



UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



GENERAL

S/PV.680

10 September 1954

ENGLISH

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND EIGHTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 10 September 1954, at 3 p.m.

SEE PAGE 29

<u>President:</u>	Mr. URRUTIA	Colombia
<u>Members:</u>	Brazil	Mr. LEME
	China	Mr. TSIANG
	Denmark	Mr. BORBERG
	France	Mr. HOPPENOT
	Lebanon	Mr. RIZK
	New Zealand	Mr. MUNRO
	Turkey	Mr. SARTER
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. VYSHINSKY
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Pierson DIXON
	United States of America	Mr. LODGE

Any corrections to the originals of speeches in this record should be submitted in writing, within two working days, to Mr. H. Roigt, Director, Language Services Division, Room 1241, Headquarters. Corrections should be accompanied by or incorporated in a letter, on headed notepaper, bearing the appropriate symbol number and enclosed in an envelope marked "URGENT". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily if delegations will be good enough to incorporate them in mimeographed copies of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED AT 9.30 HOURS ON 13 SEPTEMBER 1954,
THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 9.30 HOURS ON 15 SEPTEMBER 1954.

54-24666

Incl. # 3

See pages 31-33 esp.

The interpretation into English of the statement by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the 679th meeting was given.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The 679th meeting is closed with this interpretation. I am now going to declare the 680th meeting of the Security Council open. If there are no objections to the adoption of the agenda, which is exactly the same as that adopted this morning by 10 votes to 1, I will call upon the representative of the United Kingdom to speak.

Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(translated from Russian): For the same reasons as I gave in my first statement objecting to the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the 679th meeting of the Security Council, I also object to its inclusion in the agenda of the 680th meeting of the Council.

The discussion of this item seems to me to be absolutely profitless and unjustified.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): For the reasons I gave this morning I call for the vote on the adoption of the agenda.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Brazil, China, Colombia, Denmark, France, Lebanon, New Zealand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The agenda is adopted by 10 votes to 1.

LETTER DATED 8 SEPTEMBER 1954 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/3287) (continued)

Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): I do not know whether the significance to be attached to the vote of the representative of the Soviet Union, which was a vote against discussing this question, is that we should pay no attention to his speech. But I listened to it and I propose to consider it as a speech which has been delivered in spite of this inconsistency which I detect in his attitude.

It was with profound regret that we heard of the incident of 4 September in which a United States Navy plane was shot down by Soviet fighters. There have been a deplorable number of incidents of this kind. To shoot without provocation at foreign aircraft which have appeared anywhere near, or even remotely near, Soviet territory seems unfortunately to have become a Soviet practice.

Mention has been made during this debate of various similar incidents, including one in which a British aircraft was involved. Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom fully supports the action of the United States Government in seizing the Security Council of this matter and thus alerting world opinion. It is, in our view, most desirable that there should be a strong and widespread international reaction against such unwarranted acts of force in times of peace which can only serve to increase international tension.

Let us examine for a moment the circumstances of this particular incident. The United States representative has given us a calm and objective account of what occurred. The representative of the Soviet Union disputes these facts. His version was diametrically different. That is perhaps what could be expected. But frankly, it did not seem to me to carry conviction. I am bound to say that in the view of my delegation there appears to be strong prima facie evidence that the attack was not only unprovoked and made without warning, but occurred well outside Soviet air space. On the evidence the attack is indefensible.

My Government would think it deplorable if the practice came to be accepted of shooting down aircraft, whether military or civilian, in time of peace, without warning or provocation, merely on the ground that they were in the neighbourhood of the territorial air space of another State. This would be contrary to every precept of proper international behaviour. Moreover, we are, I think, bound to find this trigger-happy attitude on the part of the Soviet Union glaringly incompatible with professions of a desire to reduce international tension.

My delegation wishes to express its great distress at the particular incident to which the United States delegation has drawn attention and its profound sympathy with the friends and relations of the unfortunate airman who must be presumed to have lost his life as a result of it.

Most delegations here, I am sure, share these sentiments, and I should hope that our discussion here would serve to make it plain that world opinion strongly disapproves of such acts of uncivilized behaviour.

The United Nations is now seized of this matter, and the views of the Council will be clearly on record. It is incumbent upon all Members of the United Nations, and indeed non-Members, to take heed of the views expressed in this Council and to conduct themselves in accordance with those principles of international behaviour which must be the foundation of good relations between countries.

Mr. HOPPENOT (France) (translated from French): The intention of the United States delegation in taking the step of bringing before the Security Council the incident which occurred off the Siberian coast on 4 September, resulting in the destruction of an American naval aircraft and the loss of at least one human life, was, as the head of that delegation has told us, to draw the Security Council's attention to an occurrence likely to threaten the maintenance of international peace and security. That step was actuated by a spirit consistent with that of the Charter, and the incident to which it proposes to call the attention of the highest tribunal established by the Charter itself is of a kind which it is undoubtedly our duty and our right to take into consideration. It is for this reason that the French delegation voted for the placing of this matter on our agenda, as did ten other members of the Council.

The United States representative's explanation of his Government's position favourably impressed us all by its moderation and its studied objectivity. We were equally glad to hear him affirm the United States Government's desire to embark upon the settlement of all the regrettable incidents which he enumerated, in a spirit consistent with the precepts laid down in the Charter, by a process of peaceful negotiations and, should they fail, by recourse to the International Court of Justice. That is a course from which peace-loving peoples should never allow themselves to be diverted, and the Soviet Government would greatly weaken the force of the assurances in favour of international peace and conciliation of which it has so often given us here if it refused to take it.

I listened with no less attention to Mr. Vyshinsky's statement, and I was glad to note that our Soviet colleague endeavoured, so far as the fire of his ever youthful temperament allowed him, to adopt as moderate a tone as Mr. Cabot Lodge. I hope that in the weeks and months to come the exchange of views between our two eminent colleagues will continue thus to combine firmness as regards substance with this relaxed moderation of form.

With great brilliance Mr. Vyshinsky made the most of certain contradictions and certain divergencies which he found in the official United States documents and press reports on the incident of 4 September. We had before us an advocate interested not so much in defending a legal argument or in establishing the facts of his case as in endeavouring to embarrass the witnesses by an ingenious and insidious cross-examination. But he who tries to prove too much often proves nothing, and, in my opinion, there are grounds for seeing in certain contradictions and certain fumbings and manoeuvres by the United States proof of the United States Government's good faith rather than of its perversity. By acknowledging spontaneously that it had been wrong in stating on the first day that the American aircraft had not replied to the fire of the Soviet fighters, it gave proof of honesty rather than of duplicity. There was nothing to compel it, other than a wish to be truthful, to correct the assertion, which could have been contradicted only by an unsupported counter-assertion. As to the testimony of the members of the American crew, the fact that the news agencies and press of that country gathered and reproduced them at such length gives evidence of the freedom of inquiry and of the press in the American democracy; it proves that the authorities to which that crew is responsible preferred to allow this testimony to be freely and publicly expressed rather than dictate it or suppress it in favour of an official version. I wish I were sure that in a similar situation put in reverse, all Governments throughout the world, and certain of them in particular, would acknowledge so quickly any error that they had committed, and would produce in public the witnesses of the incidents so freely -- I might almost say so simplemindedly.

