

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



1571st
PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 28 September 1967,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

General debate (*continued*)

Speech by Mr. Aiken (Ireland)	1
Speech by Mr. Couve de Murville (France)	2
Speech by Mr. Ndabaniwe (Burundi)	6

President: Mr. Corneliu MANESCU (Romania).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. AIKEN (Ireland): Mr. President, on behalf of the Irish delegation I wish to convey to you our sincere congratulations on your election. In your opening remarks [1560th meeting] you called our attention very pertinently to the spirit which should inform our deliberations and to the procedures we should employ so as to replace violence and arbitrary acts of will by reasonable standards of behaviour serving the general interest. I hope that under your guidance this session of the Assembly will make a worth-while contribution to that end.

2. In view of the many situations of actual or threatened armed conflict, it is little wonder that our distinguished Secretary-General devoted such a large part of the Introduction to his Annual Report [A/6701/Add.1] to the problems of making and keeping the peace. The Irish delegation is grateful that U Thant has not been overwhelmed by the burdens and responsibilities of his office in recent years and that he is still fit and determined to fight for peace and social progress with all means at the disposal of the Secretary-General.

3. Let me say that no one who appreciates the difficulties of government and international relations in these superheated times of rising expectations will be surprised that the United Nations has not within a mere twenty years ended all social and international injustice and violence. All that any reasonable person can expect of the various organs of the United Nations is that each will do its duty within the sphere assigned to it by the Charter "to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security" and "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom".

4. As the Secretary-General has stressed, there are many ingredients in the cure for belligerency. He rightly gives first place to conciliation and has suggested the designation by him of a special representative to the Middle East whose task would be to harmonize ideas, help find solutions for the current

situation and prevent the recurrence of war in the area [*ibid.*, para. 48].

5. My delegation feels that the powers of the Secretary-General are such as to enable him to designate on his own initiative a Special Representative for an area such as the Middle East in which a state of war exists or is threatened. In this connexion we recall that when, last December, in response to the strong urging of all the Members of the Organization, he accepted to serve for an additional term, the Security Council formally declared that it would "respect his position and his action".^{1/} It seems to us, therefore, that, having regard to the Secretary-General's conviction as to the usefulness of having a Special Representative for the Middle East, no further authorization is required. But, should a contrary view prevail, my delegation would urge that the requisite authority be granted at once by the Assembly, or by the Security Council.

6. In his report of 12 July on the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) the Secretary-General when dealing with conciliation referred to a peace-keeping operation as "a practical adjunct of peace-making" and said that its true function is "to create a climate of quiet which is more congenial to efforts to solve the underlying problems" [A/6672, para. 21].

7. When considering or criticizing the success or failure of peace-keeping operations it should be remembered that all peace-keeping operations, including observer ones, mounted since UNEF were authorized by the Security Council. They were given no power to enforce peace or suppress aggression, nor were they given any right to maintain themselves in an area against the wishes of the Government of the State concerned. The International Court has, of course, held that the General Assembly has the right to recommend the establishment of a peace-keeping operation when the permanent members of the Security Council are not unanimously in favour of doing so, but it is only the Security Council that can decide upon taking action to enforce the peace and suppress acts of aggression.^{2/} This distinction is not always kept in mind by those who condemn United Nations peace-keeping units for not taking forcible military action to implement resolutions of the General Assembly. Neither, unfortunately, is it kept in mind by Members who vote for Assembly resolutions containing clauses which would require enforcement action to ensure their implementation. Resolutions of this type are worse

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 18, document A/6540, "Official communiqué of the 1329th meeting of the Security Council".

^{2/} Certain expenses of the United Nations (Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter), Advisory Opinion of 20 July 1962: I.C.J. Reports 1962, p. 151.

than useless, for they create false hopes outside our Organization and they distract the Assembly from concentration upon its real work: that of pressing the Security Council to take enforcement action if such is necessary.

8. The Irish delegation believes that one of the reasons the five permanent members of the Security Council are hesitant about approving peace-keeping or enforcement operations is that under Article 17 of the Charter they would be required to pay their normal share of the expenses, and thus be held responsible for every act and omission of the United Nations Force involved. This might mean that a great Power with tentacles all over the world would be embarrassed if the United Nations Force did not always please all the States or sections with which it wished to be on good terms. My delegation believes that the system proposed for the financing of peace-keeping operations contained in the draft resolution co-sponsored by my delegation last year^{3/} would go as far as is reasonable to meet the difficulties of the five permanent members of the Security Council. Indeed we hope it would encourage them to help their fellow Members of the United Nations, in the words of the Charter, "to take effective collective measures to keep the peace and repress aggression", which, after all, is the primary aim of the Organization.

9. I now wish to make a few comments upon one of the problems to which the Secretary-General directed our attention in the Introduction to his Annual Report. It is a problem which involves the safety and survival of the whole human race, a problem which is rapidly approaching the point when it will have passed beyond the possibility of control: that is, the problem of preventing the further spread of nuclear weapons to ever-widening circles of States.

10. I should like first of all to congratulate the Latin American countries upon the conclusion of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. They have given a wise and much-needed example to the world. The Governments concerned have earned the respect and gratitude of all who wish to see modern resources and skills used for the welfare and happiness of human beings rather than for their impoverishment and destruction.

11. In view of the urgency of concluding a world-wide non-dissemination agreement, I wish also to welcome most heartily the recent tabling of identical draft treaties at the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament by the United States of America and by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.^{4/} It will be one of the greatest tragedies in history if these two great Powers do not complete the treaty without further delay and open it for signature, as was done in the case of the Moscow test-ban Treaty, in the capitals of all the nuclear Powers which had signed it.

