

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
 ASSEMBLY**

NINETEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1310th  
 PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 22 December 1964,  
 at 10.30 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

Page

*Item 9 of the provisional agenda:*

*General debate (continued)*

<i>Speech by Mr. García Robles (Mexico) . . . .</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Speech by Mr. Balla (Cameroon) . . . . .</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of Israel . .</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of Portugal</i>	<i>13</i>

*President:* Mr. Alex QUAISON-SACKY  
 (Ghana).

**ITEM 9 OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA**

*General debate (continued)*

1. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): I should just like, Mr. President, to convey to you the most sincere congratulations of the Mexican delegation on your well-deserved appointment to direct the work of this Assembly. Your election, in our opinion, implies a threefold tribute from all Member States to your outstanding personal qualities, to the prominent role which your country has played in the United Nations, and to the African continent's growing importance in this Organization.

2. As is probably known to all, just three weeks ago, on 1 December, there was a change of Executive in Mexico. In his inaugural message to the Congress and through it to the whole nation, the new President, Mr. Gustavo Díaz Ordaz, outlined his Government's foreign policy in these words:

"The outstanding fact in international affairs is that the post-war period has come to an end. The world is on the threshold of a new phase in history, the features of which cannot yet be clearly determined; but we may hazard the guess that it will be different from the period immediately preceding it.

"Man's spectacular conquests in the vast field of outer space and in the astonishingly minute field of the atom naturally convey the impression that the barrier between the possible and the impossible has been broken down. It now seems that everything is possible, or will be in the near future.

"This is perhaps one reason for the impatience shown by men who for centuries have hoped and suffered; it unites them far more than any of the ideologies bequeathed to us by the nineteenth century.

"The mere fact of living through these fascinating moments in the history of mankind places upon us an immense responsibility, which assumes even greater proportions for those holding a position of authority.

"I speak as a typical Mexican, as one among many; but the vote of my people, freely given, means that my voice is also that of Mexico. I desire the message from that voice to be one of optimism and harmony; but I would also adjure all peoples, particularly those whose greater power invests them with greater responsibility, to lend their support in the campaigns, carried on jointly or at least simultaneously, against the enemies of mankind—poverty, ignorance, disease, insecurity, oppression, injustice and warlike fanaticism, all of them sterile remains of a world that has already ceased to exist. For if man has achieved such spectacular victories in technology and science, how could it be conceivable that he should not succeed in advancing the political, economic and social spheres?

"Both the most exalted idealism and the most elementary common sense stimulate us to defend peace, since peace is now essential to man's continued existence.

"If we want peace, we must fight against the conditions that lead to the possibility of war. Mexico favours disarmament, beginning with denuclearization. We hold that peace will be guaranteed only to the extent that objective conditions are created in which all peoples will endeavour to consolidate it.

"We must repeat that peace means, not only the absence of war, but effective co-operation between nations for the purpose of coping with the age-old problems that assail man in all latitudes. Only by a great pooling of effort can we establish firm bases for a true peace and, even so, permanent and resolute efforts will be required if peace in its true meaning is to be preserved.

"Mexico's foreign policy is governed by basic principles and not by the caprice or arbitrariness of men, who are but transitory creatures. It is the fruit of our unhappy history and the inescapable result of our experience. It draws inspiration from old ideals and is implemented in accordance with principles of lasting validity. In a world like ours, in which rapid and tremendous changes are taking place, our foreign policy is also, and must continue to be, an instrument in the service of the over-all development of the community.

"In the present-day scene, Mexico appears as a nation asserting its independence ever more vigorously. In its independence, however, it is aware that no country, rich or poor, great or small, powerful or weak, can live in isolation. This conviction, combined with the Mexican people's cordial openheartedness, leads us to offer and desire friendship with all the peoples of the world. By friendship we mean a disposition first to respect the

integrity and dignity of a friend and then to endeavour to understand him, with a view to serving him better. It is the noblest bond by which men can be united.

"It is our aim that each individual should control his own destiny in society and that, on the basis of this right, each community should govern itself freely.

"Non-intervention and the right of self-determination are principles which, for more than a century, we have constantly upheld.

"We were born under the sign of anti-colonialism and in the past we have suffered invasion, attack and intervention. It is therefore in the very essence of our nationality to condemn the domination of any country by another, regardless of how it originates or of what form it takes.

"Reason and justice tell us that there is no dispute between men or between peoples that cannot be settled by peaceful means. We feel we have a special responsibility to fight for this principle in inter-American relations.

"When the powerful man bows to justice, he assumes an attitude that does not diminish or lower him, but rather honours and exalts him; as for the weak man, the law has always been his best protection.

"At a time when distances in the world are becoming smaller but its problems are growing greater, national and international solidarity must become stronger and more intensified.

"We are firmly convinced that peace and international co-operation require the smooth functioning and strengthening of general and specialized international bodies such as the United Nations and the regional inter-American agencies. We shall not be sparing in our support of them.

"When we in Mexico postulate a policy of independence for ourselves, we also postulate the full independence of all nations, so that, from collaboration voluntarily given by peoples which are all free and equal, genuine international solidarity may arise.

"We have developed and are continuing to develop mainly as a result of our own efforts, although we in no way undervalue the co-operation which we have on honourable terms received. We feel we are entitled to assert that in vast areas of the world, and of course in some areas of our own hemisphere, there are some countries which need outside co-operation much more than others do, and that they are entitled to receive it in forms and by procedures which do no injury to their dignity, sovereignty and natural essence.

"If in the domestic field many injustices have been corrected by such means as social security systems, minimum wages and guaranteed prices, there is no reason why in the international field—and specifically in the regulation of trade and in financial co-operation—moral conscience and a sense of justice and human solidarity, which would in any case represent sound and healthy foresight, should not prevent an increase in the gap between the prosperity of the few and the poverty of the many, provided that the latter for their part are prepared to put

their shoulder to the wheel. We know that, fundamentally, prosperity and good fortune come to no one from outside.

"We shall continue to do our best to ensure that, particularly in the vital field of foreign trade, co-operation takes form in which fairness is combined with effectiveness.

"Mexico desires peace throughout the world; it desires friendship with every people of the world, though, obviously, friendship of an even closer and warmer type with the peoples that form the community of our continent.

"To our immediate neighbours to the north and to the south, we reaffirm our resolute will to make our relations with them an example of cordial and constructive coexistence.

"The Charter of Punta del Este<sup>1/</sup> set the formal seal of a hemispheric agreement on objectives which the Mexican people has long sought, in the most noble of its struggles. It leaves to each country the responsibility for planning and directing its own progress; but it makes social justice the prerequisite and condition for that progress, and prescribes co-operation as a complementary though indispensable tool in the long, difficult but noble task of raising the level of living which is so desperately low in many rural areas of America.

"It is unfair to Mexico to describe it as wishing to set itself up as a leader of Latin America. We make no such claim, nor do we desire such a status. Within the Latin American community, Mexico can be at the head, at the tail, or in the middle, according to circumstances, so far as any given aspect of our life is concerned; but its only aspiration is to be just another member of a group that is uniting its efforts for the betterment of all.

"What Mexico wants is to be in intimate brotherhood with all its fellow-Latin Americans."

Such is what the President of Mexico said in his inaugural speech.

3. It is not my intention to review, here, the items which, as every year, are included in the General Assembly's agenda and which, in the case of the nineteenth session, amount to almost a hundred. I shall confine myself to examining briefly a few of them, selected both for their intrinsic importance and for the special importance attached to them by our delegation.

4. With regard to the first two of these items, my statement will be partly in the nature of a report, since they are questions which have recently been the subject of international study and decision in my country's capital, during two meetings over whose work I myself, by a happy coincidence, had the signal honour to preside.