About the incidents themselves I shall merely say that this attitude on the part of the American authorities, which Mr. Vyshinsky holds against them, seems to me to constitute a solid and even a convincing presumption of their good faith, and that while I am no more an airman than Mr. Cabot Lodge or Mr. Vyshinsky himself, all the airmen I have been able to consult agree that it is almost inconceivable that a bomber could deliberately expose itself to the risk of a reply bound to be fatal to it by opening fire on fighters which are much faster, much lighter and much less vulnerable than itself.

But the question before us is a different one -- or rather, it goes far beyond the incident of 4 September. What should be borne in mind, and the view the Security Council should express, is that it is inadmissible that the undoubtedly regrettable but often inevitable presence of an aircraft close to or even over the territory of a foreign country, in peace time, should be punished by its destruction and by loss of human life. Even if the aircraft has committed an error, even if it is established at the very moment of the incident -- and that is strictly speaking impossible -- that that error was voluntarily and deliberately committed, the use of force in driving it off, with the certain risk of destroying it, should not be accepted by civilized countries maintaining peaceful relations with each other. The varying limits of territorial waters were fixed in the period of sail, when it took vessels several hours to cover a distance an aircraft now covers in a few minutes. Besides, any airman will tell you that it is as impossible in the great majority of cases for an observer on land or at sea as it is for the pilot of an aircraft to determine within a matter of kilometres the vertical position of an aircraft. This consideration, opening up as it does so many possibilities of errors committed in good faith, should be enough to render recourse to force and violence in correcting and rectifying them morally unacceptable. I must add that it should also indicate the desirability of prudence and wisdom to aircraft carrying out peaceful missions near foreign territory; and it is to be hoped that the pilots of such aircraft will always leave an ample margin of adequate safety between the international air space open to them and the national air spaces, the limits of which they cannot easily discern exactly from the air.

As Mr. Cabot Lodge has reminded us, when an incident of this kind occurs there is an international procedure which should make it possible for it to be settled in an honourable and peaceful way, in the spirit and according to the provisions of the Charter. If a State is convinced of the illicit presence of an aircraft over its territory, means to prove the justification of its complaint other than shooting the aircraft down in full flight are open to it; and if such an affair has unfortunately ended in tragedy and the two parties are casting the responsibility for this upon each other, the same procedure of negotiation, enquiries and finally recourse to the International Court of Justice should enable the injured party to obtain satisfaction and to prevent the recurrence of such incidents by appropriate measures.

As I said at the beginning of this statement, it was with deep satisfaction that I heard Mr. Cabot Lodge, speaking on behalf of his Government, open wide the doors for the application of this procedure both to the incident of 4 September and to every similar case, and I regretted the more that I could not find in Mr. Vyshinsky's statement any response to that declaration, which was wholly in conformity with the spirit of the Charter, by which all of us here should be actuated. The action taken by the United States delegation will have had the great merit of disclosing to the Security Council and to world public opinion a state of affairs and a number of incidents which have plunged only too many homes into mourning, peace-time though it may be, and which are both symptoms of the distrust dominating international relations and factors aggravating this tension. A discussion such as the one we have here begun should permit full light to be thrown on this situation, and should give the conscience of mankind the opportunity to express its disapproval of methods of behaviour which contravene all the precepts of international morality.

In expressing to the United States delegation its deep sympathy for the unfortunate victims of these methods, the French delegation cannot but fully associate itself with the action it has taken and support that action without any reservation.

Mr. LEME (Brazil) (translated from French): The United States delegation is submitting to the Security Council for consideration a somewhat serious situation. A United States military aircraft has been attacked over the high seas by two Soviet MIG aircraft while carrying out a peaceful mission. The aircraft was destroyed and human lives were lost.

We very much regret that at the very time when the United Nations is preparing for the work of the ninth session of the General Assembly, after the conclusion of the armistice in Indo-China, a time when all hearts are joyfully celebrating universal peace, a fresh incident should have occurred, thus threatening the maintenance of this peace and of international security.

An atmosphere of mistrust and hostility cannot possibly constitute the climate in which the nations of the two hemispheres are to live. Peoples sometimes differ in their ideologies; that is of no importance. The peoples gathered under the flag of the United Nations have pledged themselves to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours. This spirit should govern the conduct of nations on land and sea and in the air. It is understandable that in an atmosphere charged with intrigue and suspicion excesses may sometimes be committed. Such may be the conduct of certain persons but it must in no circumstances be that of nations. Accordingly, an act of the kind which has been reported to the Council, if it is not the first, compels us to conclude that the requisite steps to prevent the recurrence of such incidents have not been taken.

The Brazilian delegation takes note of the incident of 4 September; it regrets the fate of the victims, and, in the interest of international peace and security, appeals to States to give strict and categorical instructions to ensure that the men to whom missions of responsibility are entrusted should by caution and calm be able to prevent the recurrence of events such as that now before the Security Council.

Mr. TSIANG (China): I voted both this morning and this afternoon in favour of the adoption of the agenda, after listening carefully to the objections of the Soviet Union representative.

The Soviet Union representative raised two objections. One was to the effect that, in his mind, the United States version of the incident of 4 September was entirely wrong and that, therefore, the incident was not worthy of attention. His second objection was based on his opinion that a discussion in the Security Council of the incident of 4 September would, as he stated, aggravate the situation in the Far East. I should like to take up the second objection first.

I do not believe that by itself any discussion in the Security Council aggravates any international situation -- or, for that matter, improves any international situation. What effect a discussion in the Security Council can have on the factual situation in the world depends to a large extent on the tone of the discussion. In this respect, I should like to join with preceding speakers this afternoon in congratulating the United States representative on the moderation and sobriety of his statement and on the fact that he informed the Council that his Government was ready and willing to accept any of the means of peaceful settlement prescribed by the Charter of the United Nations. If there should be any aggravation of the international situation as a result of this discussion, the responsibility therefor would certainly not lie on the shoulders of the United States delegation.

FGB/ns

S/PV.680

16

Suppose the Council had decided to accept the objection of the Soviet Union representative and had dismissed this complaint offhand. Would that have improved the international situation? Let us imagine the resulting situation in the world if we had accepted the advice of the Soviet Union representative. I do not believe that it would have been improved at all. I believe that the effect of such action would, indeed, have aggravated the situation not only in the Far East but in the world as a whole, for by dismissing this complaint without a discussion we should have destroyed one of the important instruments of peace which the world has today.

I am firmly convinced that the Security Council did the right thing in adopting this agenda and in proceeding to consider the serious complaint that the delegation of the United States has placed before us. I would go a little further and say this: the United States, in bringing this case to the Security Council, has acted not only in defence of the interests of the United States but also in loyal fulfilment of its obligations as a Member of the United Nations.

Now we are faced with this situation. We have heard a version of the facts presented to us by the representative of the United States; we have heard also, a version of the facts presented to us by the representative of the Soviet Union; and the two versions are diametrically opposite. I am not a third party witness of the incident, and I doubt if it would be possible for this Council or any other international body to obtain a third party version of what took place for the simple factual reason that third parties did not happen to be on the scene.