12. Let me say that the Irish delegation does not regard as essential the inclusion of a clause in the projected treaty which would provide at this stage for the inspection of the territories of nuclear Powers. There is more than one good reason for our attitude but it is sufficient to mention one: that, as all alliances

are subject to change, it would not be in the interest of a nuclear Power to share its nuclear weapons with another State. We strongly advocate, however, that the treaty should provide for a regular check in all non-nuclear States on all plant and stores which use, stockpile or produce any nuclear material coming under treaty control.

13. It is fervently to be hoped in the interest of mankind that if two or more nuclear Powers agree upon a treaty to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons, it will be signed without delay by all the non-nuclear States. In the case of some of the larger States, which already have the requisite resources and skills to make nuclear weapons, we recognize that this is asking for the exercise of what is perhaps an unprecedented degree of enlightened national self-restraint. But no one who has read the recently expressed thoughts of Secretary McNamara can fail to realize that there is urgent need to mobilize sufficient moral strength and political wisdom to control the spread of nuclear weapons; that otherwise the remainder of mankind's existence on this planet will be distorted by the strains and burdens involved in trying to maintain even a very inadequate defence system against nuclear bombs and the fall-out from missile and anti-missile explosions.

14. The near-nuclear States have a vital role to play in preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. Let us hope that all of them will be wise enough to sign a non-dissemination agreement as soon as one is tabled. For the sake of their own people, as well as the rest of the world, they should concentrate their attention on helping to build a stable all-nation world system of collective security and they should eschew all idea of building a nuclear defence system in the hope of providing effective protection and ease of mind for their own people. For such hope would surely prove false in a world in which nuclear weapons had become part of the conventional equipment of the armies of a growing number of industrialized countries.

15. In conclusion, may I appeal to both nuclear and near-nuclear States not to waste their resources and skills on the will-o'-the-wisp of military invulnerability. I would urge them instead to seek their security and prestige by co-operating with all other Members of the United Nations to promote true peace and progress throughout the world.

16. Mr. COUVE de MURVILLE (France) (translated from French): Mr. President, the French delegation is highly gratified at your virtually unanimous election to the high office which you will hold during this session of the General Assembly and, in fact, during an entire year. To begin with, we have known you for a long time and appreciate your personal and political qualities. Secondly, you are here as representative of Romania, a country with which France has certain ties whose names are civilization, history and friendship. Lastly, we view the choice that was made this year without opposition from any country whatever as a recognition by the international community of the welcome evolution which has been taking place in Europe for some years and to which in France we often apply the terms *détente*, understanding and co-operation.

17. It was time, it was high time, to set a seal of approval on the transformations that have occurred

^{3/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 33, document A/6603, para. 25, draft resolution A.

^{4/} Documents ENDC/192 and ENDC/193.

in our old continent, twice ravaged in the past half-century by cataclysmic wars and then petrified, as it were, for twenty years by the cold war, i.e., the existence of two blocs opposing each other and risking a confrontation in Europe for world domination. Now that countries everywhere are once again becoming aware of their national identity, and although a balance of nuclear terror is hardly the best manifestation of human wisdom, conditions are gradually changing and normal relations in all areas are being established across what used to be called Iron Curtain. The European peoples are at last beginning to see that the future may not limit them to a choice between perpetuating that rigid and hateful division which they are beginning to get rid of, and returning to the bloody quarrels of the past thousand years of their history.

18. Of course such an advance towards reason is still predicated upon the settlement of the great problem which is a legacy of that same history and which is known as the German problem. Who has better reason to know this than France? It will require on everyone's part, over and above feelings and memories, not only time, which is to say patience, but also determination and courage, or, in the last analysis, realism and common sense. For the time being, thanks to the current evolution, which must continue and grow, we can but set the stage for that broad European discussion the need for which is becoming increasingly manifest and whose culmination would be, within a sound system of general security, to enable a pacific Germany, in concord at last with all its neighbours, near and far, to play in the international community, and in particular here in the United Nations, the part which is the due of this great people, once it has exorcised and cast out the demons that have caused its misfortune and Europe's.

19. That is the task with which my country intends to grapple, to the extent of its possibilities and in the light of its immediate interests. France feels that there is no other way for the continent of which it is a part to regain its proper role and exert its influence for the benefit of all, supplying that element of balance and peace which the world today so woefully lacks. The diversity of the national units of which Europe is composed, provided these can affirm themselves freely because no one, within or outside the continent, seeks to dominate them, should present no obstacle to the unity we seek. On the contrary, it should be an enriching and vitalizing element, provided also that the great problem I have mentioned has been solved and no longer divides Europe into two camps. There is, of course, one more condition, which is that Europe as such should not be affected by some external crisis whose repercussions would inevitably spread to it. But that is a matter for the wisdom and determination of the European countries themselves.

20. Nothing of what I have just said to this great world assembly that we are should be taken to mean that France wants Europe to withdraw, as it were, to stop taking an interest in anything that occurs outside or to forget its international responsibilities. What France wants is that Europe should recover the means and the will to exercise those responsibilities independently. There can be no doubt in anyone's mind that Europe's first concern would be solidarity

among men, and its primary goal, peace. Certainly that is France's concern and France's goal. Wherever peace is threatened, endangered or breached, no one can remain indifferent, and the scope of the action to be taken depends only on the means and influence at one's disposal.