5. At the invitation of the Mexican Government, the Special Committee established by the General Assembly under its resolution 1966 (XVIII) of 16 December

<sup>1/</sup> Special Meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at the Ministerial Level, held at Punta del Este, Uruguay, from 5 to 17 August 1961.

1963 met from 27 August to 2 October last at Mexico City in order to study four basic principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States: namely, prohibition of the use or threat of force, the peaceful settlement of disputes, non-intervention and the sovereign equality of States.

6. The results of the five weeks of thorough deliberation by the Committee are recorded in the report [A/5746] which is one of those submitted for the consideration of the present session.

7. My delegation feels that the task entrusted to the Special Committee, and that which will fall to the Sixth Committee when it comes to consider the Special Committee's report, are of exceptional importance. It is a question, not merely of progressive development and codification, but of the finding of formulas to facilitate more effective application of the principles mentioned, as the Assembly itself said in its resolution 1966 (XVIII).

8. It is inconceivable that peace can be consolidated without the scrupulous observance of these all-important principles, which form, so to speak, the nucleus of the United Nations Charter. We must bear in mind that at the San Francisco Conference they were inevitably formulated in very general terms. One of them—non-intervention by one State in the affairs of another—is not even explicitly stated in the Charter. In order, therefore, that these principles shall today acquire their full force as rules of conduct for States and United Nations bodies, it will be necessary to discover and define their political and juridical scope in the light of the tremendous changes that have taken place in the post-war international society.

9. As has been often and so very rightly stressed, prohibition of the use of force, for example, is a principle whose scope and content are very different today from what they were in the pre-nuclear era. Again, the more or less numerous exceptions recognized under the classic concept of non-intervention in the nineteenth and early in the twentieth century are today totally incompatible with the principle of the sovereign equality of all States, on which, as the Charter explicitly stipulates, our Organization is based.

10. The Special Committee was not able, during the brief time that it met, to achieve unanimous agreement on the principles under consideration. This is hardly surprising, given the complexity of the questions involved. In order to complete this task, it will be necessary, *inter alia*, for the efforts of the Special Committee to be combined with those of the General Assembly, and for the opinion and will of the international community, which is represented here in almost its entirety, to be clearly shown.

11. However, my delegation considers that, although the Special Committee did not succeed in establishing final texts, its labours were extremely fruitful. For the first time since the San Francisco Conference, a group of Member States, sufficiently representative both geographically and in terms of the main legal systems in the world, systematically studied, through serious, high-level work, the meaning and scope of the basic principles of the Charter. The main points of divergence were clarified; dominant trends were

outlined with greater precision, and some of them were embodied in well-thought-out proposals.

12. The exploratory work done in connexion with non-intervention has in our opinion particular value, given the gap that exists on this subject in the Charter. My delegation is convinced that some of the proposals submitted to the Special Committee on the principle of non-intervention will be of incalculable value in the General Assembly's discussions on this very important matter. Among these proposals is that suggested by Mexico. Both because of the method used in its drafting—the formulation of the principle in general but sufficiently precise terms, and subsequent illustration through the selective use of examples—and because it was prepared with the aid of inter-American documents (since, as is well known, it is in this continent that most progress has been made in the matter), we would make bold to describe it as, technically speaking, one of the most complete proposals ever laid before an international body. We have therefore deemed it useful to lose no time in drawing the Assembly's attention to this document, the full text of which can be found in the report of the Special Committee (A/5746) already referred to.

13. We are firmly convinced that, if the United Nations in 1965 succeeded in embodying in a formal Declaration a text identical with or similar to the proposal in question, it would be making one of the most valuable possible contributions to peaceful coexistence and good-neighbourly relations.

14. The Mexican capital has also very recently been the scene of another international gathering to which I would now refer, albeit very superficially. This was the Preliminary Meeting on the Denuclearization of Latin America, held at Mexico City from 23 to 27 November 1964, whose Final Act, by decision of the Meeting itself, was transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has been distributed by him as a document for the present session [A/5824].

15. Accordingly, I shall make no detailed analysis of the resolutions adopted by this meeting. But my delegation consider it relevant to make some brief mention of its main background and to indicate why its results may in our opinion be regarded as a new step forward on the road which the Assembly has repeatedly recommended should be followed in order to prevent the spread or proliferation of nuclear weapons.

16. The origin of the Preliminary Meeting was resolution 1911 (XVIII) on the denuclearization of Latin America, adopted by the General Assembly on 27 November 1963. In this resolution, the Assembly, considering that the Heads of State of five Latin American Republics had issued, on 29 April 1963, a declaration in which, in the name of their peoples and Governments, they had announced that they were prepared to sign a multilateral Latin American agreement whereby their countries would undertake not to manufacture, receive, store or test nuclear weapons or nuclear launching devices, and recognizing "the need to preserve, in Latin America, conditions which will prevent the countries of the region from becoming involved in a dangerous and ruinous nuclear arms race", noted with satisfaction the initiative of the Heads

of State and expressed the hope that the States of Latin America would initiate studies "concerning the measures that should be agreed upon with a view to achieving the aims of the said declaration".

17. With the object of helping to realize the hope expressed by the Assembly, the Mexican Government invited all the other Latin American Republics which had voted in favour of resolution 1911 (XVIII) to participate in the Preliminary Meeting to which I have referred. At the meeting, six resolutions were adopted, whose full text can be found in document A/5824. I will merely note here that, as a result of resolution II in the Final Act, a Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America was created.

18. This Preparatory Commission will have its headquarters at Mexico City and will begin work on 15 March 1965. Its main task will be to prepare "a preliminary draft of a multilateral treaty for the denuclearization of Latin America" and, to this end, to carry out the preparatory studies and measures which it considers necessary. In this connexion the Meeting recommended the Commission to give priority to a series of matters, including: the definition of the geographical boundaries of the area to which the treaty should apply; the methods of verification, inspection and control that should be adopted to ensure the faithful fulfilment of the obligations contracted under the treaty; and the initiation of action designed to obtain from the nuclear Powers a commitment to the effect that they would strictly respect the legal instrument on the denuclearization of Latin America in regard to all its aspects and consequences.

19. By a happy coincidence, resolution II to which I have just referred was adopted on the same date as that of the adoption by this Assembly, a year previously, of resolution 1911 (XVIII). We are convinced that the Latin American Republics could have done nothing more appropriate to commemorate such a happy anniversary than to establish, as they recently did at Mexico City, suitable international machinery for the preparation, in due time, of a multilateral treaty providing for the denuclearization of Latin America.

20. General and complete disarmament—of which regional denuclearization is really only one of the so-called "collateral measures"—undoubtedly continues to be one of the most important elements in the noble undertaking which mankind has entrusted to the United Nations. This objective—we make no secret of the fact—is extremely difficult to achieve, but its achievement is essential, because the peace of the world cannot rest upon the balance of terror indefinitely. On no grounds, therefore, could the Mexican delegation ignore this item, particularly since our participation in the work of the disarmament bodies is unstinted and well known to all.

21. Mexico has always regarded its membership of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament as a special honour, inevitably involving it in responsibility. In this forum and up to the most recent meetings, held at Geneva between June and September 1964, the voice of the Mexican representative has been continually heard, both on the general subject of disarmament and on the various collateral measures designed to

contribute to disarmament whether what was involved was the checking of the arms race by some means or at least, if nothing else was possible, the relaxation of international tension.

22. Our action on all these facets of the complex problem of disarmament has been guided, in a spirit of realism and moderation, by the basic consideration that, since Mexico is a non-nuclear Power which takes pride in the independence of its foreign policy, our function should essentially be that of moderator between the great nuclear Powers. Our invariable principle and the basis for our action have been that all differences can be resolved when the fundamental prerequisite of goodwill is present and that reflection, wisdom and temperance are still decisive factors in international affairs.

