be held in a normal way. But can we avoid dealing with the most important political questions that reflect the very serious international situation and the great tensions prevailing everywhere? We may exchange arguments here in this room, but in other parts of the world bullets are flying, bombs are being dropped and people are being killed -- and we are dealing with the problems connected with those events. We cannot ignore the threatening danger of a nuclear "mushroom".
We have to try to clarify the controversial issues existing among us, not to avoid them. That would be very misleading and would not facilitate our work.

In mentioning these points, I do not wish to introduce the spirit of the cold war in our Committee. That certainly is far from my thoughts. But we have to face facts; we have to face the real political situation. In the view of my delegation, our Committee has to take up the most serious, the most urgent and the most difficult problems first. We should deal with these problems at the very beginning when we are still fresh, when we are more active; we can leave the easy problems -- if there are any -- to the end. When we have become tired, it will be easy for us to agree on certain problems. But it is very difficult to make such a distinction. We have to consider the most urgent and the most timely problems, the new proposals. Whether a problem is new or not new, as was stated by one of our colleagues, I think that such problems have always been judged in the context of the existing situation. That was probably a problem impossible to solve a few years ago might today be a problem we can solve. If we had proposed the complete dissolution of colonialism fifteen years ago, everyone would have laughed at us. But today it has become a reality. Thus those problems which were taken up a few years ago and on which resolutions were voted down, we are now presenting under the actual circumstances, and we hope that the delegations, guided by a universal desire for peace and by the interests of all peoples, will be able to settle these issues and solve these problems.

As to the very relative attitude towards certain questions, it was very interesting to note that on the problem of non-intervention one of the very distinguished and learned representatives said that there was almost no debate on this issue last year, while another representative, who is also very experienced, said that it was thoroughly discussed, that there was nothing further to discuss. Thus, it can be seen that the approach is very different. We have to take these questions on their merits. Do we consider that the danger of intervention has passed? Is there no threat of intervention in the world any more? I do not think that anybody in this Committee could say that. Thus this is a problem and we have to take it up. It is a very
serious and urgent question, and we have to tackle it very resolutely and with our strongest forces.

I just wanted to recommend these few aspects of these questions and problems to the consideration of the Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Hungary may rest assured that his suggestion will be taken into account by the Bureau.

Mr. SEINER (Czechoslovakia): I should like to comment on the statement made a while ago by the representative of New Zealand. The item proposed by the Soviet Union, which is listed under item 10 of document A/C.1/931, concerns the question of the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States. This item is based on Article 2, paragraph 7 of our Charter and on the Declaration adopted at the twentieth session of the General Assembly. The purpose of the item proposed by Czechoslovakia may be seen clearly from the title of that item, namely, "Strict observance of the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations, and of the right of peoples to self-determination". This Czechoslovak item is based mainly on Article 2, paragraph 4 of our Charter. It has been very clearly proved already in the General Committee that both of the items that I have referred to have their own specific merits. The two items been allocated to different bodies of this Organization. The Czechoslovak item has been allocated to the plenary session of the General Assembly and the item proposed by the USSR has been allocated to the First Committee. Therefore, there is no ground for any statement or any attempt seeking, by reference to the item proposed by Czechoslovakia, to challenge the importance of the item proposed by the USSR.
Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I would have preferred not to speak again; however, I am deeply concerned about one aspect of this matter.

We are very thankful for the suggestion made by the representative of Brazil that the Chairman should consult with various groups or delegations, and I am happy that my colleague from Brazil added that his suggestion did not preclude the Committee from hearing views on the agenda. His suggestion was a very wise one indeed. It will enable the Chairman to be in a better position to poll the various delegations in private. Since our Chairman is the Chairman of all of us, I am very concerned that his reputation should not in any way be tarnished. The Chairman wisely grasped this concern by saying that this task should probably be undertaken by the Bureau, and not by him alone as Chairman. No Chairman should be placed in the position where, should he find some doubt or a balance between opposing views, he would have to make the choice, because then he would be called partial no matter how saintly he may be.

Therefore, I should like to add a suggestion to the one presented by the representative of Brazil, hoping that this will enable the Chairman to avoid being the sole catalytic agent in bringing the sides together. My suggestion is that first the Bureau should meet in private with the delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union, in the hope that this problem can be settled by compromise. If you begin by polling each of us who has spoken here, we may become adamant in our stand as neutrals or as partisans of one or another group of States, and the cleavage may become more serious. Since our good friends from the Soviet Union and the United States, for whom we have the highest respect, have shown great sagacity and restraint at this session, I think this procedure might shorten the road to agreement by Wednesday, if it proves possible for us to meet on that day. I am not submitting any guidelines; I certainly would not do so. I am merely submitting a suggestion.