21. It will be clear from what I have said that we are deeply concerned with the present state of affairs in a world where, in other continents, we find serious reasons for apprehension, if not out-and-out war.

22. When we met last year, Africa—and I mean Africa south of the Sahara—was suffering from the last manifestations of decolonization. Since then, some of the newly independent countries have encountered or re-encountered difficulties in finding their balance or firmly establishing their statehood. In the second case, there can of course be no question of outside intervention, and what each of us must do is scrupulously maintain the relations that are normal between sovereign countries. In the first case, on the other hand, the community has a responsibility. It is a responsibility France has never shirked, in particular as regards condemning and combating racial discrimination in all forms and helping to complete the process, already well underway, of the accession of African peoples to genuine independence.

23. The fact remains, however, that for the African continent the primary concern is development. That is true of many other parts of the world, including Latin America, even though the latter is also beset by political problems, for these, in our view, are closely related to its long-standing economic and social problems.

24. We all know that global action for development is essential; I believe we all accept this in principle. Such action should supplement—wherever these are unavoidably inadequate or unsuitable—on the one hand the national effort, which naturally is the starting point and pre-condition of development, and on the other, bilateral aid, which by its very nature is primarily directed to investment and, secondarily, to training, where affinity or tradition make such training particularly desirable and worthwhile. The obvious field for international action, apart from financing, is everything having to do with trade and the world markets. That had, of course, been the principal aim of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, which held its first session at Geneva in 1964 and whose disappointing results I have commented on in this very hall [1420th meeting]. In anticipation of the second session of the Conference, to be held at New Delhi next year, we can perhaps discern some more favourable prospects, as regards both the organization of commodity markets and sales of manufactured goods from the developing countries. If this should prove to be so, France would be the first to rejoice, for we have always thought that these two questions, and more especially the first, must be given priority.

25. Nevertheless, I shall not hesitate to say—for it is the truth—that more, and probably much more will be needed to dispel the spirit of disenchantment in which such discussions are approached today and which stems from the paucity of the results obtained. Of

course the difficulties are enormous; but let us also recognize that one of the greatest is persistent disagreement among countries, and especially among those which bear the main responsibility, i.e., the most highly developed countries.

26. May I now say that the disenchantment I have mentioned is even more general and more profound in the United Nations. It is a state of mind which grows and gains ground as disappointments and failures multiply. How could a wind of optimism blow in the United Nations when a war has just been interrupted and no means of restoring a peaceful situation in the region is within human sight; and when another, a cruel and devastating war, whose end no one can reasonably foresee, has been going on for years, with increasing violence, in another part of the world?

27. The fault is not in our institutions. Admittedly, the Charter has its gaps and shortcomings. Basically, however, it establishes a proper balance between the principal organs and a realistic distribution of powers. Yet there have been very few cases in the past twenty-two years which were dealt with as the founders had hoped they would be. At a time when opposing blocs confronted each other, during the period of the cold war, the situation with regard to the outside remained ambiguous for a long time, because the General Assembly, in which there was a solid majority for a definite point of view, served as a recourse. Today, now that so many new States have joined us, there is no longer a built-in majority for anything, save perhaps for the feeling of disenchantment I mentioned earlier. Thus, the true situation can no longer be dissimulated. Surely no more eloquent demonstration is needed of division that leads to impotence than the spectacle offered by the recent emergency special session, which was split almost equally on the substance of the matter before it and adjourned without having arrived at a conclusion, if not without bitterness?

28. Yet that was a case which might have taken another turn, if it were recognized, as common sense dictates, that concerted action by the major Powers is one of the pre-conditions for the proper functioning of the United Nations. Can there be any doubt that such action might have, to begin with, prevented the worst, that is to say the use of arms; secondly, led to settlement through negotiation of the immediate cause of the conflict—freedom of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba—and, lastly, resulted in the pacification of a region then shaken by military movements and incendiary declarations?

29. There is no point in dwelling on the past, unless we draw from it lessons for the future. How do we visualize this future, if we want peace to be restored in the Middle East and, as the French Government said in June as soon as hostilities ceased, if we want a freely negotiated settlement, accepted by all the parties concerned and sanctioned by the international community, to solve one day the various problems involved?

30. These problems—it being understood that each of the States concerned is entitled to existence and to security—are basically, in our view, apart from the question of navigation, the position of the Palestinian

refugees and the relations between these neighbouring States. I do not feel it appropriate to say more on the substance of the matter, save to repeat once again that no fait accompli as regards the territorial boundaries and the status of the citizens of the countries concerned should be regarded as irreversible. That is why in the voting on 4 July at the emergency special session my delegation supported the draft resolution^{5/} stating that evacuation of the conquered territories was an obvious pre-condition for any useful action towards a peaceful settlement. In the same spirit, it had co-sponsored other resolutions, which were adopted, concerning the lot of the refugees [resolution 2252 (ES-V)] and Jerusalem [resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)], where the real problem is not so much the definition of a status as sovereignty itself.

31. As follows from my comments, what we must now do is ascertain whether, and to what extent, the situation can be moved from the dead point at which it has been since the cease-fire. That question arises because no one can expect to derive any long-range benefits from perpetuating the status quo. For the international community that would mean allowing to subsist a hot-bed of disturbance and agitation, all the more dangerous as outside Powers might confront each other there with their opposing policies and actions. Is there any need to say that for the Arab world it would mean a retardation of its efforts to overcome a trauma whose internal and external effects are far from disappearing? Lastly, for Israel it would mean perpetuating, and perhaps aggravating, the abuses which conquest brings with it, and therefore also the insecurity it has known in its twenty years of independent existence; this is certainly borne out by each day's news. It would also mean leaving for future generations, if not making altogether impossible, that settlement of which I spoke and which should one day enable Muslims and Jews to live at last side by side in peace and reconciliation.

