

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**1587th
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 11 October 1967,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

General debate (continued)

Page

Speech by Mr. Huot Sambath (Cambodia) . . .	1
Speech by Mr. García Robles (Mexico)	5
Speech by Mr. Grimes (Liberia)	10
Speech by Mr. Al-Futaih (Yemen)	14
Statement by the representative of Ethiopia .	17
Statement by the representative of Sweden .	18

President: Mr. Corneliu MANESCU (Romania).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia) (translated from French): Once again this year the delegation of the Kingdom of Cambodia comes here to take part in the work of the General Assembly in a mood of despondency and low spirits in the face of the tragic turn of world events over the past twelve months. I trust that the distinguished representatives of the States Members of the United Nations will forgive this rather blunt opening to my statement. But we feel it more necessary than ever that we should cease to cling desperately to illusions and admit at last that the spirit of wisdom which hovered over the Organization when it was founded is no longer anything more than a wistful memory. In spite of eagerness to look on the bright side, one speaker after another at this rostrum has confirmed, if confirmation were needed, that the future outlook is more gloomy than it has ever been since the end of the Second World War.

2. We are well aware that the voice of Cambodia will be drowned out by the clamours of the great Powers, which look down at what they regard as a "pocket kingdom". It is nevertheless our duty, as a people with an ancient civilization, a people which has learnt much from the lessons of 2,000 years of history, to put forward our views both on the problems which affect us directly and on those which concern us all. Those who have yielded to the arrogance of power would like to camouflage or distort these problems as a pretext for settling them by force of arms. Our own purpose, as Cambodian Buddhists, is solely to recall that there is such a thing as truth.

3. Cambodia is a peace-loving country, and its love of peace has a rational rather than a traditional foundation, for the Angkor Empire to which it is the heir was a State whose stability rested on the organization and the valour of its armies. Why then, in this second half of the twentieth century, when peace and respect for international law are the popular catchwords, should

we find ourselves compelled, like so many other peoples, to fight for our right to be independent, indeed merely to live?

4. I would remind you that for several years past, and almost daily at present, hundreds of my compatriots are being murdered in cowardly fashion or are falling in battle defending their country, their families, their villages and their rice paddies. Have we ever threatened the security of the United States and the lives of American families? Yet the United States is dispatching its planes to drop bombs on our frontier villages, sending its soldiers and its mercenaries from Saigon to attack the harmless people of our country, and egging on its Thai protégés to mine our roads, our railways and even our farmlands. The United States is also arming and financing the so-called free Khmers, installing them on our frontiers and inciting them to sow discord and death among their compatriots.

5. I realize, of course, that the representatives of the United States will go on denying the truth of these facts, however patently corroborated, that they will argue that it is all a mistake or accuse Cambodia of false neutrality and of backing Viet-Nameese resistance against the American invader. Neutral we certainly are, militarily, as is recognized by all foreign observers, Americans included. But it is no doubt comforting for the American leaders to blame Cambodia for the bitter pill it has had to swallow in South-East Asia and to affirm, in the face of clear evidence to the contrary, that North Viet-Nameese divisions are encamped in Khmer territory and are supplied with weapons and munitions through the Cambodian port of Sihanoukville.

6. Our military neutrality is quite genuine, and the International Control Commission in Cambodia has constantly testified to the fact. Let me repeat: there are neither bases nor foreign troops on our soil, nor is there transit of arms across our territory. Yet, according to certain official American statements, the United States is not unlikely in the near future to take additional measures such as the occupation of the eastern provinces of Cambodia by their armed forces. To put it another way, the criminal, confident that he will go unpunished, is now announcing the murder he intends to commit. But we must make it clear that Cambodia will not be content with meek protestations—for we know in advance, unfortunately, what that achieves—but, with the infinite resources of a people's war, we will oppose any invader who tries to impose his will on us.

7. At the same time, we must express our astonishment at the type of argument advanced by the United States Government in justification of its plans for

escalation against Cambodia. Its information services know perfectly well that an attack against my country would have no effect whatever on assistance to Viet-Nam. The logical step for the aggressive imperialism of the United States would be, in fact, for the United States Air Force to destroy the actual sources of supply of the Viet-Nameese combatants—in the Soviet Union, in China and in all the socialist countries.

8. Imperialism has, of course, its own peculiar rules. We see the proof of this in the attitude of the United States and the countries controlled by Washington in the question of recognition of our national frontiers. Cambodia has a common frontier with Thailand, South Viet-Nam and Laos. The Khmer-Thai demarcation line was fixed by international treaties and agreements confirmed in 1962 by the findings of the International Court of Justice judgement in the Preah Vihear case.^{1/} But the Bangkok Government has consistently refused to indicate its acceptance of this frontier, thus demonstrating that its policy of territorial annexation, applied between 1940 and 1945 with the assistance of Japan, is still being pursued in 1967, but this time with the assistance of the United States.

9. As regards the Khmer-Viet-Nam frontier, this was only a domestic administrative demarcation line within the former French Indo-China, drawn by France to the detriment of Cambodia. In the interests of conciliation and good neighbourliness, we did not insist on our rights over the Cambodian territory wrongly handed over to Viet-Nam, and we accepted the legacy of the French administration. But the dictator Ngo Dinh Diem and his successors, set up by the United States at the head of the pseudo-Government of Saigon, have ceaselessly laid claim to almost all the islands off our coast, and with full support from the Americans they are trying to force us to engage in talks about a new frontier. In fact, the United States has already published maps in which our coastal islands, and villages and lands that have always been Cambodian, are marked as under the sovereignty of Viet-Nam.

10. However, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam, that is to say the genuine representatives of the people of Viet-Nam as a whole, have solemnly proclaimed that they recognize the existing frontiers of Cambodia. Thus we are able to state here and now that there is no longer any territorial Khmer-Viet-Nameese dispute, and that the common frontier between the two countries is demarcated for good, by agreement between the parties concerned.

11. I may also mention that our frontier with Laos is likewise permanently fixed; this was confirmed in a letter from the Foreign Minister of Laos stating that his country had no territorial claim on Cambodia.

12. We have therefore requested all countries to let us have a statement intimating that they recognize the territorial integrity of Cambodia within its present borders. All the socialist countries and several Afro-Asian countries, namely Indonesia, the United Arab

Republic, Algeria, Yemen, Senegal, Singapore and Israel, have responded positively to this request. Of the Western nations only one—France—has taken an unequivocal stand on the question. On behalf of the Khmer Government and people, I would like here, once again, to express to those countries our gratitude for this act of justice.

13. But the Governments under the domination of American imperialism have not seen fit to make known their views regarding the present frontiers of Cambodia. Where they have done so—as for example Australia—it was to specify that they were prepared to respect those frontiers that were not delimited. That too is part of the peculiar logic of the imperialists.

14. As we see it, the attitude adopted by this or that country with regard to the frontiers of Cambodia represents a test case. Those who refuse to recognize our existing frontiers are thereby betraying their connivance with the American imperialists and their satellites at Saigon and Bangkok and expressing their contempt for the rules of international law. Our Chief of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, has therefore informed the Governments of those countries that Cambodia gives them three months to think it over, after which Cambodia's diplomatic, and in some cases, friendly relations with them would henceforth be on a purely formal basis only. We shall draw our conclusions from their refusal to recognize that Cambodia is a State with legally fixed borders.

15. My country does not accept any compromise where its independence, its neutrality and its territorial integrity are at stake. Its people, under the leadership of Prince Norodom Sihanouk, enjoy the régime of their choice and are profoundly devoted to their monarchic institutions, their Buddhist religion and their age-old traditions. Foreign ideologies of whatever kind do not tempt them in any way, because they have always found Buddhist socialism to be the most effective path to economic and social development and the way most in keeping with their particular aspirations. We threaten no one and we do not belong to any military organization or alliance.

16. Yet apparently our one ambition—to live in freedom within our borders, to work without having recourse to international charity, and to maintain friendly relations with all countries on the basis of reciprocity—is not acceptable to the great imperialist Powers. In a dozen years we have virtually eliminated illiteracy, we have provided schooling for the youth of the country and built universities, increased our communications network, created industry, developed agriculture and endowed the country with an infrastructure of harbours, airfields, hotels and modern administration. In short, at the cost of great sacrifice we have made rapid progress in our Kingdom and we have raised the standard of living of the people. The outcome of these efforts has been growing hostility on the part of the imperialists. We are guilty of rejecting American colonialism in all its forms. We are guilty of denouncing the savage aggression of the United States army in Viet-Nam and elsewhere. We are guilty of proclaiming our solidarity with all the countries and all the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America who are struggling heroically to evade oppression by the United States and the Governments it imposes. Our

^{1/} Case concerning the Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia v. Thailand). Merits. Judgement of 15 June 1962: I.C.J. Reports 1962, page 6.

crime has been to stand up to American hegemony and to want all countries to live in freedom like Cambodia.

17. Our crime is the crime of fidelity to the spirit and the letter of the United Nations Charter.

18. I now come to the most tragic issue—one which casts shame on the whole of the civilized world: the American aggression in Viet-Nam or, more precisely, the deliberate destruction of an Asian country and people by a Power which dares to wave the banner of civilization and freedom.

19. We have heard the representative of the United States at this rostrum trying to justify the crimes committed by his country. He has convinced no one, not even those who have given him their support. I would not insult him by suggesting that he himself can have a clear conscience when he vindicates the cruel war his country is waging against the people of Viet-Nam.

20. For at this very moment women, children and old people are being blown to pieces by fragmentation bombs and burnt up by napalm and phosphorus dropped by American aircraft on Viet-Nam. At this very moment men are being tortured or summarily executed by the "soldiers of liberty". At this very moment poor peasants are fleeing their scorched villages, abandoning their paddy fields rendered useless by poisonous chemicals, and being machine-gunned by planes and tanks. We know what this means because among these martyred people are thousands of our own kith and kin, members of the Cambodian minority who have succeeded in finding asylum in our country. The tale of the atrocities they have suffered baffles the imagination.