Having said that and without touching on the substance or the merits or demerits of any of the agenda items, I should like to reply to my good friend, the representative of Hungary. Although he may have been referring to the more lucid statement of certain aspects of my suggestion made by our patriarch, the representative of Peru -- I say "patriarch" advisedly, for Mr. Belaunde has been with us for so many years -- I think that by implication his remarks also applied
to what I said. The representative of Hungary said that we are agreed on the questions of disarmament and outer space, because -- and I am paraphrasing him here -- they are easy questions, and that therefore they should be relegated to the end of our work. He said that we should start our work with the item that is numbered 10 in document A/C.1/951. I wish the items on disarmament and outer space were indeed as simple as he seems to indicate. There is still a great deal of disagreement even on the question of outer space. I had the privilege of personally attending the meetings of the Sub-Committee in Geneva. I have heard that the differences have been narrowed greatly, which is very heartening, because the shorter the time it takes to reach agreement the less complex the problem might become. On this subject we are dealing with outer space, where it is only necessary for two or three parties to compose their differences. But here on earth we have so many problems. I am afraid that if many of us succeeded in reaching the moon or any other planet, our problems there would be as intractable as they are on earth. Therefore, let agreement be reached, if possible, by those who are responsible for the differences on the question of outer space. I assure the Committee that those of us who can go only as far as an airplane can take us would applaud their agreement. But there are differences even on the question of outer space, and this is what I should like to tell the representative of Hungary. I witnessed what took place in the Sub-Committee in Geneva. I do not know where the representative of Hungary was, but I was present at those meetings.

Secondly, we cannot say that everything is well with respect to the question of nuclear proliferation.
Therefore, with all respect for the representative of Hungary, I believe that, by implication, he misinterpreted what I said and, perhaps more so, what the representative of Peru has said. Having stated this, that we still have differences to work out on these items of outer space and disarmament, it behoves me to make a further comment. And God is my witness that I have no axe to grind, but that, rather, I am one of those who would support wholeheartedly item 10, "Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Iradmissibility of Intervention...".

Mark the word "status". And forthwith I want to say to the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States, and to everybody who is directly or indirectly concerned in that conflict in South-East Asia, or in any other conflict in other parts of the world for that matter, that the "status" is most unsatisfactory. We all agree on that. No one can disagree with the fact that the status is unsatisfactory.

But if we were to discuss the matter at this very early stage, would the status become satisfactory? Pragmatically, would we achieve any result? That is the point with which we should grapple. The status is unsatisfactory. I am sure that even those who are called imperialists -- on whether they are or not I will reserve my view till I come to the substance -- or others who are called abettors -- and I will reserve my right to talk on the substance of that when we come to it -- or interventionists, all agree that the status of the implementation is most unsatisfactory. Would it become satisfactory, by the dint of logic, if we discussed it forthwith? I do not think so. We have bodies like the Security Council, and some parties concerned refuse to recognize that this question of the conflict should be discussed in the United Nations, for which the present item has been inserted as a matter of urgency.

Why did not the parties most immediately concerned call for a special session? That should have been done if it were of such importance. Nobody asked for a special session. And when some of us, including myself, spoke privately about this question a few months ago, saying that it should be discussed in the Security Council, we were told: "No, no, do not do it". It is true that they were not lying or misrepresenting. The other parties to the conflict were refusing to have this question considered in the Security Council or in the United Nations.
Therefore, I submit to the representatives of Hungary and Czechoslovakia, who supported the idea that precedence should be given to the question, that the status of the matter, although unsatisfactory, will not improve one iota if it were discussed at the beginning. Because those who are exercising power have their own policies. Call them stubborn, call them "as of necessity" -- depending on the outlook you have. I am referring to those who think that they should not intervene. Call them stubborn, imperialistic, interventionist, and all the epithets or adjectives you can find of an equal vehemence in our lexicon; and others would give them another name.