32. Can anyone really think that the way to achieve this, today or in the future, lies simply through direct negotiation, without intermediaries, between the Israel Government on the one hand and each of the Arab Governments concerned on the other? Is it to be believed that natural evolution, the pressure of circumstances, will necessarily bring this about sooner or later?

33. Even though, since the Khartoum Conference,^{6/} some of the larger Arab countries have been admitting that a peaceful solution is the only conceivable solution, surely this would mean assuming the problem solved in advance. I would even say that it would mean believing in miracles, for the interests at stake are contradictory, the passions aroused to a high pitch, the traditions different and the habits of thought and judgement incompatible, and all this against a background of ancient and recent history which has never known the meaning of moderation or tolerance.

34. It takes as much courage and perspicacity to surmount a victory as to overcome a defeat; so the road will be arduous and the effort long for both

^{5/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Annexes, agenda item 5, document A/L.522/Rev.3.

^{6/} Arab Summit Conference, 29 August to 1 September 1967.

sides. Equally, it is not conceivable that this great community of States, the United Nations, could wash its hands of the matter, could fail to proffer assistance in every possible form. What better proof can there be of that than the discussions which now will be resumed and which no doubt will go on year after year?

35. To give expression to world opinion, to lend the resources it has, particularly in staff, for the necessary work of supervision, control and liaison, and to formulate reasonable suggestions, using persuasion rather than force—that, we believe is in the present circumstances the mission of the United Nations.

36. Nothing can be done in this respect unless the major Powers agree, for we are well aware that if some of them say no tomorrow, as they did yesterday, all action, supposing that any action were possible, would be futile.

37. Such are the duties which we must discharge and which, in the last analysis, are the direct consequence of the fundamental responsibilities assumed by the United Nations at the outset, in 1947, in what was then known as the question of Palestine, which is to say, the creation and evolution of the State of Israel. If tomorrow or the day after, thanks to our Organization, there should appear the first signs of the beginning of a thaw, we should feel amply rewarded.

38. I realize that in expressing such a hope, or rather in envisioning such a prospect, modesty must be exercised. We must take into account the regional context I have sought to define, without concealing but certainly without exaggerating the difficulties involved. But we must also bear in mind the world context, which presents a formidable obstacle to that entente between the great Powers the need for which I have stressed.

39. The world context obviously means primarily the war in Viet-Nam, with all its consequences both there and elsewhere. We have been speaking about it from this rostrum interminably, session after session, and the only changes we can note are that the fighting constantly grows more bitter, the ruins multiply, the military and civilian losses mount, and there is no prospect ahead save that of further escalation. Must we indeed despair? Is there no chance of putting an end to the incredible trials of the Viet-Nameese people and of stopping a conflict which beyond any doubt has a direct and most unfortunate effect on international relations as a whole?

40. This is a very different crisis from the one in the Middle East, since it so happens that one of the greatest Powers of our epoch, if not the greatest, is directly concerned in it. That is of course a reason—in addition to other reasons, often cited and legal in character—why it would be futile to submit the matter to the United Nations for its judgement. It is also the reason why we have said repeatedly that a decisive initiative by that Power can alone constitute that new element failing which the only prospect is a sterile and endless continuation of what everyone has long since admitted, to be pointless fighting, since it is generally agreed that no military solution is possible.

41. Could this new and decisive element be, as many have said, the unconditional suspension for an unlimited time of the bombings by which North Viet-Nam is

being laid waste? France would be the first to approve of such a decision, to begin with, because it would put an end to the suffering of many Viet-Nameese. If following such a measure, discussions could be considered, as the Hanoi Government has repeatedly declared since January, we too should be happy, for that would indeed constitute a first step.

42. Over-all negotiations, i.e., discussion of a political solution to the conflict, imply that South Vietnam, which in this war is both the stake and the champion, must also be directly and validly represented. They also mean that both sides know and recognize what such a solution should comprise. The 1954 Geneva Agreements are often mentioned in this connexion, and indeed no settlement is conceivable without reviving the Agreements. May I take the liberty of quoting what I said in this Assembly a year ago to describe what would have to be done? Reviving the Geneva Agreements, I said,

"... means agreeing to evacuate all foreign troops and to prohibit their return and forbidding any outside interference whatsoever in the affairs of Viet-Nam, which will undertake to maintain in future a policy of strict neutrality. These directives would be embodied in an international treaty which would be signed by—and hence would be binding upon—all the great Powers and other countries directly involved. It also means—provided that the above conditions are fulfilled—leaving the Viet-Nameese, both North and South, the former to manage, the latter to continue to manage their own affairs in complete liberty and on their own responsibility, under whatever form of government they may choose. The question of reunification would be... a purely Viet-Nameese problem, to be settled, when the time comes, in full independence between the parties concerned." [1420th meeting, para. 76.]

43. I think that if all this were publicly and unequivocally accepted by all, prospects of settlement would not be long in opening up.

44. I have endeavoured to define clearly France's views and positions on the major questions, all too often the major crises, which concern and divide the world today. I have also tried to bring out my country's greatest concern with regard to each of these questions and crises; and, because it knows of none more vital, in every case France's primary concern is for peace.