23. We are convinced that at no juncture should we take up an extreme position. Rather should we confine ourselves to inviting each of the parties to listen with respect and give due consideration to the arguments of the other—both with regard to the need, for example, to initiate with all possible speed the effective implementation of a disarmament programme, and simultaneously to the other no less obvious need of not compromising security during the various stages through which the process of general and complete disarmament must pass.

24. However unfruitful efforts may so far have been, in face of direct contemplation of the facts, to meet these requirements in equal measure, we are sure that they will have to be adjusted to each other in the future; we shall then see, with all the advantages of hindsight, how far from vain was the appeal for agreement made, at the critical moment, by States which have a long, noble and at times painful history of devotion to and love of peace.

25. We do, however, take sides on one issue—and this, one might say, is the only case in which we are aligned, the only case in which we are, in legal terminology, an interested party: we are on the side of peace and humanity, and against the negative forces of death and barbarism. For this reason, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1909 (XVIII), we have repeated at Geneva our hope (which is also, as we see it, the hope of mankind) that at the appropriate time an international agreement may be signed under which there would be absolute prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. We have made it quite clear that the idea of convening a special conference with this end in view does not seem, to us, a practical one unless the great nuclear Powers agree to attend such a conference, since we are interested not in propaganda tactics but in effective results; with this reservation, however, it has appeared and still appears to us that we should continue to strive for the international outlawing, one day, of the use of these blindly destructive weapons, which inevitably involve mass extermination and complete lack of discrimination between the guilty and the innocent.

26. Last, but certainly not least, I should like to refer to the joint memorandum submitted by eight States (among them Mexico), which in my delegation's opinion constitutes an important contribution within the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. It appears among the annexes to that Committee's report

to the Assembly, and in it the signatories "urge the nuclear Powers to take all immediate steps towards an agreement to ban all nuclear weapon tests and to discontinue all such tests".<sup>2/</sup>

27. However true it may be that the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the three elements with which we are all familiar<sup>3/</sup> has been the most important "collateral measure" of disarmament so far taken, it is equally true that, in accordance with its preamble, it must be extended so as to ban nuclear tests in every conceivable element. The difficulties in identifying or distinguishing between natural seismic movements and underground explosions must be overcome through progress in science and technology, combined, if necessary, with some form of on-the-spot inspection which would be acceptable to all.

28. With unflagging hope, therefore, and despite the meagreness of the results achieved at the most recent meetings, Mexico will continue to collaborate wholeheartedly in the work of the Committee on Disarmament, since we are convinced that to accept defeat in this field would be tantamount to accepting the possibility of universal extermination.

29. I should like to say a few words about the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, which was undoubtedly the most important event of recent years in the field of international trade relations.

30. As we know, the Conference met at Geneva for almost three months, from 23 March to 15 June 1964, with 120 States participating. It was convened, in the words of its Final Act, "... in order to provide, by means of international co-operation, appropriate solutions to the problems of world trade in the interest of all peoples and particularly to the urgent trade and development problems of the developing countries".<sup>4/</sup>

31. I shall venture to mention some of what my delegation regards as the most outstanding results of this Conference, which we hope is destined to mark the beginning of a new advance, of deep and historic significance, towards reducing the shattering inequality that exists between the industrialized and the developing countries.

32. In the first place—although this was an incidental effect of the lengthy preparatory work for the Conference—it seems to us that mention should be made of the joint relationship which gradually but spontaneously took shape between the developing countries with a view to their exerting, through co-ordinated action, more effective influence in the matter of formulating and implementing a new policy of international economic co-operation. This joint relationship was officially expressed in the Joint Declaration of the Developing Countries, which appears as an annex to General Assembly resolution 1897 (XVIII) of 11 November 1963. It has already acquired sufficient force to ensure that it will persist in the body originally known as the "group of seventy-five countries", and in the future it will certainly constitute a valuable

means of defending the legitimate interests of all the developing countries.

33. Secondly, we should stress the recognition, by the Conference, that removal of the obstacles to an increase in the real income of the developing countries requires complete revision and a thorough transformation of the traditional systems under which international operations in the fields of trade, finance and assistance have been carried out. Guided by this conviction, the Conference adopted a series of General Principles and many practical recommendations.

34. To illustrate the importance of those principles, I think it is worth recalling the texts of the first four of the fifteen principles adopted by the Conference. General Principle One states:

"Economic relations between countries, including trade relations, shall be based on respect for the principle of sovereign equality of States, self-determination of peoples, and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries."

General Principle Two provides that:

"There shall be no discrimination on the basis of differences in socio-economic systems. Adaptation of trading methods shall be consistent with this principle."

General Principle Three says:

"Every country has the sovereign right freely to trade with other countries, and freely to dispose of its natural resources in the interest of the economic development and well-being of its own people."

Finally, General Principle Four runs as follows:

"Economic development and social progress should be the common concern of the whole international community and should, by increasing economic prosperity and well-being, help strengthen peaceful relations and co-operation among nations. Accordingly, all countries pledge themselves to pursue internal and external economic policies designed to accelerate economic growth throughout the world, and in particular to help promote, in developing countries, a rate of growth consistent with the need to bring about a substantial and steady increase in average income, in order to narrow the gap between the standard of living in developing countries and that in the developed countries."<sup>5/</sup>

35. With regard to the recommendations, special mention should be made of those for the stimulation of a dynamic and steady growth in the real export earnings of developing countries, both through international commodity arrangements and liberalization of commodity access to markets, and through the adoption of a programme of preferences in favour of developing countries, which would considerably increase their share of international trade in manufactured or semi-manufactured products. The recommendations indicating the reforms in national domestic structures that can best promote economic development should also be noted.

36. Of course, if the results of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development are to be

<sup>2/</sup> Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for January to December 1964, document DC/209, annex I, sect. 0.

<sup>3/</sup> Signed in Moscow, on 5 August 1963.

<sup>4/</sup> Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, vol. I. Final Act and Report (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 64.II. B.11), Final Act, para. 8.

<sup>5/</sup> Ibid., Final Act, para. 54.



reflected in benefits corresponding to the urgent needs of the developing countries, it will be necessary for the General Principles adopted by the Conference to become a permanent rule of conduct for all States, and for the recommendations to be faithfully implemented. We nevertheless trust that the industrialized countries will be persuaded, as the developing countries already are, of the urgent need for both the principles and the recommendations to take full effect in the immediate future.

37. We believe that one of the greatest advantages stemming from the interest aroused by the work and conclusions of the Conference was a better understanding, in managerial circles in the industrialized countries, of the adverse conditions which act as so pernicious a brake on the progress of the developing countries—for example, the strangulation of their economies, due in large part to the present features of international trade. It therefore seems to us that it would be most desirable, with a view to spreading knowledge of these facts as widely as possible, for maximum publicity to be given to the Final Act of the Conference in the industrial countries.

38. Lastly, although it may appear obvious, we do not think it superfluous to emphasize once more the paramount importance of prompt approval, by the Assembly, of the Conference's recommendation that it be established as an organ of the Assembly itself and that a permanent organ of the Conference—the Trade and Development Board—be set up.

39. I need hardly add that Mexico will continue to contribute, as it has in the past contributed, to this common effort in international co-operation, both by expediting the execution of its own development plans and by collaborating whole-heartedly in the work of all the competent bodies and organizations.

40. For reasons which I am sure we all deplore, the Organization has for some time been faced with serious problems deriving from the financing of the so-called "peace-keeping operations". In the Working Group of twenty-one members, my delegation has endeavoured, with persistence and without discouragement, to help to the best of its ability in the search for a solution that would be generally acceptable.

41. We are glad to note the apparent probability that such a solution will be found in the near future. We hope that this will come about, since a split would be so fraught with danger to the very existence of the United Nations as to be totally inconceivable, particularly on the threshold of the year 1965, which is the twentieth anniversary of the United Nations and when it will be imperative for all Member States to show, by deeds, that our decision to designate 1965 "International Co-operation Year" is not an empty one.