What are we to do with these two versions? I have certain considerations in mind -- certain guiding considerations. In the first place, in the United States -- and, in fact, in all countries of the free world -- there is no compulsion, legal, political or social, on the citizens of the country or on the servants of the government, civil or military, to falsify reports to their superiors. When a public servant in a free country -- be he civil or military -- sends a report to his superiors he is expected to report the facts as he saw them.

FGB/ns

S/PV.680

17

That is an elementary standard of conduct in all the free countries. In fact, in the free countries governments do not assume for themselves omniscience and do not presume to determine any line of thinking. That is not true in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union Government does assume omniscience and does presume to determine the thinking and even the reporting of its servants.

The fact that the Government of the United States corrected a part of its first note adds to my respect for the veracity of that Government. The fact that the United States press, with thousands of newspapers, discussed the incident from different angles and called the attention of the public to the different versions and to the different aspects of this whole story also adds to my respect for the United States version of this incident.

The United States Government, and in fact the government of any free country, faces domestic criticism for its public statements. That is one consideration in my mind in viewing and reviewing the two versions of the incident of 4 September which have been presented to this Council. A second consideration is that such incidents have occurred in the past. The representative of the United States this morning called our attention to a number of such incidents affecting United States aircraft. He also called the attention of this Council briefly to some of the incidents affecting aircraft of other countries.

MA/mlw

S/PV.680
18-19

It so happens that yesterday morning I received the report of the Australian Royal Commission on Espionage. This publication is called Official Transcript of Proceedings taken at Melbourne on Wednesday 30 June 1954. It produces the testimony of a former Soviet civil servant. I have in mind Mr. Petrov whose name figured so largely in the world press a few months ago. Now, unexpectedly and in fact very surprisingly, this testimony supplies a test of the veracity of the Soviet Union Government in matters of a similar kind.

In the winter of 1937, Soviet Union armed forces sought to intrude into the Chinese province of Sinkiang. The Soviet Union Government then, as the Soviet Union representative here, proclaimed its own innocence. In this testimony, I was interested to find that Mr. Petrov said that he was a member of that unit which intruded into Chinese soil and that, in fact, Soviet soldiers, tanks and aeroplanes did carry on warlike activities on Chinese soil and then withdrew.

That controversy lasted for several years without any final decision being obtained. Here at last, from a civil servant of the Soviet Union, a participant in that incident, we have the final proof as to Soviet responsibility in that case.

This morning, we heard a version of the facts which we may call the Vyshinsky version of the incident of 4 September; and, in the course of time, we will also have a Petrov version of the incident of 4 September.

This incident of 4 September stands condemned by the civilized opinion of the world. In the opinion of my delegation the action of the Soviet Union aeroplanes which shot down the United States aeroplane deserves to be condemned.

ER/bs

S/PV.680
20

Mr. SARPEN (Turkey): I have listened carefully to the statements made by the representatives of the United States of America and the Soviet Union. My delegation is gratified to note the calm and moderate tenor of the statement made by the representative of the United States. I understand fully the depth of indignation felt by public opinion in the host country to our Organization over this most regrettable incident.

The incident as reported by the news agencies and as explained in the letter dated 8 September 1954 from the representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/5287) is indeed very grave. "A United States Navy P2V aircraft, on a peaceful mission over" (international)"high seas", states this letter, "was attacked without warning by two MIG type aircraft with Soviet markings... on September 4." This unprovoked attack caused the destruction of the United States Navy aircraft and the loss of one of the members of its crew.

Had this been the first incident of its kind, one might not perhaps feel as alarmed as one does feel now. Such incidents have, most unfortunately, been recurring for some time in conditions similar to the one now under consideration.

As to the arguments that the United States Navy aircraft had violated Soviet Union territory or Soviet Union air space and that it had fired first on the Soviet fighters, these are not sound and convincing at all. Even if we were to suppose that the P2V aircraft had flown over Soviet Union territory as a result of human or mechanical error, or because of unfavourable atmospheric conditions, it should, according to well-established practice, have been warned and directed to its proper course. The ignoring of this practice and the shooting down of the aircraft without warning cannot and should not be condoned.

The representative of the Soviet Union quoted abundantly in his statement from the United States press, and he made great capital of an error in the reports that immediately followed the incident under consideration. The United States Government, as the representative of the Soviet Union admits, had subsequently corrected this error and had given an accurate account of the incident as it had actually taken place. This, in our opinion, should rather be appreciated than sharply criticized. We do not very much admire those who stubbornly insist on errors and who consider themselves infallible.

DR/bs

S/PV.580
21-22

The representative of the Soviet Union, in the final part of his statement, almost admitted, as clearly as could be expected under similar circumstances, that this deplorable incident had taken place over international high seas. As to the contention of the representative of the Soviet Union to the effect that the American plane fired first, we cannot even for the sake of argument believe for a moment that the crew of the P2V had fired first. The speed and manoeuvrability of the P2V and the MIG are known to us all. In respect of both speed and fire power the P2V is largely handicapped. Therefore, firing first by the crew of a P2V aircraft on a MIG would mean seeking certain destruction -- and no one in his right mind would seek to be destroyed.

Avoidance of such provocative acts in international relations is one of the first prerequisites for achieving an atmosphere of international co-operation that will be conducive to the maintenance of international peace and security. What makes the incident under consideration all the more deplorable is the fact that it has occurred at a time when appearances tend to indicate that some attempts are being made to lessen the existing tension in international relations.

In this brief statement I have tried to be as frank and as straightforward as I could be in order to show the apprehensions of my delegation over the recurrence of such lamentable incidents which might increase to dangerous proportions the already existing tension. It is in this spirit that we are prepared to support any decision or recommendation which may find a peaceful solution and provide assurances for the prevention of the recurrence of such incidents.

AW/ns

S/PV.680

23

Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand): An incident of the nature described in the United States representative's letter of 8 September is prima facie a matter of international concern, and when, as in this case, the States involved are great Powers, such an incident cannot be viewed other than with gravity. That sense of gravity is accentuated by a feeling of grief and sympathy over the loss of life involved.

At this stage no specific action by the Council has been proposed. Even if no action is contemplated, however, it is appropriate that the Council should be fully acquainted with the facts and that its members should have an opportunity to express their views. I should like to add my tribute to the moderation and candor displayed by the representative of the United States in his speech this morning. The consensus of opinion in the Council -- and that consensus is already clear enough -- it may be hoped, will be taken into account by the parties responsible, whether or not it is embodied in a formal resolution.

It cannot be disputed that this incident took place, and that, furthermore, in recent months other incidents of a similar nature have occurred, in each of which Communist planes have attacked planes of other nationalities, outside Communist territory. The United States letter states that the latest incident is "of a type which might endanger international peace and security". It is obvious that this danger increases with the repetition of such incidents, particularly if they assume the nature of a pattern. It is also obvious that international tension will be created and international relations will deteriorate if all protests, however well founded, are rejected and no means of equitable settlement can be found.

In this connexion I should like to refer to the speech delivered in the general debate at the seventh session of the General Assembly by the leader of the Swedish delegation. In his speech Mr. Unden referred to a similar incident involving Swedish and Soviet planes, and his remarks, in my opinion, were a model of pertinence and moderation.