21. The American generals shrug their shoulders: "War is war". At Oradour, Lidice, Warsaw and Coventry also, "War was war". In Viet-Nam the Oradours, the Lidices and the Warsaws have been lost count of. The communiqués actually announce with great satisfaction that a record tonnage of fire and steel has been poured upon the Viet-Nameese villages and cities.

22. The diplomats of the State Department proclaim without a blush that their soldiers are "repelling the aggression" or, better yet, that they are "defending the freedom of the Viet-Nameese people". I leave you to judge whether this is cynicism or callousness.

23. The United States is the aggressor. That is a truth which will go down in history despite the distortions of American propaganda. The United States Government undeniably violated the Geneva Agreements on the very morrow of their signature when in 1955 large quantities of arms and thousands of military "advisers" were disembarked in Viet-Nam. Then the popular uprising against the bloodthirsty and tyrannical régime of Ngo Dinh Diem, which came to be more and more controlled by Washington, was countered by the Americans with the "special" war in which they supplied the officers for the forces of repression, herded the people into camps which they called strategic villages, and so on. When this special war failed utterly, the United States began its escalation by sending in its own combat divisions. It was then only that the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam furnished direct aid to the National Libera-

tion Front in the south. Finally, the United States Government claimed that Hanoi was the aggressor and had to be punished. It was then that the terrorist bombings of North Viet-Nam began.

24. What the United States Government is saying is that the 500,000 men of its expeditionary force should be free to massacre the people of South Viet-Nam, who have arisen against the invader, and to impose their will on a country which has been fighting for its independence for twenty-two years. Is there a single country in the world where part of the population would passively look on at the extermination of those of its own race and blood separated by an imaginary line which was to be drawn for a short time only? For Viet-Nam is a single nation and a single people—a point which certain lines of propaganda would have us forget.

25. The Americans claim that they have obligations towards the Viet-Nameese people they are destroying. Admittedly in their eyes this people was at the outset personified by the dictator Ngo Dinh Diem, who was assassinated after he had tried belatedly to limit the American invasion. Since then the Viet-Nameese people signifies some general or other installed at Saigon through the good offices of the occupying forces and thrown out as soon as he ceases to be in their good graces. The grotesque and shameful comedy of the elections of the Thieu-Ky combine, organized by the American administration, has succeeded only in making it still more obvious that South Viet-Nam is regarded by the United States as a colony and its so-called Government as a screen to fool the Organization and a docile international public opinion.

26. The truth is that, as that great statesman General de Gaulle says, the Viet-Nam affair is a battle by a national resistance against foreign armed intervention. Even the fiction of the assistance given by the United States to the South Viet-Nameese army of Saigon can no longer be sustained, since for practical purposes that army no longer takes part in the fighting.

27. What is American aggression in Viet-Nam? It is what we, the Members of the United Nations, have sworn never again to tolerate; war in its most cruel form against a peace-loving people. I know that the Government of the United States protests its good intentions and claims that it has no colonialist ambition. But the colonialists of the past were infinitely less barbaric. They imposed their will, exploited our resources, our riches and our labour. But the American colonialists are engaged in genocide—human, cultural, moral, religious genocide. They are destroying all national and traditional values, replacing them with violence, corruption in all its forms, and organized destitution. The struggle of the Viet-Nameese people is legitimate, as is or will be that of the Asian, African and especially the Latin American peoples against aggression, domination or imperialist tutelage. What we are all concerned to defend is the dignity of man, the right to absolute independence, the right of all peoples to live in freedom and to develop according to their wishes.

28. The settlement of the Viet-Nam question is a matter for the Viet-Nameese and the Viet-Nameese only. The United Nations has no right whatever to

intervene as an arbitrator, as the American Government seems to wish it to do. It is not, after all, a question of arbitration between two parties in conflict where the responsibilities can be apportioned. The Viet-Nam affair is simply the case of a small country attacked and invaded by the armed forces of a foreign Power. Hence the only contribution which the United Nations can make is, in accordance with the Charter, to call upon the United States to end its aggression.

29. The representative of the United States has affirmed once again that his Government is ready to sit down at the negotiating table. But the plan he proposes for bringing peace to Viet-Nam offers nothing new and does not in any way suggest that the United States has renounced its plan to maintain its domination over Viet-Nam through the military junta in Saigon, after crushing the national resistance of the South Viet-Nameese. It is nevertheless strange to hear the United States representative cite the 1954 Geneva Agreements, which his country has consistently violated, and actually ask that its right to continue to violate them be recognized; for that is what is involved when assurances are sought from the Government of Hanoi before the bombing of North Viet-Nam is halted.

30. As was pointed out recently by Prince Norodom Sihanouk in a message to Mr. Bebler, "The solution of the Viet-Nam problem lies in the unconditional cessation of American aggression from the air against North Viet-Nam and the undertaking by the United States to withdraw its troops from South Viet-Nam where they are stationed without any right".

31. Any American proposal for negotiation which does not take this into account is doomed to failure, since it will quite rightly appear to both the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam, which is the only genuine representative of the people of South Viet-Nam, as an obvious attempt to bamboozle them.

32. If the American Government really wants to return to the Geneva Agreements, it must sincerely accept the four points of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the five points of the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam, which are in accordance with the letter and spirit of those Agreements. In that connexion Cambodia would like to see all the signatories to the General Agreements condemn the United States aggression and call on the United States to put an end immediately to its violation of the texts it has signed, and to respect the terms they embody. Clearly the first step would be the immediate cessation of the terrorist bombing of North Viet-Nam, as called for even by some of the United States' allies. But—and we must be under no delusion about this—the South Viet-Nameese people will fight for ten years, twenty years if need be, against the American army of occupation for the right to settle its internal affairs without foreign interference or intervention.

33. But what would happen after we had left? ask the American leaders. Our answer is that that is the concern of the Viet-Nameese themselves and that no country in the world can usurp the right to intervene in their affairs. The State Department is acquainted with the political programme of the National Liberation Front; it does not constitute a threat to the security of the United States and it is in line with the aspirations of

the South Viet-Nameese people. If the clique of fascist generals in Saigon wish to oppose that, let them; but let them do so alone. The South Viet-Nameese are at liberty to choose the régime they want and to decide their own future, since the Geneva Agreements have never stipulated that this or that form of government would not be allowed in South Viet-Nam. For us Cambodians, non-intervention and non-interference in the affairs of others are sacred principles, and we can never accept the idea of any foreign Power whatsoever imposing its own régime or ideology by violence or by any other means.

34. I have dwelt on the question of Viet-Nam because it concerns a neighbouring, fraternal country and also because the imperialist policy of the United States is preparing other Viet-Nams in our Third World. Tomorrow the American Government, applying the same theories as in Viet-Nam, Cambodia and Laos, will send its marines to Bolivia, Venezuela or Colombia and its bombers to Cuba. Unless the United Nations strenuously opposes the United States policy of world hegemony there will soon be three or four Viet-Nams in Asia, Africa and Latin America, with the inevitable prospect of a world war.

35. As every year, the General Assembly will have to examine the question of the representation of China in the United Nations. As every year, Cambodia will ask that the People's Republic of China be invited to resume its place usurped by the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek, whose presence here is a scandal that has gone on too long.

36. We know very well that the representatives of the United States will assert once again that China is a threat to world peace, especially since it set out to equip itself with nuclear weapons. And the Governments under the thumb of Washington will, as always, obey the directives for the maintenance of the status quo.

37. But if China is propagating its ideology, the United States is imposing throughout the world its military bases, its armies of occupation, its "local" wars, its fascist Governments resulting from coups d'état instigated by the Central Intelligence Agency.

38. If China has become a nuclear Power, it has solemnly undertaken never to be the first to use its atomic weapons, whereas the United States at every opportunity wields the threat of its prodigious arsenal of atomic and hydrogen bombs against any country which resists it. Who is threatening the peace of the world?

39. The lawful representatives of a country of 700 million people are excluded from this Organization in favour of a delegation which is nothing more than the creature of the American authorities in the Chinese province of Taiwan. The absurdity of this is sufficient to demonstrate that in renouncing the principle of universality and bowing to American instructions, the majority of the Members of this Assembly are leading us all along a dangerous dead-end path. There can be no doubt that failing the restoration to China of the province of Taiwan, which is administered without any entitlement by the United States, and failing an invitation to the People's Republic of China to resume its place among us, with all its rights and pre-

rogatives, the United Nations will never be able to play its proper rôle; on the contrary, its impotence will be confirmed more and more clearly every year.

40. There is another Asian problem which calls for an urgent solution, namely, the problem of the still-divided Korea. There is proof positive of the harm done by the persistent interference of the United Nations in this problem, which must be left to the Korean people to solve. In South Korea under American military occupation, popular resistance continues to grow, especially since Korean divisions began to be used for the American aggression in South Viet-Nam. The domestic situation in that country is definitely heading for another Viet-Nam. We believe that it is the duty of the United Nations to act before it is too late.

41. The Organization should therefore call for the withdrawal of American troops from the territory of South Korea, and order the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, which is clearly serving no useful purpose. It would then be for the Korean people, by themselves and without interference from outside, to seek to reunify their country by peaceful means.

42. The crisis in the Middle East likewise weighs very heavily upon this general debate. Cambodia deplores the armed conflict which has taken place between Israel and the Arab countries, and reiterates that recourse to force only makes the settlement of disputes more difficult. The adversaries today are in an impasse created by Israel's military occupation of conquered Arab territories. Withdrawal must therefore be a prior condition for discussions we would like to see, based on the right of Israel to existence and security, and the right of the Palestinian people to have their legitimate claims satisfied.

43. We sincerely hope that an agreement consonant with international law will be reached between all the countries of the Middle East and Israel, although we believe that such an agreement will only be possible if the great Powers cease to interfere in the affairs of either side. We are of course well aware of the opposing views of Israel and the Arab countries, but we refuse to believe that they cannot be reconciled.