42. Mr. BALLA (Cameroon) (translated from French): The delegation of the Federal Republic of Cameroon wishes first of all, Mr. President, to add its voice to the chorus of congratulations which has greeted your election as President of the nineteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly. The circumstances in which this election took place, the fact that you were the only African candidate, and the vote by acclamation—an unusual occurrence in this

hall—constitute an indisputable tribute to the whole of Africa and a source of pride for all natives of that continent and their true friends.

43. We Africans rejoice doubly because, while the United Nations has been enriched by the admission of three new Members, the family of the Organization of African Unity has been joined by two more independent States. To these three States just admitted to the United Nations—Malawi, Malta and Zambia—we offer our brotherly welcome and our wish that they may prosper and develop in this life of independence, which has proved difficult for some and painful for others, but is stimulating for all once its responsibilities are accepted.

44. For almost three years now, a singular conspiracy of fate has dictated that the Assembly should meet either in the shadow of crisis or in such circumstances that its proceedings are disturbed virtually from the outset. On each occasion, the Assembly has heard the wings of the angel of distress beating above it.

45. Is this not particularly true of the present session, when you, Mr. President, like Robinson Crusoe on his island, are for the moment the sole member of our presidium, which should normally also include seventeen Vice-Presidents and the Chairman of the Main Committees of the General Assembly? I surely am revealing no secret in expressing the anxiety felt by each of us, which has led us to take the paradoxical step of opening a general debate without an agenda and thus assuming such an incredible measure of freedom that each, if he so desires, can discourse on the sex of the angels or the temperature on Venus without your being able to call us to order, while so many burning and pressing problems demand our attention. How can it be explained that the General Assembly, from which the world expects a yearly review of the prospects for peace and for the advancement and development of mankind, is so paralysed that, despite this debate, no one can maintain that the session has really started? All this shows that the symptoms of a major crisis are present. It seems to us that the time has come to face it squarely, and above all to examine our consciences.

46. For this reason I would prefer not to make a statement on Cameroon's foreign policy, which our President, Ahmadou Ahidjo, explained in detail from this rostrum at the eighteenth session on 17 October 1963.

47. It is rather my intention to make a brief survey of this phantom agenda, the draft of which we carry in our brief-cases and which we have agreed to discuss without adopting it, and to try at the same time to indicate the essential features of the problems which must be solved if our Organization is to resume its normal course and regain the necessary vigour in the interests of fruitful relations between the members of the international community.

48. How and why does it come about that the world continually proceeds from one crisis to another, even involving this Assembly, when never before have there been so many regional organizations, so many smaller and larger conferences at which almost invariably the same issues are discussed without solutions to them being found? How and why does it happen that

the United Nations is suddenly prey to a deadlock, that the same abscesses of localized war continue to be inflamed, at the very time when permanent dialogue between Moscow and Washington has been established—dialogue from which one was entitled to expect an end to the "cold war"? How and why is it that, while arriving at quite substantial agreement on other points, the two capitals are at loggerheads with regard to paltry sums which are a mere drop in the ocean compared with the amounts spent on Luniks, Sputniks, Observers, Mariners and all the others of the same species, when what is at issue is the preservation of this Organization? There is far too much inconsistency in all this.

49. Already, during the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at Geneva, we had witnessed this extraordinary clash of extremes, based on the same "nyet", in connexion with the unanimous demand from the small and medium-sized countries concerned about their backwardness, asked in terms of great moderation that account be taken of their perilous situation and that something be done not only for them but in the interests of stability, so advantageous and essential to all!

50. This is clear indication and proof of the fundamental anachronism of our times: international society, inherently conservative, has not been able to develop and adapt itself to the physical change called for by this century, which is itself the beginning of a new epoch.

51. It has already been said, from this rostrum, that we are living in this second half of the twentieth century with the mentality prevalent at the end of the nineteenth century. Even the spirit in which the Charter was conceived is now out-of-date. Hence these contradictions in which we are involved and from which we find it hard to escape.

52. It is no longer possible for the affairs of the world to be thought out and decided by a few. The desire for freedom is now so powerful that all the old structures are breaking down, are collapsing. This new age of mankind calls for a new spirit in the men and women of our times, in their institutions and in relations between their States.

53. In the case of our Organization, the rule of the powerful, established by the veto, must be made more flexible and less absolute. It is no longer possible for two nations, even if they hold the terrible privilege of being able to end life on earth, to claim sole right of decision in regard to the affairs of the world community as a whole.

54. We wish here and now to issue a respectful but solemn warning to the Soviet Union and the United States of America. We say to them: the small and medium-sized Powers are essential to you. You can never do without them. The logical consequence of your different systems and of the equal and terrible power you possess is that you are inevitably opposed to each other. Only a third, mediatory force can prevent a fatal encounter between you. You may think that agreement at our expense would be easy; but we say to you that the conflict would come at the end, when the spheres of influence were divided up.

55. There is accordingly only one solution—to consolidate the United Nations and restore it to normal working order, with the operation of the traditional democratic machinery, obviously oiled by mediation and negotiation.

56. We have been asking, for a very long time, that the Charter be reviewed. We desire that the coming year, which is that of its twentieth anniversary, shall be, as in the life of an individual, the year of transition from childhood to manhood. We desire that 1965 should be the year of true, genuine and fundamental revision of the Charter. Together we must think out, coolly, intelligently, fair conditions for exercise of the veto, and ways and means of reconciling it with the requirements of the democratic majority. It will no longer be enough to proclaim faith in democracy; we must first, and at once, put it into practice in this forum of nations.

57. Is it not here that the root of the financial problem lies? It is a conflict of competence between the Security Council, which some wish to have exclusive right of decision in regard to peace-keeping operations, and the General Assembly, which is subject to no veto other than the law of numbers.

58. If we consider the state of paralysis into which we have been led, if we consider the extraordinary fact that, despite almost universal goodwill, a conflict between two States is erecting a barrier against the views of 113 States, there can be no doubt that we are facing an unmistakable challenge to the principle of equality and balance carefully established by the Charter.

59. The present crisis is merely the expression of a political conflict in terms of obligatory annual contributions. Let no one speak to us of legal or juridical arguments. Political will, when it exists, knows no irreconcilable principles or criteria.

60. Let nobody be mistaken: if it comes to a choice between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, we shall always choose the United Nations. We will not be a party to excluding anyone. Are men's memories so short? How did the League of Nations die? Through the gradual departure of its important members, of those that were the great Powers of their time. The essential feature of our Charter is its universality. It is not selective; if it were, it would be that, no longer of the United Nations, but of selected nations. If it were selective, could we, the late-comers, rely on being co-opted?

61. In short, I would say on this matter: We wish to retain all countries, with all countries paying, because without contributions the United Nations cannot live.

62. Why should we renew the United Nations and ensure its survival? The answer is clear: in order to ensure international peace and security, to safeguard that triptych which President Ahidjo spoke of, in this Assembly, as being the fundamental need of man. I quote:

"... the need for security, to feel himself safe from attack; the need to feel himself free, to choose according to his will or to consent without constraint; and the need to survive, to grow and to develop;" in three words: "peace, self-determination and development" [1244th meeting, para. 29].

63. What do we mean by peace? It seems that the words which are most common are also those for which each one has his own definition—often, unfortunately, different from the ordinary meaning: Peace is not simply a state of calm in one's own national territory, where a nation can enjoy to the full the agreeable sensation of being remote from the theatres of war, generally situated overseas—even if from time to time some few families must mourn sons who have fallen on those distant battlefields.

64. Peace, we repeat, is indivisible. Can one speak of peace when in Cuba, Cyprus, the Congo, Viet-Nam, Laos, Korea, Berlin, South-East Asia and the Middle East whole armies wait, finger on trigger, squadrons and fleets are ready to take off or set sail, guerrillas are ready to come to life, the "maquis" are on the alert? One has the impression that the great Powers say to each other: so long as it is not happening between us, these are the slightly adult games of unruly children.