AW/ns

S/PV.680
24

He drew attention to the fact that both the Swedish planes shot down were flying over international waters, even outside the twelve-mile limit claimed by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, he reported, refused to accept any responsibility in regard to the first claim, despite the fact that no aircraft belonging to a third Power were in the vicinity. In regard to the second incident, the Soviet Union claimed that the plane concerned had crossed the Soviet frontier and had opened fire. In fact, the Swedish plane was unarmed and was engaged in rescue operations. The Soviet Union further refused to submit the matter either to the International Court of Justice or to arbitration.

It was in connexion with this last refusal that the representative of Sweden made his most cogent point and one that is equally relevant today. The Swedish representative drew attention to the "tremendous peace offensive" which had been launched by the Communists. He emphasized, as so indeed did the representative of the United States today, the valuable contribution to peace which would derive from an extensive use of a judicial procedure in the settlement of international disputes. "The governments which range themselves behind the new peace propaganda", he concluded, "should at any rate show so much good will as not themselves to refuse acceptance of inquiry by international organs into the facts of a dispute".

Today there is much talk of the possibility of what is called "peaceful co-existence". I should like to suggest two simple ways in which a state of peaceful co-existence can be strengthened. In the first place, attacks of the kind we are discussing should not be made. Surely they can be avoided. None, I believe, is unavoidable. In the second place, such disputes as do arise should be submitted to international judgment, and that judgment should be accepted. If these two principles were followed by all, "peaceful co-existence" would attain a less precarious reality than it has today.

BLS/bd

S/FV.600

25

Mr. BORBERG (Denmark): A detailed account of the incident of 4 September and the reply of the Soviet Union representative having been given just today, my Government has obviously not been in a position to study the case. My observations must therefore of necessity be of a tentative and very general nature.

In view of the importance which the Great Powers attach to such incidents and the consequences the people of the smaller Powers fear may result, it was with great pleasure that I noted the restraint with which the representative of the United States presented his case. Not only was there nothing in the direction of war threats, but there were definite indications of willingness to settle the matter either through direct negotiations or in the International Court of Justice. As the Soviet Union has not brought the case before the Council, in spite of the fact that it maintains that the United States aircraft attacked first, there seems to be on its side as well no desire to exaggerate the incident. I therefore very much hope that the two parties will succeed in finding a solution satisfactory to both of them.

To that hope I add the expression of another hope, based on their stand here today, that the great Powers, in their endeavours to safeguard peace, will henceforth find it possible to make their military border relations less tense. The effect of shooting down one single aircraft in peacetime is of no military importance worth speaking of, but its effect in making negotiations more difficult is long-lasting. Add incident to incident, and the willingness of Governments and people to settle down to negotiations, trading and living together will dwindle parallel to the tensions created by the incidents. A policy to avoid incidents would be a great help to all peace endeavours.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Since all the members of the Council have expressed their views on this case, I should like to make some observations in my capacity as representative of Colombia.

We have all of us had to reply to general criticisms of the United Nations. It is accused of being a useless organization which could well be dispensed with. But the fact is not that the United Nations is useless or ineffective, but that our Governments do not know how to make use of it. The United States request gave us great satisfaction, because it proves not only the usefulness, but also the necessity of the United Nations and the justification for its existence.

In the past, even incidents less serious than the one we are now discussing have started wars. It is to be hoped that the permanent members of the Council will in future bring such incidents before it, as the United States has done; for this discussion shows how important a part the Security Council can play in preventing them from bringing about consequences of more tragic seriousness.

I have to admit that I did not understand the arguments adduced by our eminent Soviet colleague very well. I do not, for instance, see why he criticized the United States delegation for approaching me last Monday and requesting the convening of the Security Council four days later. On the contrary, I consider that the attitude taken by the United States proves its entire good faith. When you discover that a fire has broken out, you do not wait to find who is responsible before you call the fire-brigade. I believe that Mr. Cabot Lodge's decision to request the calling of the Security Council and to refer the matter to it even before he had received full reports on what had occurred proves not merely his entire good faith but also his sincerity. That is why I believe that what has happened during the past four days -- the haste with which the case was referred to the Security Council and the very frank correction of certain errors and certain reports -- bears witness to a sincerity and a good faith for which all of us should be grateful to the United States delegation.

I have also been impressed by the case argued by our French colleague, Mr. Hoppenot. Without being an airman, one must obviously find it hard to understand why a mere bomber would provoke an attack by fighter planes, which, as everyone knows, have far greater striking force. It is just as though someone were to try to attack with his bare fists a soldier armed with a sub-machine gun. It is incomprehensible on the face of it. It is hard to see how the reconnaissance aircraft could have attacked the fighter planes.

I have noted, too, Mr. Vyshinsky's argument that the map calculations were wrong. No very accurate maps are available, but I have referred to an atlas and have found that Vladivostok is situated at the south of a peninsula less than fifty miles long. Following Mr. Vyshinsky's suggestion I drew a line eastward from Vladivostok; and according to the scale, the distance of 100 miles to which he referred gives a point on the high seas, not on any territory, either Soviet or non-Soviet. I may quite well be wrong, but this does at least show clearly that the matter needs to be examined more closely. I should be grateful to the Soviet representative if he would furnish us with a map so that we can check the distances he mentions.

That is why I, for my own part, would have been in favour of an investigation in accordance with Article 34 of the Charter. Indeed, it was precisely for reasons of this sort that the decision was taken to include this Article when the Charter was drafted at San Francisco: in order to give the Security Council the power to investigate any dispute so as to prevent obscure incidents from becoming threats to international peace and security as a result of false information or misinterpretation. Accordingly, the Council's investigatory powers were universally recognized, without reservation. Still more: the permanent members of the Council were required to abstain from voting in the discussion of any dispute to which they are parties, as was the position of the United Kingdom when the Corfu case came up for consideration. In my opinion it would unquestionably be a great step forward if the Council were allowed to make use of the investigatory powers conferred upon it at San Francisco; for that would enable it to settle situations which might, if allowed to deteriorate, start a war, as they have done in the past.

Hence, the step taken by the United States delegation is a very important one, and, I repeat, it is unfortunate that the proposals for an investigation are not being accepted. Obviously one of the parties can oppose an investigation, supposing that it is carried out on its own territory, by, for example, preventing aircraft crews from making statements to a United Nations commission. But that, in my opinion is a detail; what really counts is the judgment passed by public opinion. For it is self-evident that if one government accepts the investigation and the other refuses to have anything to do with it, no arguments will prevent public opinion from regarding the government which does not accept the investigation as guilty.

Mr. Vyshinsky told us this morning -- I made a note of his observation -- that the matter needed clarification. We entirely agree, but in my view the best method of achieving this is to agree to an investigation. If Mr. Vyshinsky told us that he was not against an investigation, that would be a far more solid argument than all those we heard this morning.