There is a cleavage here. The test should be whether by discussing this question first we will achieve results from those who have peace and war in their hands in South-East Asia. I personally believe that the status will not change, but, as has been rightly mentioned by the representatives of Hungary, Bulgaria, the Soviet Union, and others of the same persuasion, this item should not be relegated to the end of the agenda. That is why I suggested that it be considered even before the middle of the agenda. And that is the basis of a compromise. It could come after we dispose of outer space -- if we can -- and certain phases of disarmament, and only on an interim basis discuss the question of Korea. Because something will emerge, or nothing will emerge, with regard to bringing that partitioned, sad land together, unifying it.

Saudi Arabia is far from Korea, but we know what partition means. The big Powers did not consult us before 1945 and they partitioned many things. They even partitioned cities in Europe, and partitioned lands. And then we come here as false witnesses. We have our views. I am not going to say anything about the substance.

But, on an interim basis, when we dispose of the question with regard to whether or not a proper invitation can be sent to both parties -- I hope not in a protracted manner -- we can come to the question of "status" and the inadmissibility of intervention. If we do not apply ourselves objectively, we will find ourselves, from the beginning, taking rigid positions and poisoning the atmosphere -- polluted as it is in New York with carbon monoxide; and where we live under tension in this big city, all of us who as individuals come from cultures where we have leisure -- and nerves will be frayed, and emotions will run high, and the "status" will become more unsatisfactory.
To sum up, this is the argumentation. I would have preferred not to make it and to be inarticulate. But I found that this House may very easily be divided. And let us not forget the Biblical saying: A house divided against itself cannot stand. Let us in unity appeal to our colleagues, through you, Mr. Chairman, and if you want, through the Bureau, to cause the Soviet Union and the United States to put their heads together for the sake of peace and unity in this House -- not too much together so that we ourselves are left out in the cold, but together for the sake of peace, to which we all aspire, and for which, as Ambassador Fedorenko rightly said, the big Powers have a primary responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Saudi Arabia, Mr. Baroody, for concerning himself with the task of protecting the good reputation of the Chairman. May I assure him that we shall bear in mind all his suggestions and try to meet with all parties, and avoid any great difficulties or leaving anyone out in the cold.
Mr. BERNARDO (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): May I be permitted, first of all, to express my satisfaction at seeing in the Chair of this important Committee, the First Committee, a man of the great talent, ability, experience and independence of judgement that characterize Mr. Benites. Within the Latin American group and at the appropriate time, I paid due tribute to him; but today, and this being the first time that I speak in this Committee, I feel duty-bound to repeat those expressions of tribute to him by way of paying him his due, even though it might seem somewhat inappropriate for me to do so since Mr. Benites is an adopted son of my own country.

Secondly, I wish to assure Mr. Benites that in this debate, as in all subsequent ones, I shall faithfully abide by the rules of procedure, so that he may also depend upon me to heed his appeal this morning urging us not to go into the substance of the various points but to confine ourselves, rather, to the consideration of priorities only.

And now, in connexion with this matter, may I say that my delegation fully supports the very wise proposal of Mr. Sette Camara, the representative of Brazil, to the effect that the Chairman, after the necessary consultations, should submit to us an agenda which he regards as most in keeping with the interests of the United Nations -- which proposal the Chairman later modified, broadening it to include in this delicate responsibility not only himself alone but the other members of the Bureau as well.

Third -- and I shall be very brief -- I wish to state that I share the views of those who have regarded it as necessary to group items on the basis of their intrinsic affinities, and to establish an order of priority having regard to two factors, namely, the importance and the urgency of the items. I lay particular stress on the urgent questions, those problems that the whole world is waiting for the United Nations to confront and resolve, those that are threatening the prestige and authority of the United Nations and those that are filling all mankind with anguish. Of course, granted the common-sense of our Chairman, this order of priority cannot be expected to conform to the interests of any geographic region or of any particular country; rather, it will correspond to the interests of the world at large and to the pressing concerns of mankind. I feel certain that this will be so because I have faith in the Chairman of our Committee.
Mr. PEDERSEN (United States of America): I do not intend to go into the substance of the issues at this time. When these respective items come up for discussion, we shall have a number of forthright things to say about policies and practices which are extant in various parts of the world. I wanted to say at this point, with respect to the procedural suggestion of the representative of Saudi Arabia, only that as far as the United States delegation is concerned, we are prepared to consult in any manner which you, Mr. Chairman, and the Bureau consider most conducive to the effective working of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Since there are no other speakers on the list, and if the Committee agrees, I shall now adjourn this meeting.

The meeting rose at 5:55 p.m.