44. The trend of the international situation and the inability of the United Nations to command respect for its Charter do not make for optimism. Imperialist or neo-colonialist ambitions, the arrogance of the great Powers, the widening gulf between over-developed and under-developed, and racial oppression, are everywhere causing wars, popular uprisings and brutal repression.

45. As was pointed out by our revered and courageous Secretary-General U Thant, to whom we would like to pay a very special tribute, we are drifting relentlessly towards a world confrontation. Unfortunately, his warnings are contemptuously rejected by irresponsible or criminal leaders, and they find only a very feeble response in this Assembly. Yet the United Nations had and still has the means of removing, or at any rate lessening, the causes of this calamitous drift.

46. Unfortunately, we find the United Nations endorsing so-called economic bodies designed by the

great imperialist Powers to impose their will on the developing nations. Thus in the course of the past year Cambodia has been urged to join financial organizations or regional economic co-operation bodies controlled by the United States, either directly or with Japan as intermediary. We have also observed that the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and the Committee for the Coordination of Investigations of the Lower Mekong Basin are becoming more and more the instruments of American policy. This new form of imperialism is extremely serious, because it increases the dependence of the Afro-Asian and Latin American countries on the United States and creates a threat for countries which, like Cambodia, are developing and making progress by their own efforts.

47. It is equally deplorable that the United Nations has been unable to end the manifestations of racism which are a disgrace to so many countries. In South Africa and in Rhodesia, the African population is suffering vile oppression by Governments which openly flaunt their racism. In Angola and Mozambique colonialist domination is the order of the day. And how could we forget that the Cambodian minority in South Viet-Nam is still victim of physical, cultural and religious genocide on the part of the American/South-Viet-Name army and administration?

48. In the United States itself, the desperate struggle by 25 million black citizens to affirm their human dignity and to acquire the elementary rights they are refused deserves our full support, because their struggle is our own, the struggle of all peoples of colour whom certain fundamentally racist Western Powers are trying to maintain under their thumb. We therefore believe that to allow the Headquarters of the United Nations to remain in a country engaged in the extermination of Asians in Viet-Nam and in violence against its own negro citizens is an anomaly which needs to be remedied.

49. The Cambodian delegation therefore trusts that the General Assembly will tackle the grave problems before it at the present session with a determination to seek the bold and just solutions which the peoples of the world await.

50. In conclusion, allow me to say that we were delighted at the election of Mr. Corneliu Manescu as President of this session of the General Assembly. The Cambodian delegation extends to him its warmest congratulations and its best wishes for complete success in the high office entrusted to him.

51. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish). I know of no better way to begin my statement, Mr. President, than to convey to you the very sincere congratulations of my delegation on the honourable and well-deserved appointment conferred upon you by the General Assembly. The exemplary manner in which you have been conducting our debates and the judicious words of your opening statement testify to the wisdom of that appointment. My delegation entirely agrees with the point which you made on that occasion, namely, that more than ever before, the present international situation calls for the intensification of efforts by small and medium-sized countries to foster regard for morality and

respect for the rule of law in relations between States and between peoples.

52. I should also like to extend our congratulations to Ambassador Pazhwak, who with such distinction and ability has presided over, not only the twenty-first session, but also the two special sessions of the General Assembly which dealt with problems whose seriousness and importance it would be difficult to overstate.

53. The year 1967 will not be outstanding in the annals of the United Nations so far as concerns international peace and security, responsibility for the maintenance of which was placed upon the Organization, as its main task, by the Charter signed at San Francisco.

54. The truth of this statement is so self-evident that there is no need for me to try and substantiate it. In the first of the two parts of my speech, I should merely like to make a few general remarks about my country's position on the questions of Viet-Nam and the Middle East, and with regard to one of the fundamental principles of the Charter.

55. In addressing this Assembly in the general debate at the twenty-first session [1418th meeting], the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Mexico expressed our Government's deep concern over the war in Viet-Nam. He said that the war undoubtedly constituted the most serious threat to world peace since the Korean War in 1950. For reasons known to all, he went on, it would appear that the United Nations is not now in a position to take action to settle that conflict. He repeated that Mexico is nevertheless ready to lend its moral support to any practical proposal that will enable the parties directly involved to begin negotiations as soon as possible to end this war, in which the principal victims are the Viet-Nameese people, who have been shedding their blood year after year. The conflicting forces, interests and ideologies are such, he continued, that the co-operation which countries not involved in the conflict can offer, especially those without great material power, lies not so much in suggesting practical measures, as in solemnly exhorting the Powers with major responsibility to keep open all channels of communication that may lead to a peaceful settlement. He concluded by recalling the Secretary-General's untiring and patient efforts, and declared that "although he has not yet achieved what we all desire, all men of goodwill are in debt to U Thant".

56. It is just over a year since those words were uttered before the General Assembly, but the time that has elapsed since, far from diminishing their validity, has increased—if that were possible—the extreme urgency of the exhortation contained in them. Today more than ever, therefore, it is essential that the Secretary-General—who is at the head of the only principal United Nations organ which for the time being seems in a position to take effective measures to remove the conflict from the battlefield and bring it to the conference table—should receive the loyal and sincere co-operation of all Members of our Organization so that his work of reconciliation may finally bring forth the results which all men hope for.

57. The unstable situation that has existed in the Middle East for two decades as a legacy of what was

originally called "The Palestine question" deteriorated in the spring of this year to the point where it broke out into armed conflict of grave proportions.

58. Mexico did its utmost to help to restore peace in the region in accordance with the principles of justice and international law as laid down in the Charter. The unselfish objectives we were pursuing and the principles which guided our actions have been summed up in the annual report presented by President Diaz Ordaz to the Congress of the Union of Mexican States on 1 September 1967, in which, *inter alia*, he stated:

"In the turbulent world in which we live, we frequently have to face emergency situations. At times they endanger universal peace and cause moral and material damage difficult or impossible to repair in countries whose geographical remoteness from our own does not exclude them from the close fellow-feeling we have for all men everywhere.

"At the outbreak of the conflict in the Middle East, we expressed our hope that some means could be found of channelling action along paths leading to peace.

"Subsequently, in the United Nations, the Latin American countries set up a negotiating group consisting of the representatives of Mexico, Brazil and Trinidad and Tobago. They submitted to the General Assembly a draft resolution which, although it obtained the largest number of votes of all the draft resolutions of a general nature that were submitted (57 votes out of a total of 120), did not obtain the two-thirds majority required by the United Nations Charter for adoption. It was closely followed by the draft formulated by Yugoslavia and a group of so-called 'non-aligned' countries. Both drafts were united in their condemnation of the use of force and in pointing out the need for Israel to return all the Arab lands which it has occupied since 5 June last. The fundamental difference, as we see it, between the two drafts lies in the fact that the Latin-American text specified that the withdrawal of Israel forces should form part of a programme leading to the establishment of a lasting peace.

"The experience of recent years shows us that any proposal, if it is to be truly effective, must establish norms that would permit those peoples to live as good neighbours, fully respecting one another's sovereignty, territorial integrity and rights.

"We believe that Mexico has discharged a historical and political duty in condemning the use of force for the solution of international conflicts, and in once again repeating that war confers no rights and that to base law on the amoral use of physical violence would be tantamount to destroying the very foundations of what mankind has always understood by law. We refuse to recognize the alleged validity of so-called victories on the battlefield."

59. My delegation regrets that the efforts of the fifth emergency special session of the Assembly have proved fruitless. We are prepared to give our support to any attempt to resolve the conflict, as long as it complies with the basic principles enunciated by the President of Mexico in his annual report, to which I have just referred.

60. We are convinced that it is in times of crisis, when international events or situations may cause some of us to doubt the validity and immutability of the fundamental principles of the Charter, that it is most important to restate them and define them precisely. Accordingly, at the recent session in Geneva of the Special Committee on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operations among States, Mexico not only reaffirmed its unqualified support for the principle of non-intervention, as defined in General Assembly [resolution 2131 (XX)], but at the same time submitted to that Committee a joint proposal [A/6799, para. 27], in sponsoring which it was joined by Argentina, Chile, Guatemala and Venezuela—that is to say, all the other Latin American States represented on the Committee—on the principle prohibiting the threat or use of force in international relations. I shall take the liberty of explaining the content of that proposal in some detail, both because of its intrinsic importance, and because the General Assembly will be called upon to consider it at its present session.

61. The draft, which is drawn up in the form of a declaration, begins by reaffirming the duty of every State to refrain in its international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. After adding that "such threat or use of force shall never be used as a means of settling international issues", it goes on to spell out a series of specific corollaries and obligations which derive automatically from the foregoing fundamental principle without limiting its generality. Since the complete text of the principles, corollaries and obligations can readily be consulted in the report which the Special Committee is to submit to the Assembly, I shall refrain from reading them out, although I consider it indispensable that they should be known to all delegations. I would merely mention here that they include the principle that:

"In accordance with the United Nations Charter, no territorial acquisitions or special advantages obtained by force or by other means of coercion shall be recognized".

62. The joint proposal, after enumerating all the various specific prohibitions which should be regarded as included under the general prohibition of the threat or use of force, proceeds to define the only three cases in which, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, the use of force is lawful, setting out the conditions that must be fulfilled in each case.

63. The use of force shall be considered lawful, solely and exclusively:

(1) When it is undertaken by or under the authority of a competent United Nations organ in accordance with the relevant provisions of the charter;

(2) When it is undertaken in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence, recognized by Article 51 of the Charter, on the very clear understanding, as the proposal specifies in this respect, that this right "may be exercised only in confronting armed attack, without prejudice to the

right of a State which is subject to subversive or terrorist acts supported by one or more other States, to take reasonable and appropriate measures to safeguard its institutions";

(3) When it is undertaken by a regional agency, with reference to which case the proposal, as in the previous instance, adds a highly important condition—that "the use of force by regional agencies, except in the case of self-defence, requires the express authorization of the Security Council, in accordance with Article 53 of the United Nations Charter".