However, investigation is only one of the possible solutions. There are others. The representatives of France and Turkey, for instance, have made observations which might very well serve as the basis for constructive negotiations to prevent the recurrence of incidents of this kind. For example, we have heard an explanation of the way in which Soviet aircraft warn aircraft flying off course that they are over foreign territory. An aircraft may happen to stray off course owing to bad weather or technical reasons and enter foreign territory; but would it not be possible, in order to warn it of that fact and direct it to land or withdraw, to agree on conventions or signals other than a burst of artillery fire -- a somewhat violent method of bringing the matter to its notice?

I believe that a solution could be found if the will to study the matter existed. For example, it might be possible to draft conventions providing for effective means of informing the crew of a foreign aircraft that it has strayed, it may well be in good faith, over the territory of another country. At all events, today's discussion proves that the problem needs to be considered and a solution found.

As the representative of Denmark has very judiciously observed, nothing is more dangerous than international tension in frontier areas. Anything that is done to obviate incidents in these areas will contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security.

I myself have no proposal to submit to the Council. However, in case any member of the Council, bearing thought for the future, should wish to submit specific proposals at another meeting -- if there is one -- I wish to say that my position is identical with that of the representative of Turkey. If after a closer examination of all the documents, we have the opportunity of reopening this debate and of reaching an effective solution, I shall certainly vote for any draft resolution designed to achieve the purposes laid down in Chapter VI of the Charter.

I have no other speaker on my list. Does any member of the Council propose to speak after the interpretation of my statement?

S/PV.680

29

Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I should like to take this opportunity of replying to some critical remarks which have been made here in regard to my statement. In asserting that the specific incident described in the United States notes of 6 September did in fact occur, Sir Pierson Dixon should have adduced some facts to corroborate and bear out his contention that the incident took place precisely as described and not otherwise. He confined himself, however, to an unsupported assertion that there was, as he put it, strong prima facie evidence that precisely such an attack took place. It must, I think, be recognized that considering all the circumstances, a bare unsupported assertion that the event took place in such a way and not otherwise, considering that a number of statements have been made to show that that was not and could not have been the case and that the version given contains a number of contradictions and is extremely confused, in such circumstances, I repeat, a mere uncorroborated assertion is not sufficient.

I should also like to take the opportunity of saying that I have no intention whatsoever of explaining my position as if I were an accused person standing trial. The Soviet Union is apparently sitting in the dock and is being confronted by a series of prosecutors and judges; I am apparently expected to disprove some charge, to justify myself to someone. In order to remove this misunderstanding, I should like it to be clear to the Council that I do not consider myself or my country to be in such a position. Since my request that the item should not be included in the Security Council's agenda was not met, I consider it essential to make an explanatory statement, giving an accurate and objective account, based on precisely established facts in the possession of my Government, of what in fact took place, and at the same time, to draw attention to a number of contradictions, errors and mutually exclusive arguments; there will thus be no room for doubt of the objectivity and impartiality of the analysis I am making. I am obliged to take this course, because the Security Council rejected my proposal that this question should not be discussed. This does not, however, mean that I accept the view that the Security Council is obliged to discuss the question because it has taken a decision to that effect. I still adhere

to my opinion, which is that it is inappropriate for the Security Council to discuss this question for a variety of reasons, the most important of which are that the incident described did not occur, that it did not take place at the position stated and did not involve the occurrences described in the incorrect account contained in the note submitted to the Council by the plaintiff.

If I understood him correctly, Mr. Urrutia is now proposing not only that I should take a line directly opposed to my position, as I have just described it, but also that I should acquiesce in the desire that the Council should undertake a more detailed examination of the question.

He is presumably counting on my great naiveté. He is probably assuming that I shall agree with a kind smile, to absolutely everything. That would be a completely unfounded assumption.

I prove to you that it is not the business of the Security Council to examine this question, and the reply I get is: "Come, let us appoint a commission to go more deeply into the question". But if I said: "I entirely agree with you, let us appoint such a commission", I should ipso facto be accepting the thesis that the Security Council is entitled to deal with this question. But I have argued and sought to convince you from the very outset that the Security Council is not entitled to do so.

You refer in this connexion to Article 34. I see no grounds whatever for bringing this incident under Article 34. I referred to this, among other matters, in the statement in which I drew attention to the observations of the Christian Science Monitor's special correspondent in Washington. This gentleman pointed out that responsible United States military authorities not involved in diplomatic and propaganda tactics would be inclined to take the line that this incident and others of the same kind represented a normally admissible risk of patrol and counter-patrol duty in certain areas. So that if you engage in this type of patrol work, which some in all seriousness call nothing but offensive snooping (let me use the language of criminal law, of the Criminal Code: the right word for it is espionage), I must be allowed to insist that measures of some other kind should be taken, not those preached here by certain representatives claiming to be guided by highly delicate humanitarian considerations. But I shall have something to say about this a little later.

S/PV.680

31

Accordingly I consider that Article 34, to which you have referred, can have no bearing on this question, simply because this question has no connexion with Chapter VI. Chapter VI is concerned with cases in which a dispute arises, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

I deeply regret the occurrence of such incidents as that of 4 September. Even so, however, we surely cannot seriously think that this incident is capable of causing international complications likely to endanger international peace and security? And what I have heard here from other members of the Security Council strengthens my conviction that, whatever attitude we may adopt in this case, whatever regrets we may express -- and regret is called for because the incident, since it entailed loss of life, provoked needless tension in the relations of the countries directly involved -- we must not represent the case as one which, unless some sort of special measures are immediately adopted, will cause the outbreak of a third world war. But articles in the press say quite frankly that the case must by hook or by crook be brought under Chapter VI in order to make it impossible for the Soviet Union to cast a contrary vote, that is to use the veto, in order to force it to abstain from voting, as it would be entitled to do under Article 27(3) (not 26, as they state in error). But all these manoeuvres have absolutely no bearing on the incident itself, despite all its regrettable aspects from the humanitarian and political points of view -- in which connexion of course I have no reason to raise any objections and shall raise none.

Of course an incident is an incident. This is a regrettable incident. Firing is regrettable, one way or another, wherever it occurs. But, I venture to ask, what connexion is there between this incident and Chapter VI? There is absolutely no connexion.

The United States representative and I will doubtless continue to differ about how the incident came about, who was guilty, what were the consequences, and so forth. But will the continuation of this dispute be a threat to peace? No. A threat to peace will be created if the patrol activities of such aircraft are continued and if such patrolling -- which some frank journalists have called "espionage" -- leads to armed clashes.

Of course an increase in the frequency of border incidents could bring about a threat to peace; quantitative changes of any kind may be transformed into a qualitative change. But a dispute connected with an incident of this kind is not by itself sufficient to create such a threat; this will arise only if such incidents are repeated. Naturally we must take steps to see that they do not occur. I shall fully support any proposals which, independently of this particular case, are designed to prevent the occurrence of such incidents in the future; but the essential condition for that is to put an end to this "prying" (as the American press calls it) into foreign territory by so-called patrol bombers, which are made out to be quite puny, indeed incapable of attacking anyone and so slow that they can scarcely disengage if attacked by some other aircraft.