45. Generally speaking, world peace is at stake. It always is in matters of development, because these affect the lot of hundreds of millions of men, and their future relations among themselves and with the privileged nations. It always is when there is a local conflict, because there is always a manifest danger of a spread—known today as escalation—of hostilities. Peace is, of course, especially endangered when a great Power is involved and is engaged in actual fighting. That is why, always and everywhere, we firmly oppose war. That seems to us to be in the interests not of France alone, but of all mankind. That is also why, always and everywhere, we stand for the independence of peoples and aid among nations, against the power game and the struggle for influence, and for genuine disarmament.

46. We are well aware that there will always be great and small countries, national rivalries, conflicts of interests, overweening ambition and even ideological conflicts. But over and above all these, in this atomic universe of ours, the first need is for man to survive, and that is why our first duty, as well as our primary interest, is peace.

47. Mr. NDABANIWE (Burundi) (translated from French): Mr. President, it is a pleasure and an honour for me, as representative of the Republic of Burundi, to convey to you and to the distinguished representatives at this Assembly a message of peace and sympathy from His Excellency the President of the Republic of Burundi, Colonel Michel Micombero.

48. This is certainly not the first time that you will have heard the Republic of Burundi mentioned. Yet it was only quite recently, a year ago almost to the day, that Burundi was represented at this very rostrum under the traditional label of monarchy.

49. Since the memorable day of 28 November 1966, Burundi has been completely transformed by a salutary and peaceful revolution which freed it from the yoke of feudalism and despotism.

50. Today, this transfigured Burundi has democratic institutions which meet the deepest aspirations of its citizens and which are designed for socialist development. I have therefore come here, not to perform a routine rite of oratory, but rather on pilgrimage to a sanctuary of peace, in order to reaffirm the fidelity and dedication of the young Republic of Burundi to the sacred precepts of our Charter. For such, indeed, is my country's credo.

Mr. Shaw (Australia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

51. May I now, Mr. President, offer you my heartiest congratulations on your well-deserved election to the presidency of this world assembly. The name of Mănescu, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Romania, is in itself a symbol and a message. It is charged with meaning, at this opening of the session. It is a sign of the times that—a point I would stress—for the first time in the history of the United Nations an eminent representative of a truly socialist country has been raised to this highest office in the world organization. This inauguration, this investiture, opens up new prospects in our search for world balance. Thus our work begins under the sign of *détente* and, I trust, reconciliation. We are all familiar with the man who quite recently carried out a number of missions in the West in the service of peace and of a rapprochement between peoples with different social systems in the name of coexistence.

52. Consequently, in this great international figure I salute the messenger of spring in international relations. On the eve of the commemoration of the greatest revolution in the world's history, I salute him as a "dove of peace" of the colossal socialist revolution of October 1917.

53. I have no doubt that all these signs augur well for our work; let us hope that they are a guarantee of its success.

54. Despite the optimistic note I have sounded, I do not think that the atmosphere of this conference is entirely unclouded. We have an opportunity once a year, apart from emergency situations, to stop and think, to take stock, to ponder together on our work and balance the accounts for the year just past before turning our faces to the future. Because of the dreadful habit we have fallen into of accumulating problems in our files without making a serious effort to find appropriate solutions for them, the inventory for the year shows the liabilities heavily outweighing the assets. I shall endeavour to comment on various aspects of the Organization's work as viewed by my Government.

55. There is no doubt that the Middle East presents the thorniest and most urgent question of the season because of its serious political, social and moral implications. Yet the fact is not without precedent. It represents a manifestation of history which, if I may say so, is a direct outgrowth of the perfidy of Albion.

56. Without laying any claim to being a historian and without delving into the remote past, I think I can fairly say that after it was granted a mandate over Palestine by the League of Nations, Great Britain, as the Mandatory Power, played a double game and made absolutely contradictory promises to the two parties.

57. Suffice it to recall the Balfour Declaration, in which MacMahon promised to the Arabs the establishment of a great political Arab community extending over the whole of the Middle East, and to the Zionist Jews, the creation of a Jewish national home in Palestine.

58. Whatever trials the Jewish people may have had to undergo, it is an established fact that for the past two thousand years the soil of Palestine has been occupied by the Arabs. In law or in fact, can there be any surer or sounder title to land than uninterrupted occupation for two thousand years? There are few States among us that can lay claim to such antiquity.

59. Forged in blood, in disregard of the principles of the Charter, a perpetual cause of unrest in the Middle East, the State of Israel should never have been recognized by United Nations organs. The obligations under the mandate having been violated, the United Nations, without examining the matter and without calling for sanctions, hastened to give its blessing to a *de facto* situation, a situation brought about by force and fraught with dangerous consequences. That was tantamount to bowing before the facts and accepting the law of the jungle, the principle that might is right, the law of force, whereas the mission of the United Nations is, on the contrary, to uphold the force of law.

60. Be that as it may, if we agree that a joint error creates law, it would be absurd to want to go back, it would be impossible to re-establish the *status quo ante* and to put everything back as it was. If it was indeed intended to compensate Israel for the misdeeds of history, we can only regret that it should have been decided to redress a wrong by committing another wrong against the Arabs.

61. An ideal solution being impossible, common sense dictates the choice of the lesser evil, or of the lesser

sacrifice in the light of the realities: Israel exists, and that is why we can speak of its international responsibilities.

62. We are all eye-witnesses of persistent violations by Israel of the fundamental principles of the Charter. Israel has never seen fit to respect any United Nations resolution—never in twenty years, the length of its existence. Thus, it violated resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 on the partition of Palestine, resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948 on the return and indemnification of refugees and Trusteeship Council resolution 114 (S-2) of 20 December 1949 prohibiting it from setting up its Parliament in Jerusalem, to say nothing of a number of others.