65. We must create a mystique of peace. Peace at home, and peace in the territories of our neighbours, the great, and the small; a general, total peace. Without such a mystique, there will be no general, total disarmament, complete and controlled. What an astonishing century ours is, when no scientific advance can be described without a series of highflown epithets.

66. The twentieth-century common man—and we are of his ranks—demands, so that mankind should survive, disarmament so patent that all epithets are superfluous. The drive which produced the Moscow Treaty has clearly lost its force. Is this not further reason for redoubling our efforts?

67. But it will not be enough to renounce weapons; the desire to impress others must also be renounced. To impress others—this, first and foremost, is the extravagance, the inordinate pride, whereby man seeks to subjugate man, to deny to his fellow the rights he claims for himself. Colonialism, imperialism, neo-colonialism and discrimination—such are the various aspects of this same moral sin.

68. As I pursue this subject, I already hear criticism from some to the effect that the tune is old and overplayed. Perhaps it is. But unfortunately it is also more timely now than ever. At the risk of repeating myself, I would say that here too it is the same cause producing the same effects. In this era, when proclamations of faith in self-determination abound, there is no lack of secret ambition to restore former dominion through gunboat tactics, open or disguised.

69. But we shall meet the obstinacy and unpardonable refusal of some to hear us with a no less inflexible resolve to cast an anathema on imperialists of every kind until, wearied by our revolt, they allow the subject or oppressed peoples to intone at last, with those that have been set free, the hymn of deliverance and fraternity.

70. Close by us in Africa, the persistent cries of anguish from our brothers groaning in the shackles of Portugal and South Africa are with us from morning to night. We shall never be able to taste the full joys of independence so long as Angolans, Mozambicans, Rhodesians, Basutos, Zulus, Bantus, and others continue, at our side, to suffer their calvary.

71. No, we cannot remain silent. For in this matter our silence, or even a pause in our protesting, would amount to criminal complicity. After the adoption here of the historic Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, after the untold sufferings to be found all over the colonies, after the experience of cases where decolonization has proved to strengthen and better the relations between former metropolitan countries and new nations, it is astonishing to find that colonial Powers have still not understood and learnt.

72. True, some of them have shown a degree of understanding. At the doorway to the Federal Republic of Cameroon lie Fernando Póo and Río Muni. Spain, the colonizing Power, has taken a positive step there by instituting a system of self-government by stages. Having ourselves gone through the same process, we would be wrong not to give it its due, especially after the painful experience of unsuccessful decolonizations. But caution must not result in evasion. Self-government is not an end in itself, but simply a state on the way to complete self-determination or independence.

73. We have referred to self-government in Cameroon; the self-government stage lasted one year. Spain must therefore make haste, for it is already behind the time-table of African liberation. Decolonization is, moreover, indivisible. It would mean nothing to release the former Spanish Rif while retaining Fernando Póo and Río Muni.

74. Justice requires courage. The reform undertaken in Río Muni and Fernando Póo is a development we recognize and welcome, the more so as we have encouraged refugees from Río Muni and Fernando Póo to return to their country and there undergo an apprenticeship in managing their own affairs. But we trust that Spain will take the next step too. Complete independence must be granted without delay, and the inhabitants of these territories must be allowed to decide their destiny freely, without hindrance or mental reservation, without manoeuvres or machinations.

75. Indeed, independence must come for all those who have not yet obtained it. Portugal must withdraw within its original frontiers fixed in Europe. It must abandon the course of artificially extending them into Africa through a policy of assimilation which history has condemned. It is so written in the stars. Like all the overseas empires of all times, the Portuguese empire must come to an end, as have those of Italy, Belgium and the Netherlands, to speak only of modern colonial empires. And yet, does this mean that these Powers have left Africa or Asia? In fact they are present there more than ever before, thanks to the necessity of co-operation among nations.

76. This indeed is the question, the real question—transforming the presence of former colonizers in our countries. A few days ago I heard a prominent person ask what neo-colonialism was. This person is so familiar with international affairs that it is hard to imagine why the meaning of this term should have been so difficult to fathom. It is a question of the "transforming of presence." There are those who make a pretence of leaving but who stay on under the same conditions as before determined to concede nothing and retain all. There are also those who



remain, even though in a sense they have left, but who stand aside for the rightful rulers and simply remain available for the provision, on request of aid and advice—proud and eager to consolidate and complete a truly exhilarating undertaking, one in which there is true human solidarity, true brotherhood. In the other camp there is only egoism, cowardliness and treachery; and at the worst there is intervention in the affairs of others, leading to tragedy, to revolt and finally to those crises of which we have so many examples before us.

77. When we think of man's egoism in dispossessing others of their rights, when we think of all the distress of our times due solely to the fact that self-determination has entered the political vocabulary but not the sphere of political action, we cannot but agree with Roland Dorgelès, who wrote in his Les Croix de bois:

"How hard is man, despite his cries of pity;  
How mild the pain of others seems to him,  
When his own pain is not a part of it."

What would this writer have said if he had visited that hell on earth, the Bantu part of South Africa, where, under apartheid, man is not a man, where he is hunted on his native soil, penned up, maltreated and lynched, just because of the colour of his skin? What would he have said if, having so severely castigated the ordinary man, he were asked to pronounce on the attitude of this Organization and its Members, adopting resolutions on South Africa and refraining from carrying them out?

78. All we have called for is the application of economic sanctions. Is this so difficult? What is so ironical is this leniency towards South Africa compared with the rigorous attitude taken on finances, simply a question of money but one which, it is feared, may cause the elimination of a few founding Members. Now that is a great deal. We for our part are not asking for so much.

79. Let us re-examine our consciences. Let us rearm ourselves with courage and take the stout resolve to reinstate man in his rights everywhere in the world, including the Union of South Africa.

80. It has become a truism to say that political liberation is a deception if unaccompanied by economic independence, which is its necessary complement. Thus, among nations as between individuals, civic relations must be complemented by relations of interchange which are free of all subjection or dependence. Man does not live by freedom alone. He lives, first of all, by bread.

81. To be convinced of this, we need only recall how last year public opinion throughout the developing world sought and demanded the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and hailed its opening, last March, at Geneva. The holding of this historic Conference dispenses me from any need once again to analyse the current economic situation, which was presented, commented on and dissected by the world's foremost economists.

82. The results of the Conference are impressive, as we may judge from the United Nations press release of 1 October 1964, which reads:

"A total of nearly sixty individual recommendations were adopted by the Conference. These included

fifteen 'General Principles' and thirteen 'Special Principles' to govern 'international trade relations and trade policies conducive to development'; and eight principles relating to transit trade and land-locked States. Recommendations were also adopted relating to commodities, manufactured goods, financing for an expansion of trade, improvement of 'invisible trade', special problems, and a programme of work in the field of trade and development.

"The recommendations approved by the Conference also included one calling for the establishment of new international machinery as an integral part of the United Nations to continue the work initiated by the Conference and to implement its recommendations and conclusions."

There are grounds for asserting that never before has a disease been submitted to the meticulous scrutiny of so many physicians, all experts in their special fields, and never before has a prescription been so long and detailed. But what will the remedy finally be? We can no longer claim to be ignorant of the disease, its scope or its gravity, or of the therapeutic measures that ought to be applied.

83. This is why we are concerned, as I said at the beginning of my statement, over the paralysis with which this session of the General Assembly has been stricken. We are most anxious to see the establishment of this new machinery which is to be part of the United Nations and is to deal specifically with trade and development.

84. At Geneva we were moderate, and we remain moderate today. We were asked to consider institutional arrangements for conciliation. A special committee worked on that question and made recommendations. But this is neither the time nor the place for an analysis of that matter.