In my view, measures must be taken to put a stop to this patrolling, or weather observation or, as Mr. Lodge called it, anti-submarine surveillance. It may be asked what submarines the aircraft were looking for. Whose submarines were they trying to track down and why? If the American fleet were to cease performing such functions, if the whole practice and system of what is called peaceful patrolling were dropped -- a policy in actual fact of endeavouring to penetrate frontiers with military aircraft, armed to the teeth and intended, with the help of their radar and other apparatus to detect and observe one thing and another -- then we should have grounds for hoping that such incidents would not be repeated in the future.

No self-respecting State can permit its State frontiers to be inadequately defended.

Mr. Munro has referred here to the Swedish incident. I should like to point out that that case too involved the question whether or not it is permissible to warn an aircraft violating a frontier that it will be fired upon, and to open fire on such an aircraft.

The Swedish Government in its note and correspondence with the Soviet Government argued that Swedish legislation and Swedish regulations in general did not admit that procedure. However, I should like to recall that there is a Swedish Government instruction which was appended to the

S/PV.680

33

Swedish Government's note to the Soviet Government in 1952, in which it is stated that individual aircraft which penetrate into Swedish territory without permission should be warned to withdraw. If the aircraft does not change its course and head away from Swedish territory, the instruction says, it should be fired on. That is what Sweden says; it is an instruction issued by the Swedish Government.

This means that a State which has any respect for its sovereignty, its independence and its security in all cases has the right of self-defence. Where there is no attack there need be no self-defence: that is the import of this principle. Of course it does not mean that a State may take the offensive on the pretext that it has been attacked. That would be a gross distortion of the principle to which I am referring.

I again say, let us assume that all of you are right. For certain reasons, which are quite understandable, incidentally, you are all with one voice upholding the United States version. Let us assume that all of you are right, that the incident did in fact take place at a distance of 40 miles (this is an assumption only, and an incorrect assumption, since this was not the case). At this point I should like to say a few words to Mr. Urrutia on the subject of geography. While assuming that he is right, I would, however, ask him where the 40 miles in question were located. Were they in the waters off San Francisco or San Diego? Where were they? Off the United States coast or, perhaps, off the Japanese coast which Soviet aircraft approach within a distance of 40 miles? No, these miles were off the Soviet coast. What is the reason for approaching to a distance of 40 miles and then asserting that the aircraft approached to that distance only. What is the reason? What is the reason for aircraft approaching to a distance of 40 miles, aircraft which are armed and, furthermore, equipped with radar? The United States press itself states that the purpose is to feel out the strength of the enemy's radar installations. Who is that enemy? It is hardly necessary for me to be specific and state that the Soviet Union is regarded as the enemy against whom the United States is conducting an armaments race and stockpiling atomic and hydrogen bombs, having regard to the propaganda it is making in favour of a preventive war against the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is the enemy. This is why, at one point or another, the United States is feeling out its strength. This is a fact Mr. Urrutia should bear in mind.

Even if the facts set out in the notes from the United States Government are correct, I still ask where the incident occurred? It did not occur off the United States coast, even at a distance of 50 or 100 miles. Vladivostok indeed is 10,000 kilometres from the United States. Where then did the incident occur? Perhaps the aircraft of the Soviet Union penetrated deep into American airspace? Perhaps Soviet submarines are prowling off the coast of Colombia? I do not know. Mr. Urrutia is quite likely better informed on this matter than I. But I ask you: even if this is the case, why was it that this incident took place near the Soviet coast, even if it was forty miles away? You carefully avoid this question. You regard it as quite proper that, as is now the case, the United States navy should consider itself the master of the situation in the Pacific, able to go wherever it likes. It can sail into the Strait of Formosa. It can undertake the defence of that unfortunate so-called Government of Chiang Kai-shek, with its equally unfortunate and not over-intelligent representatives with whom we are unfortunately obliged to have dealings here and who engage in all manner of slanderous nonsense which, I regret to say, runs unchecked in the Security Council, as was clearly demonstrated here today. You yourselves, the Americans themselves, and people in the highest positions say that the United States navy is the master in the Atlantic, the Mediterranean and the Pacific... It is the master everywhere. You force us to believe that anything its aircraft, its submarines, or its surface warships do will be justified. I see proof of this here now. The present case, too, serves to prove it.

I accordingly ask you to bear in mind that the Soviet Union considers that this matter does not fall within the Security Council's jurisdiction and that we shall therefore reject any proposals which are based on the premise that it does. Whether or not you think I am entitled to vote, whether or not you consider that I am an interested party in the dispute, whether or not you interpret my vote as a veto, whether or not you intend to take this into account -- regardless of all this, we shall continue to maintain this position.

To revert to Sir Pierson's reference to "strong evidence", what "strong evidence" does he have in mind? On what is it based? On the statements which the airmen were able to make. But we still do not even know what they said beyond the fact that one said he opened fire and another said that he did not open fire. The Navy Department states in reply to inquiries that it is not known who fired. But if it is not known who fired, when and why he fired are also unknown. A state of confusion, no less. And this is what is described as prima facie evidence. But such a description is a mockery of the course of justice. It is not prima facie evidence, but prime nonsense. The most complete and utter nonsense.

The fact is that absolutely no evidence has been put forward in the case. Take Mr. Lodge's letter, for example. It contains no evidence to support the assertions made. Take his speech. In my view, he proved nothing except the opposite of what he set out to prove.

Sir Pierson Dixon's arguments therefore seem to me to be ill-considered and unwise.

All of us have long been acquainted with Mr. Hoppenot and have a deep respect for both his stronger and weaker sides -- for we can still respect a man's weaker side -- and we therefore respect both the stronger and weaker sides of Mr. Hoppenot's way of thinking. I am not sure whether the bone I have to pick with him concerns his stronger or weaker side, but whichever it is, I feel bound to raise the point. Mr. Hoppenot said that contradictions are proof of good faith and that acknowledgment of mistakes is evidence of honesty. To my mind, it is good when a man corrects his mistake, but it is not good if he does so and at once proceeds to commit a greater one.

Of course, if there are contradictions, if some say one thing and some say another, then, according to the maxim that the truth emerges from the clash of opinions, the truth will emerge when contrary views are expressed. But how can it be concluded that contradictions are proof of good faith? Does it mean that if a man speaks without involving himself in contradictions, he is not speaking in good faith? If a man speaks smoothly and clearly -- the case in question being itself quite clear -- and there are no contradictions, does this mean that he is not speaking in good faith? Such reasoning is completely incomprehensible and cannot possibly be entertained. Are we to say that contradictions are proof of good faith and that therefore the more contradictions there are, the more good faith is demonstrated?