64. Of course, the codification of the obligations entailed by the principles of the Charter would serve little purpose if it resulted in the compilation of documents which, however high their quality, were of purely academic interest. My delegation believes that, if our Organization is to avoid the sad fate that befell its predecessor, the League of Nations, it is essential that each and every Member should scrupulously observe the principles of the Charter in its relations with other States, and that it should fulfil, with equal scrupulousness and in good faith, the obligations deriving from them.

65. We venture to hope that this requirement, though obviously difficult, will be safely realizable since a calm and objective analysis of the lessons of history demonstrates conclusively that such a course is in the long run the best way of defending the legitimate interests of all the peoples of the world, whether the States they belong to are large or small, weak or mighty. Suffice it to recall what was so rightly stated in this respect by Grotius as long as three centuries ago, in the Prolegomena to his Treaty on the Law of War and Peace:

"For since, by his own admission, the national who in his own country obeys its laws is not foolish, even though, out of regard for that law he may be obliged to forego certain things advantageous for himself, so that nation is not foolish which does not press its own advantage to the point of disregarding the laws common to nations. The reason in either case is the same. For just as the national, who violates the law of his country in order to obtain an immediate advantage, breaks down that by which the advantages of himself and his posterity are for all future time assured, so the State which transgresses the laws of nature and of nations cuts away also the bulwarks which safeguard its own future peace".^{2/}

66. As I implied at the outset, this year has witnessed, and continues to witness, international events and situations which offer precious little encouragement to those of us who consider that the United Nations Charter should be the ultimate criterion in relations between States. This is perhaps a further reason for singling out, as a means of warding off pessimism, an undertaking of transcendental importance, which it was the good fortune of Latin America to bring to a successful conclusion in February 1967, and which has already been referred to in complimentary terms by so many distinguished representatives in their statements. I shall speak

^{2/} Hugo Grotius, On the Law of War and Peace, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1925, Vol. II, p. 16.

of this undertaking now, in the second part of my statement.

67. On 27 November 1963, a few minutes after the General Assembly had adopted, without a single opposing vote, [resolution 1911 (XVIII)], entitled "Denuclearization of Latin America" [1265th meeting], I had occasion to come to this very rostrum to explain briefly the significance that Mexico attached to the decision which had just been adopted, and which I ventured to term historic.

68. I said at that time that the resolution was both a challenge and a testimony:

"a challenge to the ability of the Latin American States to work together and to achieve unanimous results that reflect the intense desire for peace with which, we are sure, all their peoples without exception are imbued" [*ibid.*, para. 78];

"a testimony that Latin America has now come of age and is able to assess correctly the real desires of its peoples" [*ibid.*, para. 81];

and I added by way of conclusion:

"We do not intend to act rashly or hastily. We shall follow the advice of the wise Latin adage and make haste slowly, but we shall make haste.

"Today, with the historic resolution adopted by this Assembly, Latin America starts along the road to denuclearization. We are convinced that sooner or later we shall achieve that goal, for we can count upon the unreserved and enthusiastic support of all our peoples". [*ibid.*, paras. 90 and 91.]

69. These words were to prove prophetic. In fact, only three years and a few months later, on 12 February 1967, the twenty-one member States of the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America, meeting at the offices of the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs, at Tlatelolco, unanimously adopted the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, which is already known by the name of that historic district of my country's capital.

70. It was no less a person than the Secretary-General of the United Nations who make a point of stressing the overwhelming importance of the Treaty—a truly Latin-American contribution to disarmament and peace. In his message to the Preparatory Commission that same 12 February, U Thant stated emphatically:

"The signature of this Treaty on the 14th of this month will be an event of historical significance in the world-wide effort to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to curb the nuclear arms race.

"The Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America marks an important milestone in the long and difficult search for disarmament. It takes its place together with the Antarctic Treaty of 1959, the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963, and the Outer Space Treaty of January 1967 in establishing limits to the nuclear arms race. It provides the statute for the creation, for the first time in history, of a nuclear-free zone for an inhabited portion of the earth.

"The provisions of the Treaty also mark a major step forward in the field of verification and control. Among the treaties I have mentioned, the one you have today approved is the first and only one that establishes an effective system of control, under a permanent and supervisory organ ...

"The success you have achieved in your work here will stand not only as a landmark but will be an encouraging example, and I trust also an important stimulant, for progress in other disarmament measures of world-wide as well as of regional significance. The importance of your work also goes beyond that of the field of nuclear disarmament; it contributes in a concrete way to the promotion of international peace and security.

"The nations of Latin America can, with ample justification, take pride in what they have wrought by their own initiative and through their own efforts."

71. Of course, the Treaty of Tlatelolco—the first example of the unconditional prohibition of nuclear weapons in inhabited portions of the earth, which Latin America offers to the world as testimony of its desire for peace and its unequivocal repudiation of such weapons of mass destruction—was not concluded on the spur of the moment, and this is one of its principal merits. In fact, it was the outcome of steady and continuous joint efforts by the Latin American States, by which it was patiently discussed, drafted and approved.

72. It is not my intention to review those efforts in detail here; I shall have an opportunity later, in the First Committee, to refer to the most noteworthy milestones in their progress. For the time being, I shall merely recall that, immediately after the closure of the eighteenth session of the General Assembly, the Mexican Foreign Ministry initiated active consultations with the foreign ministries of the other Latin American Republics with a view to determining what might be the most effective procedures for implementing the recommendations contained in General Assembly [resolution 1911 (XVIII)]. The outcome of those consultations was the Preliminary Meeting on the Denuclearization of Latin America, held in Mexico from 23 to 27 November 1964. That meeting saw the setting up of the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America, which also had its headquarters in Mexico City. I had the signal honour of presiding over the Commission, which, in the course of four sessions between March 1965 and February 1967, successfully carried out the task entrusted to it, namely, to draft the text of what was to become the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

73. I do not believe that this is an appropriate forum for making a close analysis of the principal provisions of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, although in due course I shall attempt to do so in the First Committee. I should merely like to draw attention to a few aspects of this international instrument and model which I believe are of particular significance.

74. First of all, because of the privileged conditions which fortunately exist in Latin America, the Treaty of Tlatelolco has been able to go further than a non-proliferation treaty, in that it is designed permanently to prohibit nuclear weapons from Latin American

territories, irrespective of the State exercising control over those weapons, thus ensuring that Latin America will be completely free of nuclear weapons for all time.

75. Secondly, while it is true that the Treaty was preceded by two other treaties which are somewhat similar in their objectives, namely, the Antarctic Treaty of 1959 and the Treaty on the Use of Outer Space, which was signed in January 1967, these latter relate respectively to areas covered by eternal snows, and to celestial bodies millions of miles removed from us. The Treaty of Tlatelolco is, therefore, the first to be concluded in respect of territories densely populated by man and covering almost the whole of one continent of the earth.

76. A third aspect which should also be stressed—as indeed it was by the Secretary-General in his message of 12 February 1967 to the Preparatory Commission and again in the Introduction to his Annual Report [A/6701/Add.1]—is that this is the first treaty to be concluded in the field of disarmament that establishes an effective system of control under a permanent supervisory organ. The system includes the full application of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, but it is much wider in scope. In the first place, it is intended to verify not only "that devices, services and facilities intended for peaceful uses of nuclear energy are not used in the testing or manufacture of nuclear weapons", but also to ensure that none of the activities prohibited in article 1 of the Treaty are carried out in the territory of the Contracting Parties with nuclear materials or weapons introduced from abroad, and that any explosions for peaceful purposes that may be carried out are compatible with article 18 of the Treaty. In the second place, the Treaty assigns important supervisory duties to the three principal organs—established under the Treaty—of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, namely, the General Conference, the Council and the Secretariat.

77. Finally, I cannot but make specific mention, even in such a general review as this, of what is undoubtedly one of the chief merits of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, namely, that it has succeeded in reconciling the comprehensive and absolute prohibition—without exceptions or reservations of any kind—of nuclear weapons with the right of the Contracting Parties to the peaceful use of the atom for their own economic and social development. Both principles, the principle of the prohibition of nuclear weapons and that of the peaceful uses of the atom, are embodied in the Treaty. The prohibition, however, in article 1, is absolute and without reservations, whilst, under articles 17 and 18, the peaceful uses of atomic energy are, as could not be otherwise, subject to the condition that they do not entail violation or infringement of the unqualified prohibition of nuclear weapons. The control system to which I have already referred and the incorporation into the Treaty of an objective definition of what, for the purpose of the Treaty, shall be understood by the term "nuclear weapon" constitute adequate and effective guarantees that the relevant provisions of the Treaty will not be violated either overtly or clandestinely and, in particular, that it will be impossible to test or manufacture nuclear weapons under the pre-

text of carrying out nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

78. General Assembly [resolution 1911 (XVIII)] contains recommendations addressed to three separate parties: the States of Latin America, the nuclear Powers, and the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Put briefly, the purpose of these recommendations was threefold: to encourage the States of Latin America to initiate studies and take measures, as they deemed appropriate, in order to conclude a treaty designed to prohibit nuclear weapons in Latin America; to recommend the nuclear Powers, once such a treaty had been concluded, to "lend their full co-operation" for the effective realization of the peaceful aims of the resolution; and to request the Secretary-General to extend to the States of Latin America such technical facilities as they might require in order to ensure the success of their undertaking.

79. The Latin American States are especially grateful to the Secretary-General for his help. Not only has he always extended, through the Chief of the Disarmament Affairs Division, all the invaluable technical assistance which was requested of him, but also in each of the introductions to his annual reports since the Preparatory Commission was set up, he has been good enough to include the stimulus of his encouraging comments on the Commission's work.

80. So far as the Latin American States are concerned, the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, which is included on the agenda of the present session as item 91 and which has already been signed by twenty of the twenty-one States that approved it, is the best proof that they have faithfully carried out the most arduous part of their task. It still remains for them, however, to see that the necessary steps are taken to enable the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, which is set up under the Treaty, to come into operation as soon as the Treaty has entered into force among eleven States, in accordance with the provisions of article 28, paragraph 2. We venture to hope that this will be within one year at the most.