63. In making the Holy City its capital, Israel prevented the establishment of an international régime for the Holy Places. Now, it has annexed outright the Jordanian part of the city on the pretext of reunification.

64. Israel refuses to apply the various relevant resolutions enjoining upon it to withdraw its troops beyond the armistice line, thus liberating the occupied zones in Egyptian, Syrian and Jordanian territory, to indemnify these three States for the incalculable damage to property they have suffered because of the war, and to remedy the moral injury inflicted on all the Arab States, whether or not directly concerned in the conflict.

65. That is why, when hostilities began, my Government unhesitatingly embraced the cause of the Arab States subjected to escalating aggression. In so doing, it chose the path of reason and law.

66. My country, wholly dedicated to the cause of territorial integrity and sovereignty of States, could not but give its entire support, without any reservations and without any trace of opportunistic motive, to the Arab Governments that had resolved to repel the attacks of an imperialism which was cunningly hiding behind Israel but which had proclaimed its intention of breaking the revolutionary movement by cementing counter-revolution and unleashing wars of conquest and subversion with a view to re-colonizing the Middle East and North Africa. That is why Burundi has embraced the cause of the Arab community.

67. There are certainly men in our midst versed in legal subtleties, who are bound to invoke legitimate self-defence and Israel's right to existence in connexion with the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran. These highly topical matters have already caused a great deal of ink to flow, but blood and tears as well. Since a question of law is involved, we should like to state our view on it.

68. The first fact to be noted with regard to the Gulf of Aqaba is that it has a narrow opening, which at no point becomes part of the high seas. Consequently, the question of who has jurisdiction over it is governed only by the principle of sovereignty of the riparian States. To say that, according to article 1 of the Barcelona Convention of 20 April 1921^{7/} on the régime of navigable waterways, the Gulf of Aqaba is a

navigable waterway of international concern is not the same as saying that it is an international waterway subject solely to international regulation and has nothing to do with territorial sovereignty. Only commercial traffic in the Gulf is a matter of international concern, the waters themselves being purely internal and, as such, being governed by the law of the riparian States, which are free to accept and apply international rules.

69. Although the Barcelona Convention enunciates the principle of freedom of passage, that principle applies only in times of peace, for it must be innocent passage. It goes without saying that the international conventions on the subject are not intended to define the rights and duties of belligerents and neutrals in times of war. They may even be derogated from in peacetime in case of serious happenings endangering State security.

70. The same applies to the Strait of Tiran. While some straits are governed by special regulations, no separate international convention was ever concluded with regard to the Strait of Tiran. The 1958 Geneva Convention on the law of the sea,^{8/} which was signed by the States concerned, is the only one which applies. Inasmuch as the Strait of Tiran does not connect two areas of the high seas or one such area with the territorial sea of a foreign State, it is not a strait as that term is defined in the Convention. The only relevant portion of that text is that relating to its scope of application, which covers only innocent passage. Leaving aside the question of the volume of traffic, can passage by Israel ships through the Gulf of Aqaba be regarded as innocent? The facts prove that the opposite is true. It is known that Israel did not have access to the Strait prior to the 1956 expedition. Consequently, a will to the contrary has been manifested.

71. Moreover, ever since the creation of Israel there has been an uninterrupted state of war or belligerence. There can therefore be no question of innocent passage; between belligerents, passage must always be presumed to be otherwise.

72. The 1949 General Armistice Agreements, in fact, provided for a mere suspension of hostilities, a truce which, unlike a peace treaty which would have proclaimed a definite end to hostilities, legally allowed a state of war or belligerence to continue. In that particular context, it would be inadequate to label only the recent events aggression. In reality, they are part of an aggression that has been going on for twenty years. It would therefore be more accurate to term them an escalation or a resumption of aggression, inasmuch as neither the aggressor nor the victim of aggression has changed since 1947.

73. Since what is needed is to re-establish the balance destroyed by the unilateral action of Israel with the connivance of the imperialist Powers, in my opinion we must examine here all the problems of the Middle East and look for an over-all solution to them that would be both definitive and fair. My Government feels that, if such a search is to succeed, the Israel forces must effect an unconditional withdrawal to their positions of 5 June 1967, the occupied terri-

^{7/} Convention and Statute on the Régime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern.

^{8/} Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone of 29 April 1958.

tories must be given back at once in their entirety, and the Arab States whose territorial integrity has been infringed and which have suffered major losses in human lives and damage to property must be duly indemnified.

74. Turning to the thorny question of Rhodesia, I must say that British duplicity, coupled with what is often called "the weakness of the United Nations", has unfortunately conditioned us through repetition to accept the fait accompli. We always start with a situation which has been brought about by brute force but which is termed "temporary"; then little by little we watch it harden and develop into a permanent situation, until at last it acquires the force of law.

75. When the Rhodesian adventure first began, the United Kingdom, where a Labour Government had just taken over, told us sweetly that it would put an end to the Rhodesian rebellion before three weeks had passed. Later, it was to stress that the rebellion was an internal matter, before finally describing it as international, in order to allow Ian Smith to gain time. Later still, it threatened Rhodesia with so-called "selective"—which meant optional—economic sanctions, which, moreover, were never applied.