A man who embroils himself in contradictions is a man of the greatest good faith because, had he not been, he would have been at pains to conceal and avoid contradictions. While if he does not avoid contradictions and if the contradictions pile up, one on top of another -- a veritable mountain of contradictions -- then he is a prodigy of good faith. That is Mr. Hoppenot's reasoning. I cannot possibly agree with such a line of reasoning. Does this imply that any case can proceed without contradictions? No. Does it imply that contradictions are always evidence of bad faith? No. Indeed, as I have said once before today -- and Mr. Hoppenot should remember this -- the idea that all this is being deliberately done, with the knowledge of the higher authorities -- at any rate of the American authorities -- is far from my mind. I noted it primarily in connexion with the hubbub and confusion there has been over this question. Mr. Hoppenot asks me why I mentioned the call, which I as well as others knew about. But that is really not some sort of State secret; and I did not learn of it by means of some piece of radar apparatus. The fact is that the call was made on Monday but the meeting was not called until Friday. That was what I said in pointing out that there had been some kind of confusion. And you will pardon me if I point out that in one of the American newspapers yesterday, or perhaps today -- I have forgotten the date -- I read the comment that certain American officials had acted too hastily in this case, had forced the pace too much and then, when they had overstepped the mark, had no idea what to do next. And only then did they consider questions of form and method, did they consider what claim should be made, the nature and form in which it should be expressed and so forth. That and that only was the bearing of my remarks. Of course, I might have ignored the matter. I did not know that this was a great secret of yours. If it is, then I must apologize for uncovering and disclosing it. But I must say that I was not warned that it was a secret. In future you must take care to see that your secrets do not leak through the walls of the President of the Security Council. Mr. Hoppenot defended the United States version at all costs and in an attempt to help the United States authorities extricate themselves from these "contradictions", said that nothing prevented them from maintaining their original position.

I would ask Mr. Hoppenot if he seriously thinks that there was nothing to prevent this? If one airman says "I fired", and another one says "I fired, not you", it is very difficult afterwards to say that nobody fired. Perhaps he thinks this is perfectly normal: a lie once uttered should be persisted in to the end, regardless of consequences. But there are people and facts that may catch a liar out. This is even more dangerous than admitting the mistake. There is never any shame or danger in admitting a mistake provided the admission does not lead to another. That is Mr. Hoppenot's reasoning. But what does all this reasoning amount to? I ask the Council. It amounts only to this: the United States must at all costs be shown to be in the right. That is precisely what one newspaper said when it observed that, in order to prove that the incident occurred over the high seas, the United States authorities took such and such steps. What steps were these? First there was the affirmation that the incident occurred 100 miles to the east of Vladivostok -- and I must warn anyone who wishes to refer to the map that what is meant is a distance not along a straight line but along the parallel, for on the globe and on maps distance is measured along the parallels. This I must point out in advance. At first the distance was 100 miles but later, when the first steps were being taken to prove that the clash occurred over the high seas, the figure of 125 miles made its appearance. Even 145 miles was mentioned. I do not know how any reliance can be placed on such data as these. To my mind it is impossible to place any reliance on them at all.

You say: let us verify the facts. Mr. Urrutia even asked whether I would not produce a map. I could do so without difficulty, of course, though I have no cartographer's workshop or office here to prepare one. But I can go to a bookshop -- assuredly in the United States there is a shop where maps are to be had. I have no doubt that they are to be had even in Colombia -- and purchase the map. Then, after acquiring a pair of dividers as well, all we have to do is to measure off on this map the appropriate distance to scale. You will then be able to fix the spot where these 100 miles end. Why then do you need a map of mine, a map signed by me? Why? I see why. If I say "Certainly, here you are", it will mean that I have been dragged into discussing this question: I will produce a map, then we will appoint a commission, then there will be something else. In other words, it will turn out that the Security Council is competent to deal

with this question. No, it is not competent to do so. If I venture to take up the Council's time it is only because I am compelled to do so.

For the record, I should like to add with reference to one of the later speakers, that I consider it beneath my dignity to react in any way to the slanderous statement by the so-called representative of China, who in reality is the representative of the Chiang Kai-shek clique and was thrown out of China by the freedom-loving Chinese people when they freed themselves from their oppressors. I consider it beneath my dignity to reply to the slanderous venom he poured out here, taking advantage of the fact that he happens to be in a position where no one will stop him. I did not wish to raise a point of order at the time because I relied on the loyalty of the President. Now that I have the floor I am taking the opportunity of pointing this out. This too, very likely, is part of the plan for the consideration of this question; presumably it is considered undesirable to discuss it in a more tranquil manner than that which those gentlemen -- who I regret to note are still seated near me -- allow themselves to use in discussing any question.

The Turkish representative said that this incident, in the form in which it was described in the American press, gave rise to universal alarm. Of course, it gave rise to alarm; it alarmed us too, because we see a good deal of evidence that certain States are persistently pursuing the objective of "feeling out", as some newspapers put it, what is going on in foreign territory.

This incident provides further proof that such States are following a course of action entailing consequences which cannot of course contribute to an improvement in the international atmosphere; quite the reverse. The Berlin Conference helped to ease the tension, despite the unfavourable conditions under which it was held; the Geneva Conference resulted in the end of the war in Indo-China. That marked an enormous advance towards the strengthening of world peace and international security. As we know, a number of other steps have been taken with a view to aggravating the international political situation; for example, the attempt to compel France to vote for ratification of the so-called European Defence Community. That attempt failed, thanks to the resistance of the French people, for which they are only to be commended.

All the facts I have mentioned have served to ease international tension to some extent. This development was probably not welcome in all quarters and it was perhaps thought that it might be useful, at this particular moment, on the eve of the ninth session of the General Assembly, which will be called up to consider and decide a large number of highly important questions, to attempt to raise a stir over this specific issue. The situation is quite simple: if a patrol aircraft attempts to cross our frontier, it can count on receiving the appropriate treatment from us. And such incidents are the germ, the initial cause for which a weakening of international confidence and co-operation develops. Every event, of course, has a political explanation.

Despite all the contradictions detected by Mr. Hoppenot contradictions which, in his view make the story preferable to one without contradictions -- the Turkish representative swallows all the statements that have been made here, accepts the United States story and is prepared to agree that everything took place exactly as the honourable representatives have said it did. If, he says, the incident in fact followed the course described by the Soviet Union, the Soviet aircraft should have given a warning. But how does the Turkish representative know that no warning was given? If he reads the Soviet note, he will find that a warning was given. By what method? By the usual method -- by various wing manoeuvres, possibly by warning shots or flares; in any event warnings were given. These warnings received one and only one answer from the bomber. And this was no defenceless craft; it was a bomber bristling with machine-guns and carrying many other weapons enabling it to offer resistance.

We do not suggest that the Neptune planned to attack the Soviet fighters. I presume that it had no such plan; but when it was told: "Be off!", it opened fire.

That is the situation; but you have said: "No, no one told it to withdraw, no one warned it that it was flying where it had no business to be, that it had no right to fly in that area". Where did you get this idea?

We declare that that was what happened, and you reply that a warning should have been given, and that that was not done. Apparently you must have been on the aircraft and have seen for yourselves all that happened. This is hardly evidence of objectivity on your part in the case.

You said: "We cannot believe that the American aircraft could have fired first, for that would have meant its destruction". You repeated what Mr. Lodge said about suicide. Of course the idea of committing suicide did not enter into the American airmen's plans. But the American aircraft was confronted with a specific situation. It was called upon to withdraw. What action could it then take? The action taken by the minor figures involved, who probably deemed it their military duty to die a hero's death and to resist the request to withdraw. Or perhaps there was simply some confusion.

But the question still remains: who fired first?

We advance one version and the United States advances another, contrary version. Which should be given preference? Some speakers say the version containing contradictions. We, on the other hand, consider that preference should be given to the version which is free from contradictions.

This is the crux of the matter.