81. My Government, which believes that example is the best preacher, has just deposited, on 20 September last, its instrument of ratification, to which it annexed the following statement:

"The Government of Mexico, in ratifying the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, expressly states that, for the purposes of article 28, paragraph 2, of the aforesaid Treaty, it waives in their entirety the requirements laid down in paragraph 1 of the said article, in order that the Treaty may enter into force, with respect to Mexico, at the time when the instrument of ratification is deposited."

82. Lastly, as far as the nuclear Powers are concerned, we regret to note that, although eight months have already elapsed since the Treaty of Tlatelolco was opened for signature, the recommendation addressed to the Powers in General Assembly [resolution 1911 (XVIII)] has not yet been fully carried out. Nevertheless, we would like to think that, before we have concluded our consideration of agenda item 91, or, in any event, before the end of the twenty-second

session of the Assembly, these Powers will have found it possible to affix their signatures to Additional Protocol II, which is addressed to them. We base this belief on our conviction that words should be matched with deeds. In fact, Additional Protocol II would place upon the nuclear Powers only two obligations, which the representatives of those Powers—with the exception of the People's Republic of China—have repeatedly stated that they are prepared to undertake. They have given this undertaking either in general debates in the United Nations and in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament or in correspondence reproduced in the documents of the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America. The obligations would be those set forth in the Treaty of Tlatelolco, Additional Protocol II, articles 2 and 3, in the following terms:

"... not to contribute in any way to the performance of acts involving a violation of the obligations of article 1 of the Treaty in the territories to which the Treaty applies, in accordance with article 4 thereof."

And secondly:

"... not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against the Contracting Parties of the Treaty..."

83. Before concluding, I should like to quote what a well-known historian, an acknowledged expert in international affairs has said recently about the terrible threat which nuclear weapons pose for mankind. The man to whom I refer is Arnold Toynbee. Early in 1967 he said that whenever a new weapon had been invented in the past, people had expressed the view that it was so terrible it must not be used. Nevertheless, it had been used and, terrible though it was, it had not caused the human race to perish. But men were now in possession of something which could actually destroy life on our planet. Mankind had not found itself in such a situation since the end of the Stone Age. It was then that we had succeeded in dominating lions, tigers and other such beasts. From that time on, the survival of the human race had seemed assured. But since 1945, our survival had again become uncertain, because we had, so to speak, turned into lions and tigers ourselves. The threat to the survival of mankind had in fact been far greater since 1945 than it had at any time during the first million years of history.

84. It is within the context of such considerations as these that we can best assess the importance of the contribution made by Latin America in concluding the Treaty of Tlatelolco and in prohibiting forever such terrible weapons of mass destruction from the Latin American sub-continent, with its 250 million inhabitants and its area of over 20 million square kilometres.

85. The United Nations is a world organization and, what is more, an organization that must of necessity be universal in its aims. Accordingly, the temporary set-backs that it may encounter in one area of the world will always be offset by achievements in one or more other areas.

86. What I have just been saying is well illustrated by the comprehensive review I have made of three sub-

jects to which we think the General Assembly should give priority of consideration. Two of them are on the agenda, and the first, although not on the agenda, is undoubtedly of main concern to all the peoples of the world.

87. The fact that this initiative—the military denuclearization of Latin America—has been successfully concluded, and that the many and arduous difficulties inherent in any attempt at disarmament, even a very modest one—and this is not so modest—have been overcome, may encourage us to find, through mutual goodwill, frank negotiation and a sincere spirit of conciliation, constructive solutions to other problems which today it is more essential than ever to resolve, since the choice between war and peace is directly and immediately involved. We may then not have to reproach ourselves for relinquishing or failing to stand firmly enough on principles which, and not without good reason, are termed fundamental, for they are what holds our Organization together and justifies its continued existence.

88. Mr. GRIMES (Liberia): I seize this opportunity, on behalf of the Liberian delegation and myself, to extend to you, Mr. President, our heartiest congratulations on your election as President of the General Assembly at its twenty-second session. We are indeed fortunate, in our opinion, to have such a capable and experienced diplomat and statesman as you to guide and direct the deliberations of this Assembly.

89. I also compliment your eminent predecessor, Ambassador Abdul Rahman Pazhwak, who presided over the twenty-first session, the fifth special session and the fifth emergency special session, for handling his arduous task in such a manner as to win for himself the admiration and respect of us all.

90. The twenty-second session of the General Assembly has begun at a time when the clouds on the international horizon are dark indeed. International peace is in jeopardy and the fate of mankind hangs in the balance. People are troubled, apprehensive and anxious because man's creative genius has permitted him to invent nuclear, thermonuclear and other weapons of mass destruction with which he can destroy himself rapidly and easily; but he has been unable, it appears, to use the same genius to achieve the peace for which mankind yearns.

91. There are serious problems in Viet-Nam as the war there becomes more violent, cruel and bloody. It also points up the series of unsolved problems involving other divided countries—Germany and Korea. There is the grim situation in southern Africa which threatens a serious race conflict. There is also the tense situation in the Middle East which has been with us for the past two decades and which has resulted in three military conflicts. We need to find solutions to those problems.

92. In addition there must be included the critical economic problems facing developing countries in the seventh year of the United Nations Development Decade. The modest goals set for the Decade have not been attained, and the first six years can easily be regarded as a failure. This situation is engendering more tensions, instability and conflict, with dire consequences for peace.

93. Every nation has a stake in the peace of the world. Mankind is asking for and demanding a better life, the attainment of which is essential to peace. Betterment must be sought through peaceful change so that we can avoid the series of unending crises which continue to bedevil the international scene and which could result in a global holocaust that would be most undesirable and catastrophic.

Mr. Fakhreddine (Sudan), Vice-President, took the Chair.

94. Today, more than ever, our Assembly must bring the full force of its influence to bear on the issues of war and peace. Our search for peace should be resolute, but in that search we must adopt a balanced approach towards promoting material progress and ensuring social justice and social progress for all mankind. It is only through finding and securing peace that we can ensure human survival. Here in the United Nations we have an opportunity to strengthen this institution so as to accelerate the pursuit of those important natural goals and aspirations. If we fail to achieve peace, we may have the dubious distinction of witnessing at least the initial stages of the self-destruction of the human species.

95. I stated at the twenty-first session:

"Much depends on the success and future of the United Nations. International peace and security depend on it. The whole future of the human race may well depend on it. The United Nations may be the Organization on which humanity's hope for survival hinges. If it fails, then all of us have failed. Let not national honour ... stand in the way of the salvation of mankind." [1435th meeting, para. 5.]

96. We are pleased to note the following three important recent achievements in the field of disarmament: the approval given to the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies [resolution 2222 (XXI)]; the conclusion in Mexico City of a Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America [see A/6663]; and the draft treaty on nuclear non-proliferation submitted on 24 August 1967 by the United States and the Soviet Union in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.^{3/} In spite of this there are still many problems in connexion with these treaties which are open and unsolved, and it is still not safe to say that a significant advance has yet been made toward general and complete disarmament.

97. Unfortunately neither France nor the People's Republic of China participates in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and atmospheric tests have continued. The deadlock continues between the United States and the Soviet Union on an acceptable system to verify compliance with an underground nuclear test ban. The latter insists that national means of detection are adequate to verify an underground test ban, but the former insists that present scientific capabilities are still inadequate and that on-the-spot inspections are necessary. One wonders whether there may not be considerations of apparent military necessity which have weighted the scales in favour of con-

tinued testing and have thereby prevented the conclusion of an absolute test ban.

98. The tremendous arms build-up, far from assuring us of true security, is generating more uncertainty, scepticism, mistrust and suspicion. This in turn is creating more apprehension, more misgiving, fear and alarm. However, we do not seem to possess either the courage or the resoluteness to take bold steps to end the senseless armaments race so as to make available the resources which could be usefully deployed to fight the war that mankind must wage against ignorance, poverty and disease. It is indeed a tragic and pathetic situation, and it is no wonder that some people have even expressed doubts that disarmament is a realistic goal in the world today.

99. In spite of the frustrations in this field and our apparent inability to control the inventions which our scientific advancement has made possible, we cannot afford to despair. We must redouble our efforts, improve the machinery of our Organization, and do all we can to find peaceful solutions to international disputes, and to ensure mankind's over-all progress so that we can all benefit by scientific inventions and live a better life free from fear and anxiety.

100. At a press conference just before the opening of this session of the Assembly, our Secretary-General expressed the hope that the Assembly would take new initiatives to bring the war in Viet-Nam to an end. Unfortunately, due to ideological considerations, the division of some countries, which was made for military reasons and regarded as temporary, is now, for all practical considerations, permanent and is a source of unfortunate tensions. It is still our hope that, free from ideology, the peoples in such Territories can be permitted to express their opinions unfettered, and that all countries will respect the results emanating from such a free expression of opinion.

101. The conflict in Viet-Nam has reached such proportions that the United Nations should seek to get the parties to the conflict to the conference table with the least possible delay, so that the negotiations which may then begin might be given the chance to bring about peace in Viet-Nam, and, in the case of other divided countries, to induce the proper exercise of their inherent right of self-determination.

102. In the introduction to his annual report [A/6701/Add.1, para. 49], the Secretary-General enunciated the following fundamental principles which could be usefully applied to the Middle East crisis: the territorial integrity of every State must be respected and the occupation by military force of the territory of one State by another cannot be condoned; every State's right to exist must be accepted by all other States; every State is entitled to security within its own borders; the Palestine Arab refugees "have a natural right to be in their homeland and to have a future"; and there should be free and unimpeded navigation for all through international waterways according to international conventions.

103. The Liberian Government endorses these principles and feels that if they could be accepted as binding by all the parties to the conflict, in negotiations direct or indirect, and faithfully executed and guaran-

^{3/} Documents ENDC/192 and ENDC/193.

teed by the international community, it might open the path to a new era of peace and co-operation in the Middle East.