76. Despite the Security Council resolutions recognizing that the maintenance of the rebel régime constituted a threat to international peace and security, despite the appeals of the Organization of African Unity, despite the positions taken by members of the Commonwealth, the United Kingdom, one of the oldest parliamentary democracies in the world, continues to support a racist minority of some 200,000 Whites who are holding 4 million Africans in servitude. To destroy every vestige of independence among the Africans of Zimbabwe, the white minority is resorting to classical apartheid methods: expulsion, torture, summary trials and executions, segregation, etc.

77. We who were in good faith were taken by surprise by this vast swindle. What could we expect from talks between the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and the usurper Ian Smith, dealing as equals? What are we to think of the good will missions to Salisbury by eminent figures of the British world, the foremost among them being Lord Alport? If I am not mistaken, this is what is legally known as a "de facto recognition".

78. My Government's position is well known. The major culprit is the United Kingdom. Ian Smith is merely its henchman, who is obediently putting into execution a pre-arranged plan. Can the United Kingdom, which put down the popular uprising in Aden in a way we all remember, claim today that it is unable to put down the Rhodesian rebellion and restore their legitimate rights to the Zimbabwe majority? It is no doubt waiting for Rhodesia to sever all ties with the Crown by proclaiming a republic, and it will then say to us bravely: "Sorry, it is too late." It is no doubt still haunted by the old dream of its illustrious financier, Cecil Rhodes, who, following in the tracks of the powerful East India Company, cherished the ambition of building an empire that would extend from the Cape to Cairo. But our patience has its limits, and we cannot allow ourselves to be duped any longer.

79. With regard to South West Africa, a territory once held by the Germans, we all know that the League of Nations conferred a mandate on the Union of South Africa which the latter exercised on behalf of His Britannic Majesty. We also know what has happened since. The question has been discussed here since 1946 and seventy-six resolutions have been adopted on it; it was referred four times to the International Court of Justice, the first three times for an advisory opinion and the fourth time for a judgement—a judgement branded as scandalous at the twenty-first session. All this international activity culminated last year in the vote on the historic resolution [2145 (XXI)] terminating South Africa's mandate. Despite the binding nature of that decision, Pretoria, having no great desire to let go, retains its hold on the Territory, which is of considerable economic and strategic importance. To frustrate the United Nations resolution, Pretoria today pursues a man-hunt policy, prior to initiating a general persecution.

80. A year ago, we suggested that Article 6 of the Charter should be applied to South Africa. Today, since South Africa is a hardened and unrepentant offender, we should like to reiterate our proposal, in the hope that this time it will commend itself to the majority.

81. My Government's position with regard to South West Africa may be summed up as follows. The United Nations should: compel South Africa, by an international police action if need be, to withdraw from the Territory of South West Africa; associate representatives of the liberation movements in the organs it would set up for the temporary administration of the Territory; grant the Territory economic, social and administrative assistance; and organize free and democratic general elections to enable the Territory to accede to independence within a set period. Lastly, the United Nations should take a firmer attitude in the face of the economic and military might of the Republic of South Africa and its resultant arrogance and of the connivance of certain Western Powers; for there comes a time when therapy is no longer possible.

82. The name of Portugal is always connected, as the shadow is with the body, with the African Territories of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau, which Portugal regards as its provinces and integral parts of its territory. It can be readily understood that the oldest conqueror of modern times should want to perpetuate its dominion over the African continent.

83. The United Nations has repeatedly condemned Portugal for its racist practices and its violations of the Charter. I am not forgetting that at the twenty-first session my delegation proposed the expulsion of Portugal in accordance with Article 6 of the Charter, for crimes against peace and against humanity. Will we find a more sympathetic audience today?

84. It is obvious that if Portugal, an under-developed country, were alone, it would have neither the men nor the means to conduct a war of conquest and subversion in Africa. Hence we must seek elsewhere the mysterious orchestra conductor who orders, guides from afar, supplies and finances all these operations. We are for our part convinced that certain military alliances have a hand in the Portuguese adventure in

Africa. My own view on the matter is that the one piece of luck we Africans have is that the present rivalries and ambitions preclude another Berlin Conference, which could once again throw the African continent to the colonial lions.

85. As regards the internal quarrels in certain African nations, my delegation believes that the great Powers should resist the temptation to intervene and should refrain from any action that might impair the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the States concerned. The great Powers should especially refrain from double dealing, where they officially give aid to one of the parties while supporting the other.

86. I have dwelt at length, in order of priority, on the situation in southern Africa. But the interest we take in African problems does not interfere with our awareness of other regions in which there is a political situation fraught with serious consequences for international peace.

87. In Viet-Nam, the United States, taking advantage of a period of waiting, has been pursuing a two-fold policy in a spirit of conquest: occupation of the South and aggression against the North. There is hardly need for me to recall that the Viet-Nameese people, which is waging a true war of liberation at the cost of sacrifices and privations that testify to its heroism, has all our sympathy.

88. Whereas the 1954 Geneva Agreements stipulated that the arbitrary demarcation line at the Seventeenth Parallel "should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary"^{2/} the United States has turned it into a veritable frontier. The general elections that were to be held in 1956 with a view to reunification were never held; instead, there was a series of aggressive attacks which were progressively escalated and which were meant to complete the genocide of the Viet-Nameese people after depriving it of all means of livelihood.

89. The silence preserved on all this by part of mankind is a fine illustration of people shirking their responsibilities. It is inconceivable that, while an entire nation is being systematically exterminated—a task made easier by the use of internationally prohibited weapons—countries should remain silent or even offer encouragement.

90. A solution to this problem can be found only in the framework of the 1954 Geneva Agreements, with due respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity and national unity. We demand that all foreign troops of aggression should be withdrawn from Viet-Nam at once and unconditionally and that the Viet-Nameese people should be permitted, in complete peace and full freedom, to exercise its right of self-determination by means of free elections.