85. We categorically refuse to be reconciled in any way to this chance situation which compels the General Assembly, willy-nilly, to depart for the time being from the normal procedure of expressing its desires. True, the circumstance is exceptional. But we hereby refuse to recognize it as a precedent, for at Geneva, as you will recall, the question of voting was the stumbling-block. Let no one nurse the vain hope of exploiting that example tomorrow, in the negotiations which the question of economic transformation will require.

86. It is here too, indeed here more than elsewhere, that transformation is needed. The traditional division of labour, which condemned our economies to a proletarian role in relation to the industrialized nations, must also go through its process of decolonization. It has become clear that political despotism, arraigned before history, was nothing but the puppet of a more ruthless master—economic exploitation.

87. There is, indeed, no way of ensuring world stability so long as economic inequality and under-development continue to prevail, under economic structures imposed in the past and sanctioning the monopolization of wealth by the minority to the detriment of the greater number. In his address of

17 October 1963, President Ahmadou Ahidjo uttered these cautionary words:

"To speak frankly and realistically, the attitude of the industrialized countries does not take sufficient account of the effective solidarity which, in the general context of our times, binds and will increasingly bind all nations in the world and all men. We feel that the time has come to realize that the arms race, and even the atomic arms race, is not the only factor threatening world peace and collective security. Another factor, although undoubtedly less spectacular but more insidious and enduring, is under-development. The arms race and the cold war, which is its corollary, are merely the consequence of the basic imbalance of the international community.

"How can we build a balanced international community if we do not eradicate within each nation composing it the causes of that instability, of which under-development—that is to say, poverty, disease and illiteracy—is surely not the least important?

"In view of the lesson of history that civilizations die from injustice, that is to say, from the inability to distribute equitably the fruits of mankind's achievement, it is to be hoped that co-operation will become the keynote of our times. Otherwise, it seems to us that mankind can only prepare for itself a bitter morrow." [1244th meeting, paras. 78-80.]

To be sure, not everything depends on the industrialized countries. Far from it. A great deal must be done by the developing countries themselves.

88. The normalization of the terms of trade in all spheres must go hand in hand with a rational and scientific organization of markets, supplemented by a judicious apportionment of selective preferences. The inequality of levels of development compels the smaller States, under penalty of death by suffocation, to pool their means and their resources. It is in this light that we must view the efforts of regional regrouping and direct them on to a dynamic path headed towards the outside and away from autarchy.

89. We in Africa have been much inspired, in our action, by these motives. Thus the Federal Republic of Cameroon has joined with other countries in the Association of African and Malagasy Economic Co-operation and Development, which is linked to the European Economic Community under a convention of association that was signed in our capital city, Yaoundé.

90. In a more restricted context, the founding of an economic unit has just been completed with the signing at Brazzaville on 8 December 1964 of a Treaty establishing the Economic and Customs Union of Central Africa. The participating countries are Gabon, the Congo (Brazzaville), the Central African Republic, Chad and the Federal Republic of Cameroon. This economic union is the first step towards an African common market, about which many have spoken but which we are only now beginning to develop with a view to complete economic integration, involving inter-regional trade, the equitable distribution of industrial infrastructure, the co-ordination of development programmes, the establishment of a common customs

tariff, the harmonizing of internal systems and investment codes, and the establishment of a sub-regional bank for common industrial development. Our five countries already have a Currency Issue Institute, while in the matter of transport systems all studies and projects have been conceived in terms of long-term regional development.

91. I must apologize for going rather extensively into this last aspect of my country's joint efforts with its neighbours to build African unity. But this is our ultimate objective. It is the experiment with which we are concerned today, and we hope that history will record it as our proud achievement and the symbol of our generation's contribution to the rehabilitation of the African continent.

92. Far from doing injury or creating obstacles, regional agreements, in suppressing the causes and sources of friction and fostering co-operation and good-neighbourly relations, promote and strengthen agreement at the summit. This at any rate is our idea in Central Africa: to close our ranks so that we may be more cohesive, and to merge with the continental aggregate of African unity.

93. I hope you will excuse me for having spoken at such length; but the special circumstances surrounding the convening of this session, and the conditions under which we are meeting here, called for some comment which my delegation deemed necessary to make.

94. Today, as always, each of us—each delegation—and the Organization as a whole face a crucial moment demanding courage and responsibility. A great man, Edouard Herriot, who for many years presided over the French National Assembly, once spoke of nations in these terms: "Nations make their own destinies. Nothing good comes to them simply by chance. Those who serve them best are those who develop their inner strength." I dedicate these words to our Organization in this difficult period. Our Organization will indeed face the destiny we make for it. Can it be that we will fail it? No: I am sure that, finding in ourselves this strength which lies deep within, for it is the strength of life itself, we shall mould our destiny for the survival of man and the happiness of all in a world of peace and co-operation.

95. The PRESIDENT: In the exercise of the right of reply, I give the floor to the Deputy Prime Minister of Israel.

96. Mr. EBAN (Israel): The general debate has ranged over many issues but it has had one central theme. Again and again from the opening of this debate until the eloquent speech that we have just heard from the Foreign Minister of Cameroon, this rostrum has echoed with the most sincere of all human aspirations—the quest for peace. There is now a deep and almost universal consensus about the need to establish a peaceful international order. Representatives of all continents, cultures, traditions and ideologies have spoken here of that hope. A world of more than 115 sovereignties, most of them small, all living in the shadow of a common vulnerability, cannot afford anything less than mutual tolerance and co-operation.

97. There has also been wide agreement in this debate on the principles which should govern the new inter-

national harmony. First amongst these is respect for the independence and integrity of States. From this there follows a devotion to the pacific settlement of disputes and the renunciation of the threat or use of force in international relations and especially in the solution of territorial disputes.

98. But one voice is constantly raised against the vision of an international peace to be constructed by Members of the United Nations in every region of the world, in accordance with the principles of the Charter. That voice has come from many lips—from Libya, Sudan, Iraq, from Tunisia and Kuwait, from Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Syria—but the spirit and for the most part the form of these utterances has been the same. In simple terms, the representatives of the Arab nations whose independence covers 11 million square kilometres, in thirteen sovereign States, with a population of 100 million, have proclaimed from this rostrum the hope of extinguishing by violence the freedom and sovereignty achieved by the small State of Israel—a freedom won in agony and sacrifice, a sovereignty built into the very law and structure of this Organization. I come therefore to reply to those who from the highest tribunal of peace have proclaimed a message of war.

99. The more distant an Arab State is from Israel, the more heroically its representatives announce the threat of force. Thus the spokesmen of Tunisia and Kuwait have openly discussed the prospect of eliminating Israel's sovereignty by armed violence but other representatives have in less candid terms expressed the same theme. They have spoken of a "Palestine liberation organization"; they mean an "Israel liquidation organization." The aim is to change the territorial and political structure of the Middle East and of the United Nations by force; to convert Israel, the sole and unique expression of an ancient people's personality, into a fourteenth Arab State. Thirteen are evidently not enough. Eleven million square kilometres do not suffice.

100. This is not the first time in modern history that the word "liberation" has been distorted in order to conceal an expansionist ambition. It is essential that the language of international life be freed from obscurity. The statements of Arab representatives must be decoded. You have been presented, fellow representatives, with the proposition that a State Member of the United Nations be blotted out by war. This is the ambition that you are called upon to judge. You are summoned to judge it in the light of our Charter, of international law, of historic justice, and of your own national self-interest, for no single Member State has greater or lesser rights than any other. If one State can be overwhelmed by violence, then none is safe.