104. It is most gratifying to note this significant accomplishment, namely, the conclusion of a Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, signed by sixty-two countries last January. This Treaty has extended the principles of international law to outer space and prohibits the placing of weapons of mass destruction in orbit, on the moon or other celestial bodies. It provides that the exploration and use of outer space should be undertaken for the benefit of all peoples and proscribes outer space from the claim of national sovereignty. Thus co-operation and mutual assistance are important principles in this Treaty.

105. Whilst there is still some criticism as to the adequacy of the Treaty, my delegation feels that the step taken is important and that, with goodwill on all sides, minor defects can be cured and loopholes closed so that the Treaty may well become an important model to be tried in some other fields. The United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, its various Sub-Committees, the Soviet Union and the United States are all to be congratulated for this significant achievement.

106. At the fifth special session of the Assembly, the United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, which had been scheduled for September 1967, was postponed to August 1968 and will be held in Vienna [resolution 2250 (S-V)]. It is to be hoped that this Conference will produce useful results, especially since we have a mutual interest in ensuring that outer space is used for man's benefit rather than for his ultimate destruction.

107. Of much concern in the present circumstances is the fate of peace-keeping operations by the United Nations. Recent events have shown the weakness of the foundations in this area. The Liberian delegation believes that peace-keeping is an important function of the United Nations and has performed an invaluable service in the cause of peace. Nevertheless there has been substantial disagreement as to the method of financing such operations, and the Organization is in a serious financial plight as a result of the refusal of some Members to pay for certain peace-keeping operations. The Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations has been in existence since 18 February 1965, a period of almost three years, but efforts to reach agreement have so far been unsuccessful.

108. Although my delegation fully endorses the appeal made by the Assembly, particularly to the highly developed countries, to make voluntary contributions to resolve the financial situation presently existing in the Organization [resolution 2249 (S-V)], we are also anxious to see agreement reached on the matter of training, assessment and payment for peace-keeping operations so as to prevent a recurrence of the present situation. The matter is too important to be allowed to lag and there should be United Nations capacity to act in threatening circumstances so that the fragile peace can be maintained and made more permanent.

109. On 12 December 1966 the General Assembly once again adopted a resolution [2184 (XXI)] reaffirm-

ing the inalienable right of the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese domination to freedom and independence, in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV), and calling upon Portugal to apply immediately the principle of self-determination. Instead, according to some reports, the Portuguese Government has intensified its military operations in those Territories by launching air attacks and bombarding villages and defenceless peoples.

110. Why does Portugal continue to adhere to its anachronistic policy of arguing that these Territories are integral parts of Portugal, and to ignore international opinion as well as the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly? This is not understandable. The inherent right of people to self-determination cannot be denied, and repressive measures by Portugal, with all the assistance of its NATO allies, cannot kill this right. It is in Portugal's own interest to formulate new policies which will enable the people in the Territories under its domination to make a free choice as to the future direction which they desire to pursue.

111. The United Nations should not sit idly by while Portugal flouts its decisions and recommendations, disregards its principles and violates the obligations of the Charter. Such insults and affronts are bound to have an adverse effect on the prestige of the Organization. It is important that action be taken, and taken soon, to ensure that Portugal respects the Charter obligations which it voluntarily agreed to when it accepted membership of the United Nations.

112. At the request of the United Kingdom in December 1966, mandatory sanctions were imposed by the Security Council [resolution 232 (1966)] on Rhodesian exports of asbestos, iron ore, chrome, sugar, pig iron, tobacco, copper, meat, hides and leather, and on Rhodesian imports of oil, arms, motor vehicles, aircraft and spares. These sanctions followed the earlier finding of the Council [resolution 217 (1965)] that the continued existence of the Ian Smith régime was a threat to international peace and security.

113. Despite this, reports indicate that exports to Rhodesia by West Germany, France, Japan, the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Free Trade Association (EFTA)—excluding the United Kingdom—have increased substantially during the first part of 1967. So have exports to South Africa by Italy, West Germany, the Netherlands, Spain and EEC, and it is well known that some goods exported to South Africa are also re-exported to Rhodesia. In the meantime, imports from Rhodesia and South Africa by some countries have also been substantially increased. Furthermore, it now seems to be an open secret that South Africa has become an entrepot for Rhodesia.

114. In addition, although the United Kingdom has imposed an oil blockade at Beira, it seems that substantial quantities of oil are being delivered to Rhodesia through Lourenço Marques. Moreover, the United Kingdom has failed to raise this in the Security Council so as to determine whether the Security Council would favourably consider any extension of the blockade to include Lourenço Marques and other nearby ports. Thus, sanctions are being contemptibly violated by some countries and the United Kingdom seems to be involved in this indirectly.

115. Obviously encouraged by ineffective sanctions, the régime in Salisbury has been engaged in enacting legislations such as amendments to the Rhodesian Citizenship Act, which empowers the Interior Minister to deprive certain citizens of their citizenship under rather general provisions and to reclassify along racial lines the citizens of some Commonwealth countries as aliens; and by introducing new bills, such as the Tribal Trust Land Act and the Tribal Courts Bill. These bills aim at placing all Africans under the direct control of chiefs who have been conditioned to accept racial discrimination, and deprive Africans of rights under the Land Apportionment Act if they do not obey such chiefs. There is developing a planned and systematic eradication of the few existing rights which Africans have had in Rhodesia.

116. Then on 28 February, the illegal régime appointed a Commission to advise on a constitution "best suited to the sovereign independent status of Rhodesia", the inquiries to be made in private. Recent events confirm that the Smith régime must be preparing to declare Rhodesia a republic since it is considering a new flag, a new anthem and a new system of honours and awards.

117. Sanctions are not effective because they are being violated, while the countries responsible merely wink at such violations and do nothing to prevent them. After virtually encouraging the Smith régime to rebel with an assurance that the United Kingdom would not intervene militarily if it did, we are witnessing actions and motions supposedly designed to bring down the régime without the use of force, actions that are apparently half-hearted and known to be ineffective. This is indeed a very serious matter. The rights and interests of 4 million Africans are being sacrificed on the altar of expediency while ineffectual acts designed to hoodwink us are proposed and efficient acts are feebly executed.

118. Thus, almost two years after the United Nations became seized of this problem, declared it a threat to international peace and security, and pledged to have the régime toppled, the régime is in as strong a position as it was then, if not stronger; and the pathetic and lamentable visible effect is that the United Nations has been made to appear impotent and powerless to make its actions effective. Even inaction would not have been as deplorable as the present situation is.

119. This Organization continues to be plagued with the morally repulsive, obnoxious and invidious practice of apartheid, as well as with its evil effects. We cannot forget that among the purposes of the United Nations are "respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples" and "respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race". There cannot be the slightest doubt that these principles are openly violated in South Africa and there is a constant and methodical erosion of rights of Africans and other races in South Africa on the sole ground of colour, resulting in serious deprivation of rights of individuals and outright repression. There has been an intensification of repressive measures against opponents of apartheid by indefinite imprisonment without trial, solitary confinement, and so forth.

120. Many countries, some of them members of the Security Council, are ignoring and violating the arms embargo imposed by the Security Council in 1963 [resolution 181 (1963)]. Other States are providing assistance to South Africa for production of military aircraft and other munitions, and South Africa's principal trading partners, far from attempting to adjust their relations with South Africa closer to the clear consensus of the United Nations, are in fact increasing their trade with that régime. As if this were not enough, South Africa has defiantly declared that it will neither recognize nor deal with the United Nations Commissioner for South West Africa and the eleven nation Council created by the Assembly at its fifth special session. This action had been taken by the Assembly after full discussion by the adoption of a resolution [2248 (S-V)] reaffirming the international status of South West Africa, asserting that South Africa had failed to fulfil its obligations under the Mandate and declaring that the Assembly would take it over and assume direct responsibility for its administration.

121. It is yet to be seen whether Members of the Organization will take appropriate measures to ensure implementation of the decisions of the Assembly or whether South Africa will be permitted to have its way and annex the territory entirely. In the latter case, it will have the effect of completely undermining confidence of developing countries in the United Nations and will result in a tremendous loss of its prestige.

122. As I mentioned last year [1435th meeting], African Territories under Portuguese administration, Rhodesia, South West Africa and apartheid in South Africa are now all elements of a single problem as a result of an alliance between Rhodesia, South Africa and Portugal, and it would be impossible to solve them individually. They will have to be tackled together. Recently The New York Times reported that the Foreign Minister of South Africa had disclosed that there was a mutual security arrangement between countries of southern Africa.

123. It is now the humane responsibility of Portugal's partners in NATO and South Africa's principal trading partners in the West—and it will eventually become clearly seen to be in their own interest—to use their influence and ingenuity to have these ills and injustices corrected, since they have made it clear that they do not propose to take effective international action to bring about the change that freedom and justice require.

124. One of the greatest problems facing developing countries, which might have a profound effect on international peace, is their economic plight. There is ample evidence that the gap in living standards between rich and poor countries continues to widen and, as we enter the last quarter of the United Nations Development Decade, we find a disappointing record of failure because the objectives of the Decade have not been attained. The 1 per cent of annual incomes of developed countries has not gone into external aid. Instead, the contributions of the developed countries to external aid have declined and the anticipated 5 per cent annual growth rate for developing countries has not been attained.

125. We find that financial assistance by developed countries to developing countries has been declining

not only in the relative amount of the financial assistance in relation to the gross income of the developed countries, but also with regard to the terms on which the aid is offered. In 1966, aid and private capital to developing countries was \$400 million less than in 1965, and the United States, United Kingdom, France and West Germany are actually spending less on aid than they did in 1961. At a time when developing countries need more capital for development, capital is scarce; and when it is available it is very expensive.

126. In the meantime the external public debt of developing countries has spiralled substantially, so that over the ten year period 1956 to 1965, payments of interest and amortization increased by about 400 per cent. There is a shift in aid from grants to loans, and the terms of the loans are hardening, when they ought to be softened. Should this situation continue it will lead to a further decrease in rates of economic growth for developing countries, thereby aggravating an already serious situation.