91. The case of Korea is very much like that of Viet-Nam. There too a nation has been mutilated at the whim of a foreign Power, acting under the flag of the United Nations. The Thirty-eighth Parallel, merely a demilitarized demarcation line, has become a State

boundary, with all the human tragedies resulting from this artificial division.

92. As in the case of Viet-Nam, my Government asks that all expeditionary occupation forces be withdrawn forthwith and the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea be dissolved, so that the Korean people may solve its own problems without outside interference.

93. The fiction that there is only one China and that it is constituted by the Chinese province of Taiwan—which is maintaining itself in existence only thanks to the presence of foreign occupation forces—has carried the day in the United Nations, which is thus at odds with itself, since it was intended to be a universal organization. It is unprecedented in diplomatic history for a country to be represented in the highest international organs by one of its provinces. It is sheer cynicism to deny the existence of the most populous State on earth, whose 700 million inhabitants constitute one-fourth of all mankind.

94. Some States believe the rumour that China rejects all international co-operation. Yet the facts belie such assertions. Does not China maintain the most cordial relations with a good many members of the world community? China is accused of being a threat to international peace and security. But in that case, many countries now Members of the United Nations should have been expelled a good long time ago. What, for example, should be done with those which were caught in the act in Viet-Nam, Cuba, and so on?

95. Once again, my Government believes that no problem of world concern can be satisfactorily resolved without the participation of China. It is high time for China to be given back its place in the United Nations and its seat in the Security Council. That is no mere matter of sentiment. It is a pre-condition for the very survival of the Organization, whose prestige and authority have been seriously impaired in recent years.

96. It is Utopian to speak of peace when one of the principals, China, which has forced its entry into the nuclear club, is not regarded as a valid participant in the negotiations, since treaties and commitments entered into behind China's back are in no way binding upon it.

97. We welcome the holding of the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at New Delhi. We venture to hope that it will not be a disappointing operation of the Kennedy Round type. The very choice of New Delhi, in the heart of the Third World, should give confidence to the developing countries. We expect a great deal from this conference, which should substantially improve the terms of trade as between primary commodities and manufactured goods.

98. We hope that it will mark a new stage during which we shall be able gradually to close the gap between us and the rich countries. With a little attention on one side and good will on the other, we believe we can attain a practical solution reconciling the rightly understood interests of all parties. As a guarantee of commitments entered into, we

^{2/} Further documents relating to the discussion of Indo-China at the Geneva Conference, June 16-July 21, 1954 (London, H.M. Stationery Office, Cmd. 9239), Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference on the problem of restoring peace in Indo-China, para. 6.

should like the parties to agree on a principle of good faith: pacta sunt servanda.

99. After this general survey, we have only a few concluding remarks to make. Throughout our statement, we have endeavoured to present our point of view on the great problems of our time in all frankness. We have told the truth, even if it may have hurt some feelings, without mincing words, in the spirit of independence that permeates our young Republic, which, far from being anyone's property or private preserve, is open to everyone.

100. The first conclusion to be drawn from our general diagnosis is one of bankruptcy. We have noted that, on the whole, the action of the United Nations is ludicrously inadequate and therefore disappointing. The only times the United Nations succeeded was when the parties decided to agree; when that was not the case, it failed. Moreover, in a number of situations we have found distressing contradictions. That is alarming in itself, and we cannot but draw attention to the League of Nations which, as we all know, perished of being unable to "digest" the great problems which it was its duty to solve. The United Nations might well be brought down by that same indigestion.

101. The reason why the United Nations is paralyzed is well known: it is the pride and self-conceit of the great Powers. It is sometimes true that one should leave well alone. That is why we have accommodated ourselves to the privilege enjoyed by the great of being able to frustrate any decision they do not approve of. The right of veto is a pre-condition for the very survival of the United Nations, but at the same time it hamstringing its power to act. Although at the end of the last war there had been a sacred union among the Allies, the changes in alliances that have since occurred have destroyed the economy of the entire system. World peace had been predicated on the assumption that the great Powers would not

breach it. Yet today, owing to the bipolarization that has taken place in international relations, certain great Powers are parties to every conflict. According to the principles of our Charter, we would have to ask them to redress the wrongs they have themselves committed. That would be self-criticism with a vengeance, a truly agonizing self-appraisal. The great Powers would be asked to act as both judges and parties in their own cause. How are we to break out of this vicious circle?

102. Since the great Powers have shown their unconcern, we must think of another way out. That way is offered by revision of the Charter. While maintaining the right of veto of the great Powers as a pre-condition for the survival of the United Nations, we might consider broadening and strengthening the powers of the General Assembly. Before we reach that point, I believe that the best thing we can do now is scrupulously to respect the principles of the Charter. That would be a practical way of bolstering the moral authority of the United Nations. We ought to pay greater heed to the voices of the world's highest moral and spiritual authorities and even of the medium-sized Powers which stand for peace, progress and independence, for it is very true that one may need the help of someone smaller than oneself. I am thinking in particular of some of the lessons to be drawn from the Pope's last Encyclical: "Development is the new name for peace."^{10/}

103. Very well then, in the name of peace, let us condemn war in its very essence. In the name of development, we invite the rich countries to give up their war effort and to devote the funds from their war budgets to capital aid to developing countries.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.

^{10/} On the Development of Peoples, Encyclical Letter of His Holiness Pope Paul VI, (Vatican Polyglot Press, 1967), p. 51.