101. This doctrine of aggression against Israel has been advanced here in the name of a struggle against colonialism. Nothing is further from the truth. The real aim is to uproot from the Middle East its most deep-rooted, authentic and continuous national tradition. Amongst the nations of our immediate region there is one, and one alone—Israel—which speaks the same tongue, upholds the same faith, bears the same name, embodies the same national memories as those which distinguished it three thousand years ago. This

Israeli nation, which had more than twenty centuries of Middle Eastern history behind it before the Arab tongue and nation were born, has been presented here as a recent usurper. Everybody knows that Israel is part of the very texture and memory of this region. Take Israel from the history and culture of the Middle East and you evacuate that history of its central driving force. Modern Israel, even in its new formative phase, is a nation two-thirds of whose population were born in the Middle East, in Israel itself, or in the neighbouring land and of which the other third is attached to that land and soil and culture by the most tenacious sentiment ever recorded in the history of nationhood.

102. There is a form of neo-colonialism in this region, but not in Israel. Much has been said here of resolutions adopted in Cairo. It is not Israel which has sent 40,000 troops into Yemen in a classic colonial expedition. It is not Israel which seeks to dominate or intimidate other Middle Eastern Governments in the name of regional unity. Israel represents the classic prototype of the nation-State, in that her sovereignty, her political influence, are all contained within her national frontiers with no overflow of ambition to dominate anybody beyond them.

103. I do not recall these facts of history, past and present, in order to justify Israel's statehood. That statehood stands, like that of every other State, beyond any need of justification. It lies outside the realm of legal challenge. It will be defended no less effectively than in the past.

104. I speak of these matters only to illustrate the depth of paradox into which Arab spokesmen have been plunged by their refusal to recognize Israel's sovereign rights. They see the world as a community of sovereign nations from which one nation alone is to be excluded. All cultures and civilizations must, in their view, be represented in the tapestry of world society, except one.

105. When they come here to attack Israel's rights and honour, it is clear what these Governments are trying to do. They are transferring one of the most odious forms of racial discrimination from the social plane to the international plane. They are denying to other people the national opportunity and sovereign freedom that they so lavishly exercise themselves.

106. I am confident that this doctrine will continue to fail. It is as unjustified in law as in history. There is a strong tendency in the modern world—indeed, in this very Assembly—to strengthen the doctrine of the sovereignty of States. Without an unreserved respect for sovereignty the present political map of the world would fall into a fragmented chaos. This Organization cannot, in law, look behind the identity of States in an effort to trace the circumstances of their evolution.

107. The United Nations Charter, like the Charter of the Organization of American States, and of the Organization of African Unity, is based on the doctrine formulated in the Charter of the Organization of American States that all States are juridically equal, by reason of their mere existence as persons under international law. When a State enters this Organization, something great and irrevocable happens to it,

to its stature, to its rights, to its immunity from violent change. The Arab Governments would do well to understand that they do not possess rights beyond those which all the other 102 Member States possess. It is as ridiculous to ask if Israel should exist as it is to ask if Egypt, Algeria or Syria should exist.

108. The United Nations map is not obscure. In that map, every inch of the Middle East is under the jurisdiction of sovereign States. There are no vacant areas waiting for liberation.

109. I am persuaded by recent inquiry and contact that the majority of Member States, including all the great Powers represented here, desire to see the sovereign States of the Middle East living in peace and as good neighbours. Alone a Middle East at peace amongst its sovereign States can develop its life, free from external intervention and remote from power struggles originating beyond the region. One cannot have it both ways. If we want to have the region free from external intervention, we cannot at the same time tolerate irredentist movements of so-called liberation, for such movements mean war, and war is a constant invitation to external intervention.

110. The need to prohibit the use of force in territorial disputes applies universally to all sovereign States, and with special force to areas of tension.

111. The speeches of Arab representatives have at last clarified the relationship between the refugee problem and the broader issues of Middle Eastern security. The representative of Kuwait [1305th meeting] told us quite openly that this is not a problem of assisting refugees, and I quote: "It is a question of liberating their homeland". Other Arab representatives have spoken this year in similar vein.

112. I accept this definition. It has the virtue of truth. What it means is clear. The entry of Arab refugees into Israel is linked, in the minds of these Governments, with the elimination of Israel's sovereignty and national identity. This has often been what those Governments think. It is now also what they say. These statements will, of course, affect and indeed dominate my delegation's attitude to the discussion of the refugee problem in the appropriate committee.

113. The problem is apparently, in the minds of these Governments, political and even military and no longer humanitarian. Arab Governments tell us plainly that they wish the refugees to go back, not to Israel, but to the new political reality which would ensue from Israel's destruction. Therefore, to give any countenance or recognition to what is called the Palestine liberation movement, is to invite war, to condone aggression, to violate sovereignty and to undermine the United Nations structure.

114. At the proper time and place we shall explain the truth about the population movements which have taken place in our region as a direct result of the war launched by Arab Governments in 1948. The facts of that warlike initiative were formulated by the appropriate United Nations agency in words which should never be forgotten. I quote those words:

"Powerful Arab interests, both inside and outside Palestine, are defying the resolution of the General

Assembly and are engaged in a deliberate effort to alter by force the settlement envisaged therein."<sup>6/</sup>

These words are an essential document for the understanding of how Middle Eastern history has evolved in the past seventeen years. They determine the crucial point of original responsibility. Everything flows from them. How can Governments create a refugee problem by their calculated action and then withhold their capacity to solve that problem, which they, themselves, helped to create? Can anyone doubt that thirteen Arab States in their 11 million square kilometres with their abundant resources could absorb and rehabilitate these hundreds of thousands of their kinsmen if they did not desire to keep the problem tragically alive for political and military purposes which have this year been revealed?

115. Now, these refugees are not like any others who have ever borne that name. First, they are not alienated from their environment. They are within the Arab patria. They are on the soil of their nation, surrounded by the language, the national sentiment, and the loyalties which make up their corporate personality. Indeed, the great majority of the Palestine refugees are in what was Palestine. They are in the area of the former mandated territory, occupied by Egypt and Jordan during their military assault on Israel sixteen years ago. Many of them are citizens of sovereign Arab States. One quarter of a million of them are citizens of Israel. An even greater proportion of them remained in their original homes, now under Jordanian and Egyptian jurisdiction, and therefore the concept of a nation of one million uprooted is a violent distortion of historical and geographical facts.

116. Economically, many of them have been absorbed into the developing societies of the Middle East. The problem is acute enough, but it has been greatly exaggerated by propaganda and it is artificially kept alive by the refusal of the Arab Governments to see it solved.

117. Yet the pressures of life, the intersection of availability and opportunity are bringing about a process of integration. There is nothing surprising about this. More than 40 million refugees from many nations have been absorbed and integrated since the end of the Second World War into countries of kindred national culture. The case that we are discussing is the only case in which a group of States have maintained a refugee population as a charge on the international community for the purpose of launching them into battle against a Member State.

118. This emerges explicitly from the statements that we have heard from Arab delegations this year. The poignant human suffering which Arab Governments could so swiftly alleviate is subordinated to a cruel ambition of war and the victims of such a policy are the refugees themselves. For an attempt to destroy Israel by force would not solve the present Arab refugee problem; it would more probably enlarge it further.

119. An example of a nation's capacity to meet the challenge of new population problems can be found

<sup>6/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, Special Supplement No. 2, document S/676.



in Israel's recent experience. For the first time in thousands of years, there are no Jewish communities of any size in the Arabian Peninsula, in the Tigris, Euphrates and Nile Valleys, and in certain parts of North Africa. These communities, many centuries older than the Arab civilization in the Middle East and Mediterranean, have been ejected from their Arab environment—but they are no problem; they are no burden to the United Nations; they have been willingly and joyfully integrated into Israel's developing society. Their total number is not less than that of Arabs who have left the territory which is now Israel. There has taken place an exchange of minority communities between Israel and the Arab States; there has not been a one-sided eviction justifying Arab grievances.

120. A country of 8,000 square miles, much of it arid, with a population sixteen years ago of 650,000, has given home and work and the pride of citizenship to 600,000 destitute Jewish refugees from Arab lands. Is it too much to expect the Arab nation, in its multiple sovereignties and with its vast resources, to demonstrate a similar solidarity on behalf of its own kith and kin?