127. Whether the United Nations Capital Development Fund established by the twenty-first General Assembly [resolution 2186 (XXI)] "to assist developing countries in the development of their economies by supplementing existing sources of capital assistance by means of grants and loans, particularly long-term loans made free of interest or at low interest rates" will achieve its goal will depend on the support given to it by the developed countries, especially in the light of the views already expressed on the Capital Development Fund. It is to be noted with satisfaction that the Executive Board will be elected at this Assembly, a Managing Director appointed, and the first annual pledging conference held.

128. The economic situation of the developing countries is further complicated by the population increase, as it is reported that by the year 2000 four-fifths of the world population will be living in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

129. Thus, as developing countries find it difficult to finance the import of capital goods essential for their economic development, there is great need for understanding—understanding that will not result in the mere doling out of assistance, but understanding which will permit developing countries to earn their own way in an over-all expansion of their economies that would be beneficial both to developed and developing countries. It is a situation which calls for joint and co-operative efforts to remove all the bottlenecks, such as inferior technology, inadequate skills, capital scarcity, poor transportation and communication.

130. My delegation hopes that every effort will be exerted by both developed and developing countries to foster, encourage and accelerate economic and social advancement through trade and development. My delegation also looks forward with anxiety to the implementation of the recommendations of the first session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development held at Geneva in 1964, particularly so that a system of equity between the cost of primary commodities and the cost of manufactured goods might be established.

131. I come now to a pressing problem facing Africa today: it is the problem of refugees. While the prob-

lem seems to have abated considerably in Europe, it is becoming more acute and more complex in Africa and the Middle East as the exodus of people from their homes for various reasons continues, in some cases at an alarming rate. Action in this field by the United Nations is quite commendable; but it is the view of my delegation that we should now redouble our efforts not only to provide care and repatriation for the refugees, but to eliminate within our respective countries the conditions which create refugees.

132. In accepting membership in this great Organization, we subscribed to the principles on which the Organization is based; and in Article 2, Paragraph 2, of the Charter, we solemnly undertook to fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by us in accordance with the Charter. Recent events seem to indicate that a number of States are engaging in activity which conflicts with the obligations they have assumed under our Charter. I refer particularly to the instances in which the pertinent organs of the United Nations have taken decisions affecting some States or Territories which have acted contrary to the Charter, and to the many instances where Members of this Organization have failed to carry out those decisions and recommendations.

133. The Government and people of Liberia remain dedicated and committed to that undertaking, as they were twenty-two years ago when they first accepted it. We consider also that every Member State of this Organization should remain committed to that undertaking, and that a non-fulfilment of that expressed obligation is inconsistent with membership in this Organization.

134. This is a period of grave crisis. The obstacles to peace are many. The danger that we might drift unintentionally into disaster is great. Let us therefore face the facts. Let us seek genuine solutions and eliminate force as an instrument of national policy. Let us rededicate our efforts and ourselves to the pursuit of peace and freedom and justice for all.

135. Mr. AL-FUTAIH (Yemen): Mr. President, allow me to express the sincere congratulations of the Yemen Arab Republic delegation on your unanimous election as President of the United Nations General Assembly at its twenty-second session. Your election marks a welcome healthy international attitude; it is a special recognition to you and a tribute to your friendly country, as well as a salute to the socialist countries on the fiftieth anniversary of their Great October Revolution.

136. In the same spirit, my delegation wishes to express its appreciation and admiration for Ambassador Abdul Rahman Pazhwak, who presided over the last three General Assembly sessions with resourcefulness, wisdom and impartiality in the most intricate situations. To our Secretary-General, U Thant, the Yemen Arab Republic delegation pays tribute for his tireless efforts to maintain with sincerity and dedication, but most of all with unshakable courage, the integrity of this Organization.

137. Simply stated, the Arab people, whether Jews, Christians or Moslems, have lived peacefully throughout history, and they still do. The racially discriminating theory of world Zionism of creating a State

has until now accomplished nothing more than shattering the peace that existed among the indigenous population of the area, and has increasingly cast suspicion on the loyalty of Jewish citizens of other countries all over the world. Zionists have volunteered themselves to deceive, apply pressure and speak for world Jewry. By that they hope to build up the fear and suspicion of the Jews and rally them with their resources to support the Zionist efforts to create a Zionist State.

138. Since Zionists were citizens of various countries, one country had to be first carefully selected, and a campaign to justify their acquisition of such a country had to be waged with all their resources and their world influence. But for the Zionists, in order to ensure the winning-over of Jews all over the world, that country had to be Palestine, and not any other in the list of several colonies, now independent States. Palestine would offer rich material for a dialogue in which success would be on the side that could command world opinion. And for this dialogue, the Zionists had to invert and fabricate a chain of allegations and false historical justifications. Along with this, a strong and fear-inspiring character had to be maintained for the state while world opinion was being won over for Zionism. It is easy to follow the racially and religiously prejudiced transformation of the Zionist movement from its inception by Herzl in 1897 to the present: the Zionists went begging for mercy until the climax of their blitzkrieg, and in June 1967 there was a criminal, genocidal, imperialistic State in the heart of the Arab homeland.

139. So, on the skulls and skeletons of hundreds of thousands of Arabs the Zionists established what they call a Jewish state. The Arab people of Palestine have until now remained uprooted and robbed of their homes and their land; hundreds of thousands are being scattered in the wilderness, hungry, homeless and exposed to the most ruthless circumstances of man and nature. The Arab people of Palestine who sheltered Jewish refugees through the centuries are today the total victims of Zionism, and, to a great extent, of the United Nations. The Government of Great Britain had no right to give to the transplanted and imported Zionists a part of Palestine, and neither did the United Nations. Zionists understand this very well, and in their hate and frustration have lost all vision, even common sense in fact, in their drive to establish a legal status. Vicious crimes have been committed against Arab communities by Zionist authorities. Genocidal acts and napalm bombing have occurred not only against the Arabs of Palestine but also against neighbouring Arabs in the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria. And we are told by the single-minded minister of aggression, Moshe Dayan, that he will extend his crimes further into densely populated and oil-rich parts of the Arab world.

140. In this context, the Arabs are being urged to accept conditions for peace. This is the demand of the Zionist Foreign Minister, Mr. Eban. What we find in this Zionist "context of peace" is the following.

141. First, the Arab people of Palestine must accept the fait accompli. They must accept slow death and total annihilation. They must not speak, as do other people, about their rights to self-determination and political independence. They must not speak of property

or repatriation. They must speak and think only as beggars, in terms of mercy and charity. For this affords the Zionists a feeling of dignity and satisfaction, since the Zionists have had to go through such a humiliating drama in their efforts to win over world public opinion, and it also offers to those who aided the Zionists against the just rights of the Arabs a means for appeasing their conscience by helping those same Arabs in the misery inflicted upon them.

142. And second, the Zionist criminal aggression and occupation of Arab lands beyond the territory of the already-occupied Palestine was planned in advance, to be used to force other neighbouring Arab States to accept that "context of peace".

143. The Arab forces did not, after 1948, cross the armistice lines even once. The Zionists alleged that they heard broadcasts or read references in newspapers concerning what they called an intent to "expel the Zionists" from an Arab homeland. We hear worse than that said against Arabs, but it was good and sufficient justification for the criminal Zionist hordes to bomb our population and wage a full-scale war with such audacious arrogance that the repercussions have not yet ceased. One can read in the United States Press or hear from certain responsible officials that the United States has sufficient power to destroy the whole world, including the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China; but should this provide justification for anyone, or for the whole world, to occupy and destroy the United States? That is a good question.

144. Zionism has gone too far in inflicting untold misery on innocent people. Zionism has tightened its grasp, has strangled goodwill in every country where it can do so, and has directed its immense resources into a campaign of defamation and cut down every attempt at justice and equity. It scarcely even hesitated to bring the world's greatest powers to a test of confrontation in pursuit of its self-centered, hateful, racial and colonial aims.

145. Zionism is represented by the State of "Israel", a name invented by the Zionists in their convention of 14 May 1947 in New York. Just what does it take to satisfy the Zionist State of "Israel"? What is the real concept of that "State"? What is the next demand the Zionists will ask this world to accept? Who can give any guarantee against the arrogance and defiance of the Zionists? What did the nations of the world do in connexion with the Jerusalem resolutions [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)]? These are questions we all must ask.

146. Since Arabs are committed to the principle of peaceful coexistence, we believe we can solve our problems by peaceful means, provided others believe in the same principle and cherish goodwill. Zionism, a racial and political theory, since it had no land of its own, had to acquire some other nation's homeland. It was decided that Arab Palestine should serve the purpose.

147. Those who are remote from the smell and the ugly scenes of the June war can not well understand the real problem of the Middle East. But no doubt, many colleagues here have felt the influence of Zionism on world Jewry and have seen how the goodwill of some traditionally friendly countries was at times abused in

violation of the sense of integrity and the will of those nations. It is truly ironic to see the Arabs, who always gave shelter to Jews in their times of distress over the centuries, today become the first victims of Zionism acting in the name of the Jews. What the Zionists have done to the Arab people in the last twenty years has by far exceeded their complaints against Nazism.

148. It has become crystal-clear now that the fundamental causes of the crises and the tragedy of the Middle East arise from the following: First, the occupation of 90 per cent of Palestine in 1948 through brutal force by transplanted Zionist immigrants; the systematic and continuous expulsion of the civilian population from their homes so as to thoroughly uproot them; the desecration of Christian and Moslem Holy Places so as to firmly establish an enmity between Christians and Moslems, on the one hand, and Jews, on the other, so that the Jews would have to stand with Zionism; the continuous arrests; the brutal torture, mutilation and banishment of leaders in order to break the people's morale in resisting aggression—something in which the Zionists failed; in short, the declaration of a Zionist state in an Arab country, representing colonialism in its ugliest form, colonialism which must be treated as such. And second, the systematically continuous policy of aggression and expansion pursued by the Zionist state.