The Turkish representative maintains that to have fired first would have meant certain destruction for the Neptune aircraft. This might be so were it not for the fact that the function of Soviet aircraft protecting the integrity of the frontiers of the Soviet State, is not to shoot down an aircraft, even if it has committed a violation, but to prevent an aircraft from violating the Soviet frontiers and from persisting in such a violation. To that end, they call on the offending aircraft and make a peaceful proposal that it should discontinue the flight.

But the cases which Mr. Lodge has compelled me to describe here today go to show that what usually happens is that the aircraft is requested to land but refuses to do so, is called upon to follow the Soviet planes, but declines to do so and opens fire.

You ignore all this. You also evade the question what purposes are pursued in these patrol activities. What are these purposes? You are reluctant to answer this question. Do you think these bombers are really investigating the state of the weather? Well, blessed is he who believes; he has an easy time in this world. But I do not believe it, and see no reason why I should. I know the bombers are not concerned with the weather. If you have any other evidence, I ask you to produce it.

Mr. Borberg expressed the hope that the two parties would find a solution satisfactory to both of them. He spoke of his hopes that everything possible would be done to ensure more normal border relations; he expressed the hope that these border relations would become less tense, and so forth. I agree with him entirely. The need, clearly, is that governments should live and work together in friendship. But this, of course, means that they must not intimidate one another with their armaments or, still less, amass an infinite quantity and variety of such armaments and constantly try to create occasions for putting them to use by making up all manner of fables about dangers threatening now from the east, now through Alaska, now from the north and so on and so forth. In general, the peace endeavours of which the Danish representative spoke here meet with a completely sympathetic response from me. But if they are to succeed, Mr. Borberg, there must be not only desires but specific actions, particularly on the part of those who glory in their strength and, indeed, do not know the meaning of restraint. This will not do. We must not build everything on the premise that might is the universal deciding factor. Might is not right; right is might. Right must be respected and, in particular, international law must be respected.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I have only one member of the Council on my list of speakers for this evening -- the representative of the United States. In view of the late hour, I have consulted the English and French speaking representatives. By way of exception, and by way of exception only, they have agreed to dispense with interpretation in order to allow the representative of the United States to speak now, after which we shall adjourn the meeting. The United States representative informs me that his statement will take only a few minutes. Are there any objections to this procedure?

Mr. HOPPENOT (France) (translated from French): The right to interpretation belongs equally to the speaker and the listener. In view of the special circumstances, and in order not to delay the pleasure of the members of the Secretariat, who are certainly intending to take part in Staff Day, I am ready as a listener to dispense with the interpretation into French, provided that Mr. Vyshinsky, as a speaker, is prepared to do likewise.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Such is certainly my intention. That is why I have asked the Soviet Union delegation if it could, by way of exception only and in view of the situation which has arisen today, dispense with the interpretation.

Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): I agree.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): In view of the fact that this procedure has been approved unanimously, I call upon the representative of the United States.

BS/ns

S/PV.680

43

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I shall be true to my word to the President that I will take less than three minutes. I did think that I should make a few comments on what has been said by the representative of the Soviet Union. In many respects they are similar to his previous utterances on other subjects. Today, however, he did something that I have never heard him do before when he attacked the representative of China not in his capacity as the representative of China but in a personal capacity -- he made a personal reflection on him. I think that that is a violation of the basic decencies of parliamentary procedure. I believe that Dr. Tsiang is a man of fine character and fine mind, and I regret what I think an impartial person would say was a most ill-mannered observation.

Then the representative of the Soviet Union began by expressing his unwillingness to adopt the agenda, which will inevitably lead the world to believe that he opposes discussion because his Government has something to hide; otherwise, why would he oppose discussion?

Secondly, his remarks were full of quotations from the United States press, as though the United States press were the voice of the United States Government. It would be understandable for a citizen of the Soviet Union who had never been here before to make such an assumption, because in the Soviet Union the press is a tool or an arm of the Government and the people who work for the press there are in effect government employees, subject to the discipline of the Government. But it is passing strange that the representative of the Soviet Union, who has been here for so many years, should continue making that error.

Now I was in the United States press for a good many years, and I think it is a wondrous and excellent institution, but it does not speak for the United States Government. Clippings from it cannot be quoted as indicating matters of official fact here in the United States.

Then there was the discussion of the error in reporting the location of the downing of the plane. Of course, it is by now well-known all over the world that only the Communists never admit making mistakes; only Communists insist all the time that they are perfect, that they are the peerless ones who must be above the common ordinary run of mortals who sometimes get tired and who sometimes make errors. As a matter of fact, the error was not a very large one; it consisted

in reporting the incident in a clumsy way whereby a line was drawn a hundred miles east, then dropped down south, and that is where the location was. The representative of the Soviet Union simply failed to mention the part about dropping down south and just stopped about the line going a hundred miles east. It is an old trick, and I have seen it worked in many courtrooms -- but still it is a trick just the same. The fact is that this happened forty-three miles off the coast of Siberia, and there is no mystery at all about why United States planes should be in those waters: we have a peace treaty with Japan; we have the duty and the right to exercise normal activities in that area.

In regard to all the other cases mentioned by the representative of the Soviet Union, I need but repeat what I previously said, that the United States is ready to bring them before the International Court of Justice. I do not know what fairer statement I can make than that.

One thing has emerged from this discussion today, and that is that the Soviet Union representative apparently defends the right of his Government to shoot airplanes down over the international high seas without warning and without provocation. That is a serious statement, but I put it to the Council that that is what emerges out of this, and that is something for the world to ponder.

As I close, let me express appreciation for the tone of the statements which have been made here today by the representatives of Member nations. They have been very different, they have been constructive, they have been gifted, and they have been an inspiration to me. On behalf of the United States, I express my thanks.

What we are asking for here today is not much; it is merely that the Soviet Union deal with these matters by peaceful processes. Surely, as Members of the United Nations, we should do no less.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): As there has been no interpretation of Mr. Vyshinsky's statement, may I ask Mr. Cabot Lodge whether he too is prepared to waive the interpretation of his last observations in order to enable Mr. Vyshinsky to reply to one point.

Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I do not wish to waste the Council's time but I should like to say a few words, at least, about one point which Mr. Lodge made in his last speech and which I cannot pass over in silence.

Mr. Lodge said that the Soviet Union representative was apparently defending the right of the Soviet Union to shoot aircraft down over the high seas. If he had not made his speech in haste then I am sure Mr. Lodge would not have said that, for my whole argument on this question was concentrated on proving that the incident involving the Soviet and United States aircraft occurred over Soviet territory and not over the high seas. It is therefore absurd to suggest that I could be defending the right of any State to shoot aircraft down over the high seas.

It is others who wish to defend this right. We are opposed to it. The people who defend it are those who consider for instance that they have the right to shoot aircraft down over Formosa, that is to say, not over their own territory and not over their own waters, but over the Straits of Formosa, to fly round other nations' ships and generally to misuse the armed forces they have in this region. We do not engage in such activities.

Such a conclusion is wholly absurd and I must correct Mr. Lodge's mistake. I hope he will concur.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Since the list of speakers is exhausted, I shall adjourn this meeting. The Council will be convened again if and when any delegation so requests.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.