121. These matters will receive more detailed scrutiny in committee stage. I cannot conclude this statement of reply without one reference to the alternatives which lie before the Governments of our region and of the world. Israel is a small nation with a long history. That history originates and culminates in the soil in which our nationhood has been reborn. Before and during and since the restoration of Israel's independence, the Arab nation entered on a greater inheritance of freedom and opportunity. The Middle East is the home of all its nations, cultures, religions and civilizations. Within the sovereign equality recognized for all States by the United Nations Charter, these varied and diverse statehoods could interact in a new ferment of peaceful creativity. We do not abandon the vision of peace. It will come to pass. Our own vigilant resolution and the growing influence of peace-loving mankind can prevent the explosion which some Arab representatives here have advocated with such strange zeal. The destiny of the Middle East is of a future to be shared in peace.

122. But the willingness of our neighbours to live in peace with us is not a condition of our existence. If, despite our peaceful hopes, the neighbouring Governments maintain their present rancour, Israel will pursue its destiny as best it may; it will take pride in the links of diplomacy, commerce and culture which unite it in friendship to ninety sovereign States in all the five continents of the world. It has proved its capacity, even in conditions of tension, to defend its territory, to advance its social progress, to reanimate its culture, to expand its economy, to play its part in the great enterprise of scientific and technical progress. No modern State today is exclusively dependent on its immediate regional context and not all Israel's friends are far away. It would be better for our region that it should be free and open to the co-operative efforts of all its peoples, but this does not lie in our decision alone.

123. Meanwhile, Israel's support in the international arena will be given to three causes: peace, national

independence and development. These are the central purposes of Israel's life.

124. And, finally, the 100 nations which lie outside the Arab-Israel conflict can play a decisive role in the prevention of war and the promotion of peace in our region. We ask them now as before to give their support not so much to specific nations as to specific ideas—to be for peace against war; to be for the integrity and independence of all Member States and against any violation of integrity, sovereignty and independence by word and deed; to be for peaceful commerce, against the pressures of boycott and blockade; to be for a free and equal right of friendship with all States and against a policy of inheriting the contagion of hostility. As sovereign nations, you have an unreserved right to maintain your friendships with Israel in their own merit and their own identity. It is not for other nations to tell you who your enemies should be or how to choose your friends. By maintaining a strict attitude of law and principle, you may well succeed, first in breaking the wall of hostility, and then in bringing the States of the Middle East into the shelter and the influence of the Charter's aims.

125. And so the tensions which the neighbouring Governments generate are ominous, but not necessarily tragic. If you isolate this hostility, if you quarantine yourselves against infection by it, if you refuse to allow it to intimidate your policies, you can, by this very steadfastness, advance the high causes of the United Nations in the Middle East and the Mediterranean world.

126. Our nation's history teaches us to think in large perspectives, to preserve our faith in distant human aims. It is in that spirit that Israel answers its adversaries in this debate. Our immediate task is to stabilize the existing political and territorial structure, to hold the line against aggression. If so we do, then the day will come when the ideals and interests of our peoples will inaugurate, by the sheer compulsion of history, a brighter and more gentle age.

127. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of Portugal in the exercise of the right of reply.

128. Mr. DE MIRANDA (Portugal): Mr. President, as this is the first time my delegation takes the floor in the nineteenth General Assembly of the United Nations, I avail myself of this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on behalf of the delegation of Portugal, on your election to the Presidential chair. I also take this opportunity to offer the good wishes of my delegation to the new Members of the Organization—Malawi, Malta and Zambia.

129. I wish to make a brief statement in the exercise of the right of reply. Some of the speakers who have participated in the general debate have permitted themselves to make unfair and groundless allegations and charges against my country with reference to its policy and actions in its provinces—traditionally known as the overseas provinces of Portugal.

130. Since the general debate is going to be interrupted, the occasion now seems appropriate to state and to place on record that my delegation rejects, categorically and emphatically, those allegations and

charges. This we do without prejudice to our intervention which may take place in a later phase of this debate should we deem such intervention necessary.

131. I will not take the time of the Assembly in analysing the remarks of our critics; indeed, it is hardly necessary—not only because our critics have based themselves on nothing more solid than certain preconceived ideas, if not on hearsay or on their own imagination, but also because they have produced nothing which has not been said here before and which we have not refuted with the incontrovertible evidence of facts and of impartial testimony.

132. Our position and the reasons for it have been stated clearly and consistently on several occasions, both in the Assembly and elsewhere in this Organization. Our truthfulness, realism and good faith have been verified and confirmed by thousands of independent observers. Our policy and efforts for the social, economic and political progress of all our populations, irrespective of colour, creed or place of birth, speak for themselves and for us.

133. We do not have to be apologetic or to stand on the defensive. The success we have met with in terms of human relations encourages us to make further efforts along the lines of the policy which has abundantly proved its merit. Wherever we Portuguese have been able to work in peace, without outside interference, there has sprung up a racial harmony which many another area of the world has yet been unable to achieve. Our racial harmony is not fortuitous; indeed, more than a matter of policy, it is the fruit of our way of living and being. This is not boasting but a statement of facts which those who know us have verified. The Portuguese case ought not to be judged by patterns set by others. Nevertheless, this is being done and attempts are being made to divide, on racial grounds, what Portugal has united. I leave it to men of honest judgement to say whether this makes for progress or for retrogression.

134. Developments witnessed in some parts of the world in recent times have abundantly demonstrated that such attempts have nothing to do with the real interests of the populations in whose name they are made. Furthermore, inasmuch as such attempts include the use of violence, they should be unreservedly condemned. But such is the state of affairs that the promoters and perpetrators of violence themselves come to this rostrum and pose as champions of peace and self-determination. One such self-styled champion came here some days ago to say that the trouble is inside our territories, when his own country has been transformed into a vast base of subversion with a view to disturbing the traditional peace and tranquillity prevailing in our territory lying in the neighbourhood of that country.

135. The world is already familiar with such tactics and, judging from Press reports, is well aware of the facts. It is therefore no use coming here with an air of injured innocence and pretending the contrary of what everybody knows.

136. Another self-styled champion—I now refer to the representative of the Indian Union—also came to this rostrum and said something about joining others in judging Portugal. His remarks reminded us, and must have reminded many others who heard him, of the story of the thief who joined the crowd in shouting for a policeman. Obviously the Indian representative had a look at the foul record of his own Government and felt that he needed company, but I am sure those whom he wishes to join will be ashamed of such company. When one has a skeleton and rotting corpses in one's own cupboard, the least that one can be expected to do is not to indulge in the effrontery of judging others.

137. The Indian representative, however, crossed this line of propriety and permitted himself to quote the Charter and resolutions against Portugal. But he seems to forget that it was not Portugal but a spokesman of his own Government who defiantly rejected the very *raison d'être* of the United Nations when he told the Security Council that his Government would go ahead with an aggression and I quote his words: "Charter or no Charter, Council or no Council". Nevertheless, now that the Indian representative again thinks in terms of the Charter and the resolutions, he should first prevail on his own Government to practise what it preaches and to apply the Charter and the relevant resolutions to the peoples whom that Government has subjugated by force and now forced down by oppressive methods, ranging from censorship of private correspondence, house searches and intimidation to arbitrary arrests and police torture in flagrant violation of the most elementary human rights. I refer particularly to the methods which the Indian Government has adopted to enslave my own dear, unfortunate people, the people of Goa, Damão and Diu.

138. The PRESIDENT: Tomorrow we have two meetings scheduled, the first at 10.30 a.m. and the second at 3 p.m. The purpose of these meetings will be to complete some unfinished business which must be attended to before the Christmas recess, and also to set a date for meetings of the General Assembly in January. I intend during the morning meeting to give the floor to two representatives who wish to speak in the exercise of the right of reply.

*The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.*