149. The position of the Soviet Union and of all the socialist countries, and that of all peace-loving, law-abiding Member States of this Organization, is clear: a resolute resistance to aggression and territorial aggrandizement, and support for all those who struggle for freedom and self-determination.

150. The position of the United States of America in a similar situation on 20 February 1957, was clearly stated by the then President, Dwight D. Eisenhower:

"It [Israel] insists on firm guarantees as a condition to withdrawing its forces of invasion.... If we agree that armed attack can properly achieve the purposes of the assailant, then I fear we will have turned back the clock of international order. We will... have countenanced the use of force as a means of settling international differences and... gaining national advantages.... If the United Nations once admits that international disputes can be settled by using force, then we will have destroyed the very foundation of the Organization and our best hope of establishing a world order."

Since 1957 there has been a tremendous effort to strangle American thinking so that it should not be as free and objective in 1967 as it was ten years ago.

151. It is in the context of justice that peace will prevail in the Middle East. The Arab countries continue to be burdened by perfidious full-scale military aggression and occupation as a result of political deceit, a new phenomenon in international behaviour but one which has been closely associated with Zionist behaviour since 1897.

152. The Zionist State, in the usual manner, wanted to impose peace by a costly military venture and threat of destruction and total occupation of vast Arab lands and resources; but peace cannot be imposed. We must eliminate the threat of war and seek just solutions to

the basic problem of the Palestine question, a national political problem, and put an end to the colonial aggression of the Zionists against other Arab countries; and Zionists must now learn that peace cannot come through aggression and intimidation. Equally, they must not conveniently overlook the rights of the Arab nation of Palestine.

153. This is the hope of the Arab people as it must be the will of all Member States of this Organization, which depend on the validity of a system of collective security; if that structure is shattered it will mean that all men must accept the agonizing existence of living in the shadow of a thermo-nuclear war where annihilation of the human race is a matter of fact.

154. The underlying currents dominating the trends of the Middle East crisis can only be well understood in the light of the existing struggle between the peace-loving nations seeking freedom and progress, on the one hand, and on the other the forces of remnant colonialism and imperialism. Socio-political evolution of the masses has brought them to confrontation with their classical enemy in a most critical test in the area's modern history. Never before have all the elements of the enemy collaborated in such a tight and co-ordinated manner.

155. To realize the Arab aspirations and goals of establishing a single powerful State in such a vast area with great present and potential resources and markets would only jeopardize any further enslavement of people and resources in Africa and Asia; for the Arab struggle in its human aspects has been an important catalyst in the winning of freedom in many areas in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Thus the Arab people's classical enemy is always interfering in its internal affairs and seeking means and ways to ensure the *status quo* of an Arab world divided and underdeveloped, to mention only the host of military bases suffocating Arab will and freedom and the establishment in a most persistent manner of the sole colonial agent, "Israel", in the heart of the Arabs' homeland and against their will, let alone the intrigues, propaganda and a varied chain of direct and indirect pressures.

156. The Arab people, realizing their common destiny, have risen above their circumstances and have begun to face together the forces of destruction when the means and ends have become clear and when friends and foes have shown their real faces.

157. On 26 September 1962 the Arab people of Yemen succeeded in eliminating one of the most totalitarian and backward régimes in their history. For a long time that régime kept them enslaved in utter poverty and disease—not to mention life under a cruel and atrocious rule of tyranny. The success of the 1962 September revolution was the climactic result of a quarter of a century of efforts by the Arab people of Yemen to rid their future generations of a most intricate collaboration and timely design to further the enslavement of the people and a total usurpation of their resources by neo-colonial interests and their agents.

158. Before the revolution there was no written law of any kind to state clearly the rights and duties of citizens and their government. There were no insti-

tutions of any kind—no schools or hospitals for the public—and public service was unknown. The former Government sought every possible means to divide the people and to promote all possible feuds in order to rule them easily. Corruption in its utmost form was the dominating character of the Government. Today, the revolutionary Government, in adherence to democratic principles and loyalty to the goals of the revolution, has succeeded for the first time in establishing the rule of law.

159. With aid from friendly countries, the present Government has gone a long way in building a nation from nothing. Government organization and development plans have been initiated. A considerable pace has been established in building schools, hospitals and roads; water and research surveys and projects are under way. Much has been done for the individual since September 1962; and the present plan of the revolutionary Government is a total development of the country's society and resources.

160. As early as 1948 the Arab people of Yemen took arms against a despotic rule. They were the first with the United Arab Republic to initiate practical steps in the reunification of the Arab homeland since its dissection by former Arab allies immediately after the First World War. The Coordination Treaty and later the Joint Defence Treaty between the United Arab Republic and the Yemen Arab Republic after the September 1962 Yemen revolution further strengthened the loose pre-revolution union. Such steps are a true manifestation of Arab aspirations towards eventual reunification. The deep Yemeni conviction of total Arab unity is based on the fact that Arabs can no longer maintain their homeland in security for future generations while they remain divided.

161. It is a rewarding feeling that the Yemen delegation finds in the great strides the United Nations and its subsidiary bodies have made in various fields. My country has great hope in the future work of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization; such human endeavour would lay deep the foundations of peace in this world. The work of the United Nations at the grass roots level cannot be overlooked or underestimated. Hot political issues must not overcome human wisdom and patience; but we must guard collectively against any abuse of patience and goodwill.

162. My country's policy with respect to all international relations is strict adherence to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, a policy of non-alignment and peaceful coexistence, and a true, friendly co-operation with other nations based on mutual respect and non-interference. In adhering to the Charter, the Yemen Arab Republic denounces aggression and the use of force in settling international disputes and will continue to support the just struggle of peoples for freedom and progress and the attainment of national independence. The Yemeni Government and people cannot conceive of any justification for the presence of American troops in Viet-Nam and join with all peace-loving nations in condemning its aggressive war and in demanding the immediate halt of the bombing of North Viet-Nam and the withdrawal of American military forces from South Viet-Nam.

Mr. Manescu (Romania) resumed the Chair.

163. The Yemen Arab Republic delegation would like to express from this rostrum its deep gratitude to every peace-loving representative who has taken a stand against aggression and injustice; to all those who have resisted pressures and threats; to all those who of their own free will have supported the cause of peace and justice in the Middle East. Our people will not forget the genuine assistance and support of the friendly socialist countries whose attitude was one of understanding and world co-operation.

164. The delegation of the Yemen Arab Republic regrets very much the absence of the true representatives of the Chinese people: the People's Republic of China. That great and populous nation must take its place and assume its responsibility in this international Organization whose existence symbolizes the noble character of man.

165. In conclusion, if the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly did not fulfil the expectations of the Arab people by deterring aggression, it is not too late to hope that the twenty-second session will indeed fulfil those expectations.

166. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of Ethiopia, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

167. Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia): The statement made by the representative of the Republic of Somalia at the conclusion of yesterday afternoon's general debate [1585th meeting] leaves my delegation no alternative but to exercise its right of reply, the more so since his remarks were specifically directed towards our delegation. We do so, however, with great reluctance. We know that representatives of Governments are burdened with a long list of problems which are explosive in nature and have far-reaching consequences for peace and security.

168. Under the circumstances, and having regard to the grave situation prevailing today, we would have thought that the least the representatives of Somalia and Ethiopia could do would be to refrain from introducing in the general debate an acrimonious exchange of views which can only add to the concern of all those who want to see an improvement in the international situation. Also, for our part, we had a further reason to expect that the delegation of Somalia would not raise, at this session at least, their problem with us, which they have artificially created, because only a few days before the representative of Somalia spoke here a high-ranking delegation from his Government, led by his Minister of Interior, met with our Sovereign and also had useful talks with a delegation led by our Foreign Minister.

169. A joint communiqué issued on 21 September at the conclusion of the talks between the two delegations was, in our view, very helpful. Among the many points of understanding reached, the communiqué stated that our two Governments would undertake measures designed to eliminate all forms of tension.

170. Contrary to the hopeful expectations generated by that communiqué the representative of Somalia, speaking in the General Assembly [1569th meeting] only a few days after the issuance of the communiqué—to be exact, on 27 September—made it clear to us that there was no basic change in the policy of his Govern-

ment towards Ethiopia. What was apparent from his statement, however, was that there was a change of nuance, a change of tone, and perhaps a change in tactics.

171. In that statement the representative of Somalia was at pains to show that his Government had no territorial designs on its neighbours. But, alas, in the same breath he let it be known that his Government supported what he described as the right of self-determination for the Somali inhabitants of Ethiopia.

172. Yesterday he carried the logic of this policy further when he declared outright that the Somali inhabitants of our nation have never exercised their right to self-determination. It is clear, therefore, that the representative of Somalia has arrogated to himself the right to speak on behalf of a section of our nation. We cannot accept this insistence on his part to speak on behalf of our people. This policy of his Government cannot but lead to friction and conflict with us.

173. If in their prosecution of this misguided policy the Government of the Republic of Somalia engages in hostile propaganda or acts of terrorism against us or against its other neighbours, we cannot but consider such acts as being aggressive in nature.

174. His remark that the Somali citizens of Ethiopia have not had an opportunity to exercise the right of self-determination is, of course, historically untrue.

The Somali inhabitants of Ethiopia throughout the years have exercised that right several times, together with all the other groups comprising our multi-national society.

175. In the view of my Government, what the representative of Somalia offered in his last two statements was the same old wine in a new bottle, but what Ethiopia expects from Somalia is new wine in a new bottle.

176. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of Sweden, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

177. Mr. ORN (Sweden): The Secretary of State of Liberia has just said, in connexion with Rhodesia:

"Despite this, reports indicate that exports to Rhodesia by West Germany, France, Japan, the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Free Trade Association (EFTA)—excluding the United Kingdom—have increased substantially during the first part of 1967." [*Supra*, para. 113.]

178. I should like to point out that Sweden, which is a member of EFTA, broke off all economic relations with Rhodesia as early as November 1965, and trade came to a complete standstill. This fact has also been reported monthly to the Secretary-General, in accordance with the Security Council decision of 16 December 1966 [resolution 232 (1966)].

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.